



ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER

Stories of Unity Through
Diversity and Inclusion

Shelley Moore
Foreword by Leyton Schnellert



PORTAGE &
MAIN PRESS

For Lorne Bodin

© 2016 by Shelley Moore

Excerpts from this publication may be reproduced under licence from Access Copyright, or with the express written permission of Portage & Main Press, or as permitted by law.

All rights are otherwise reserved, and no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, scanning, recording, or otherwise—except as specifically authorized.

Portage & Main Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Province of Manitoba through the Department of Sport, Culture and Heritage and the Manitoba Book Publishing Tax Credit, and the Government of Canada through the Canada Book Fund (CBF) for our publishing activities.

Printed and bound in Canada by Friesens

Cover and interior design by Relish New Brand Experience

Illustration: Jess Dixon

LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES CANADA CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION

Moore, Shelley, author

One without the other : stories of unity through diversity
& inclusion / Shelley Moore.

ISBN 978-1-55379-658-9 (paperback)

1. Inclusive education. I. Title.

LC1200.M665 2016 371.9'046 C2016-900408-2

Also issued in electronic format: ISBN 978-1-55379-699-2 (EPUB)

ISBN 978-1-55379-700-5 (MOBI)

22 21 20 19

4 5 6 7 8



PORTAGE &
MAIN PRESS

1-800-667-9673

www.portageandmainpress.com

Winnipeg, Manitoba

Treaty 1 Territory and homeland of the Métis Nation

Contents

Foreword *v*

Introduction *1*

Part 1: What Is Inclusion? Debunking the Myths *7*

- 1** Inclusion Is Not Just About Students with Special Needs *9*
- 2** Inclusion Is Not Integration *12*
- 3** Inclusion Is Not a Place and Time *18*
- 4** Inclusion Is Not a Destination *24*

Part 2: What Is Inclusion? Telling the Stories *31*

- 5** Inclusion Is Presuming Competence: Under the Table *33*
 - 6** Inclusion Is Putting People First: A Gay Danish?! *35*
 - 7** Inclusion Is Diversity: A Composition *42*
 - 8** Inclusion Is Critical: The Split *48*
 - 9** Inclusion Is Learning from Each Other: The “Other” Kids *53*
 - 10** Inclusion Is Collaborative: The Bears *59*
 - 11** Inclusion Is Multiple and Diverse Perspectives: My Bully *66*
 - 12** Inclusion Is Leaving No One Behind: The Sweeper Van *79*
- Acknowledgments *86*
- References *88*

Foreword

Why do we do what we do? What is the legacy we leave as educators? These are questions I've been wondering about lately. As an inclusive educator who is passionate about social justice and equity, teaching is not just a job. It's a passion. It's a vehicle to make a difference not just in the classroom, but in our communities and society. This book makes just such a contribution. Through story and metaphor, Shelley touches the heart and helps us to embrace diversity and move toward greater equity in our classrooms.

Educators need inspiration. We need new ways to consider and renew our practice. Shelley Moore's work provokes us. It illustrates how we can align our values and practice. It's hard to argue with the concept of inclusion. But what does it really mean? What can it look like? Shelley's work takes up concepts such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL). With "The Sweeper Van," Shelley helps us deepen our understanding of UDL. She's right. We all need increased support at different points in our lives. With humour and *gravitas*, Shelley shows that how and when these supports are put into place for some, they can benefit many.

With stories like "Presuming Competence," Shelley illustrates how students who provoke and challenge us offer us the opportunity to move into the unknown and develop our pedagogy. With this book, Shelley brings this point home time and time again.

Shelley was and is that student for me. She has helped me to see students as more than a *snapshot*. I've come to know Shelley through many lenses.

I was Shelley’s teacher in grades 8 and 9 in Edmonton and then again during her Masters work at Simon Fraser University, and I now work with her as a PhD student. I also know her as a teacher and co-researcher and friend. As I taught and learned with Shelley over these past three decades, she has offered me many a “telling moment.” Her questions, protestations, risk taking, and creativity have helped me to see teaching and learning in new ways. Her teaching, learning, and research extend the ideas I take up in my scholarship. This is why I do what I do. What is my legacy? It’s seeing my student surpass what I could only dream. It’s seeing the next generation of innovators like Shelley reimagine and recognize social justice and equity in profound new ways that change outcomes for students who are the *outside pins* and showing how inclusive classrooms can increase the learning and life chances of all students. Wrapped up in these stories and metaphors are practices and insights to provoke and inspire. This book documents the beginnings of Shelley’s legacy.

Enjoy the metaphors, stories, perspectives, and learning that accompany *One Without the Other*.

Leyton Schnellert, PhD
Faculty of Education
University of British Columbia Okanagan

Introduction

I was teaching a course last summer at the University of British Columbia called “Conceptual Foundations of Inclusive Education.” Thirty or so practising teachers from various subject areas, knowledge expertise, and experience levels from across British Columbia joined me for three weeks of deconstruction, inquiry, and reflection, creating an engaging community of learners. The course was in July, and on this particular day, it was my birthday. We started the class with some cupcakes and hung up “Happy Birthday” bunting across the whiteboard, before diving into our explorations and understanding of the concept driving learning systems all over the world – inclusive education.

I showed a slide to my students with four bubbles (see figure I.1, page 2). Their job was to label the bubbles with the appropriate terms (*inclusion*, *integration*, *exclusion*, and *segregation*) based on their own experiences and prior knowledge of the concepts.

After some discussion, it was agreed that Bubble C in fact represented inclusion (see figure I.2, page 3). This is the common consensus arrived at in many groups I have worked with, both in pre- and in-service professional development settings.

After some discussion, however, a student commented, “Shelley, I don’t think this diagram is inclusion, either.” This caught me off guard.

“Of course this is inclusion!” I thought. I had shown this slide to hundreds if not thousands of people! What could she possibly mean?




Figure 1.1




Figure 1.2

She explained, “Look what you have shown us. I see a bubble with a whole bunch of wavy dots. And then, there are a scattered handful of other patterned dots.”

“Yeah,” I said, “and...”

“Well, in my definition of inclusion, there is no *other*.”

I stood there speechless, because she was absolutely right. The diagram I was presenting was not one of inclusion; it was an example of the traditional model of education. The model where our goal is to produce more of the same – lingering evidence of the factory model of education where we needed to produce and replicate people to meet the demand of the workforce during the industrial revolution (Robinson 2009; Zhao 2009). A model where our job as educators (and especially special educators) is to identify students who aren’t wavy, and fix them. Send the checkered kids to the checkered teacher, the diamond kids to the diamond teacher, and the striped kids to the striped teacher. This model of education is a deficit, medical model, and I was showing the class a perfect example of how it was still plaguing us today. But more and more kids are coming to us not wavy! Not only is this model less effective, but also we are running out of funding, supports, and students to allow this model to continue. Some have met this shift in paradigm with panic; others are seeing it as an opportunity. This paradigm shift, however, is long overdue, and we need to start matching our goals of education to the goals and expectations needed to meet the current demands of our society – which no longer wants people to simply comply. This is especially true now, as more and more occupations involving compliance and replication are being replaced by machines (Zhao 2009).

Educational reforms are happening on a global scale, including in British Columbia and other provinces in Canada, where the Ministries of Education are completely restructuring their curricula, being designed and written by teachers for teachers, with the emphasis on moving away from classrooms of wavy students (BC Ministry of Education 2015). We are no longer living in the Industrial Revolution; this is the 21st century – where we need to value the strengths rather than deficits in learning. Rather than finding out why students aren’t wavy, our job is now to find out what their pattern is. What do they bring? What can they contribute *because* of their

diverse and unique expertise? For decades we have been trying to take this “pattern” out of our students, taking the special out of special education, the autistic out of autism, the language out of cultures, and, especially, the Indigenous out of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit children. This is not teaching to diversity. This is not inclusive. Teaching to diversity and inclusion is where we value the characteristics that *are* diverse, and not try and homogenize them.

The class continued to discuss what the conceptual diagram of inclusion could be, and together we decided that the only way to ensure there was no “other” was not to make us all wavy, but instead to make us all “an other” (see figure I.3).




Figure I.3

When looking at inclusion this way, it also helped us realize that this is no longer an idea specific to special education. There is a distinct gap between the silos of special education and curriculum (Pugach and Warger 2001; Thomas and Loxley 2007), but if we look at inclusion as a concept of teaching to the diversity of all, rather than just a special-education initiative, we can bridge this gap. We are diverse, all of us. We all have strengths, we all have stretches, and we all need to get better at something. The difference in teaching to diversity, however, is that we don't start with our deficits; we

start with our strengths, and this includes students, teachers, support staff, custodians, bus drivers, and parents. My good friend Leyton Schnellert refers to this collective as “the ecology of learning communities.” Inclusive education relies on the diversity of its ecosystem to not only promote coexistence and tolerance, but to thrive on the learning and interaction of each person in the community

Through this discussion, I also realized that if we can now extend inclusive education to include every diverse learner, then we can also start to view inclusion as not something we simply do; instead, it becomes something that just *is*. We cannot escape or avoid the diversity in our world by attempting to homogenize and standardize our classrooms and learners. Homogeneity is a battle that has never been won and never will be. Civilizations have collapsed in their attempts to make everyone the same (Morris 2013). This is no longer our vision of education (thank goodness), and we are long overdue in matching our vision to our practices in classrooms, schools, and communities.

It was also on this particular day that I was inspired to write this book, because it was on this day I realized that if inclusion and diversity is something that just *is*, then it is also something we live, something we are, and something we believe in together. And it is through this common goal that we can also be unified: we can be *one* without being an *other*.

So, please allow me to introduce to you “*One without the Other*.”

PART 1

What Is Inclusion? Debunking the Myths

You may be hard-pressed to find someone who doesn't believe in inclusion and the values of diversity on some level. Plus, it is pretty hard to avoid. Ken Robinson (2009) said it best: "The only thing students have in common is the year of their birth!" The individuals of the world are not packaged into neat little packages of people organized by age or ability, gender, or language (although I suppose there are some who would like to try!). Can you imagine if, when we walked into a grocery store, access to checkout tills were determined by these labels? It would be an absurd idea in every place in society, except in the classrooms of our schools. This unnatural arrangement is where the practical aspects of inclusion get messy, definitions of the concept start to get fuzzy, and our practices become a mismatch to our beliefs about what inclusion means in the world outside our classroom doors. It doesn't take long to notice how frequently we all, even if in the same school or community, understand inclusion differently.

Early in my career, I realized this discrepancy, and it caused tensions in my quest to understand inclusion in both philosophical and practical terms. My first question was: If we are to believe in and try to move forward in our inclusive practice as educators, don't we all need to have a common understanding of what it means? The unfortunate reality, however, is that the term *inclusion* has become contaminated (Thomas and Loxley 2007). A once-powerful word that drove equal access campaigns for students of different abilities, strengths, and challenges, the term *inclusion* has instead come to be associated with lack of funding, time, and supports – a political playing card that has turned our most vulnerable learners into a burden, defined by ratios and deficits. Further tension emerges when trying to create a consensus of how to enact practices of inclusion across districts, schools, and classrooms, leaving both teachers and students feeling like they are being shuffled around a building without the supports, resources, and understanding behind the inclusive rationale. The reality, however, is that there is no answer. There is no one way of being inclusive. Addressing diversity can be achieved in many ways, depending on the history, experience, knowledge, and philosophies of the stakeholders involved. Somewhere along this quest, however, answers have collided, and where once stood a common philosophy bringing educators together, myths and assumptions have formed about the practicalities of inclusive education that divide staff, parents, and students alike.

Reclaiming the word and concept of inclusive education and calibrating our definitions among teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and students was the beginning of my inclusive journey, and so, I thought, what a perfect place to begin this text. What is inclusion – both philosophically *and* practically? And how can we align these definitions so that our practices better match our beliefs as individuals, schools, and communities of natural diversity? Part of this reclamation is to simply debunk some of the myths driving the education silos, but also to start to reconstruct the practical realities of inclusive education.

In the following chapters, I attempt to describe these practical implications of inclusive education to help situate the rest of this text and to connect our values of inclusion to our everyday practices.

1

Inclusion Is Not Just About Students with Special Needs

When I began teaching, my first position was in a co-taught grade 4/5 classroom. I was a special educator in a beautiful school in Bronx, N.Y., teaming up with an amazing local – who could both charm and straighten out kids (and me) in a fraction of a second with a simple glance in their (or my) direction. Given the context, the school was also placed with the unfair burden of trying to negotiate additional factors, such as poverty, hunger, crime, and the general health and well-being of students and families, who were struggling to exist in a world not built to support them. It was here, however, that I also found what loyalty, compassion, and family meant, in a forgotten neighbourhood that I will never forget. I forged friendships and learned lessons for a lifetime there, and will always be grateful for the welcome and belonging I felt in this wonderful community.

On finishing my undergraduate degree in special education, I was skeptical of inclusion. I couldn't help wondering if the learning of tolerance for the "other" kids was a strong enough reason for kids to be forced together, simply breathing the same air, at the expense of explicit instruction for students who needed it the most. "Inclusion for the sake of inclusion" is what I called it, and for me, it wasn't a good enough reason. Well, it took me two days of teaching in the Bronx for me to realize how my understanding of the practice of inclusive education was inaccurate. Inclusion wasn't about

tolerance, it was about celebration! I learned the value of collaboration, multiple expertise, and the rich benefits of cultural diversity in an inclusive framework that I had previously and mistakenly understood as a framework supporting an expert model – where I thought I knew everything, and my job was to bestow my gifts of knowledge onto students and staff alike. This transmissive approach (Miller 2007) to learning did not get me far, and if I was to survive, I needed to adapt to inclusion, diversity, and collaboration quickly!

My two years in New York set me straight, as New York does, and when arriving back to Canada to complete my Masters, I had a new understanding of inclusive philosophy and the experience to back it up.

However, if New York taught me about the richness in diversity, McNair Secondary, my second teaching position, taught me about the beauty of acceptance. For the next seven years, I settled into this secondary school in Richmond, British Columbia, where I found my new home teaching students with developmental disabilities in grades 8–12. In New York, similar to many districts and schools, students with the most significant disabilities are still not included in classrooms with their peers, and are often sent to segregated schools, classrooms, or programs (Pugach and Warger 2001). Even in the literature and research, inclusive education practice and strategies are most visible when supporting students with high incidence disabilities, such as learning disabilities, high-functioning autism, at-risk behaviour, certain mental-health difficulties, and so on (Downing 2008; Katims 2000).

With a three-decade-strong inclusion philosophy, the Richmond School District prides itself on neighbourhood schools where students of all ability belong. From the ripe ages of three and four, students who traditionally have been segregated because of their ability, instead learn alongside their peers in classrooms. By the time they get to grade 8, all kids are part of cohorts that grow up together, go to birthday parties together, eat lunch together, and give each other high fives down the hallway. There are no “those kids” or “that classroom.” Kids are kids, and I saw it every day in the halls of my new school. This was not tolerance – this was acceptance.

Inclusion means everyone – but *actually* everyone, even our students who need the most support in our classrooms, schools, and communities. If New York taught me about cultural and language diversity, Richmond taught me about the importance of the diversity of ability. But both places taught me that *all* diversities need to be considered and celebrated. Inclusion is not just about students with special needs, it is about *all* students, and before we can even begin to align philosophy with practice, and shift our deficit-based education paradigm to a strength-based model, we need to understand this essential condition.

2

Inclusion Is Not Integration

To understand what inclusion is, we also have to understand what it isn't. Part of the reason *inclusion* as a term has been contaminated is that it is used synonymously with the word *integration*. Likewise, although I have never stepped into a school whose mission statement values segregation and exclusion, I have seen, in many schools, students experiencing all of exclusion, segregation, integration, and inclusion depending on the day, time, teacher, support staff, subject area, and grade (see Introduction, figure I.1).

To understand these terms better, let's look back to periods in history that we associate these words with. What events come to mind, for example, when you read the words *integration* and *segregation*? Many may recall the civil rights movement of the 1960s, apartheid, residential schools for First Nations children, or the Nazi occupation of World War II. These are definitely not times associated with communities of learning and the celebration of diversity! What all these events have in common, however, is that they involved forced movement of groups of people – who had no choice. They were either separated or brought together, sharing space – breathing the same air.

Now, we don't have to go back in time to see this happening every day. On a much less traumatic scale, we can say that education systems in general are integration. We force kids to come to school every day. School buildings and classrooms are just containers holding different groups of

References

- American Psychiatric Association. 2000. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, 4th ed., text rev. Washington, DC: Author.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. 2015. *Draft curriculum*.
<https://curriculum.gov.bc.ca>
- Benard, B. 1991. *Fostering resiliency in kids: Protective factors in the family, school, and community*. Portland, OR: Western Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities.
- Biklen, D. P., 1985. Mainstreaming: From compliance to quality. *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 181: 58–61.
- Biklen, Douglas, and Jamie Burke. 2006. Presuming competence. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 39.2: 166–175. Web.
- Block, M.E. 1994. Why all students with disabilities should be included in regular physical education. *Palaestra* 103: 17–24.
- Brownlie, Faye, and Judith King. 2011. *Learning in safe schools*. Markham, ON: Pembroke.
- Butler, D. L., L. Schnellert, and N. E. Perry. 2015. *Developing self-regulated learners*. Don Mills, ON: Pearson.
- Composition. 2015. Wikipedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Composition>
- Courtade, G., F. Spooner, and D. Browder. 2007. A review of studies with students with significant cognitive disabilities that link to science standards. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* 32: 43–49.
- Courtade-Little, G., and D. Browder. 2005. *Aligning IEPs to academic standards for students with moderate and severe disabilities*. Verona, WI: Attainment Company.
- Downing, J. E. 2008. *Including students with severe and multiple disabilities in typical classrooms: Practical strategies for teachers*, 3rd ed. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- Downing, J. E. 2005. Inclusive education for high school students with severe intellectual disabilities: Supporting communication. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication* 21: 132–148.
- Egan, Lisa. 2012. I'm not a "person with a disability": I'm a disabled person. www.xojane.com

