STUDENTS WITH INTELLECTUAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITY IN BOTSWANA: HOW CAN ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK SUPPORT BETTER EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES?

Ahmed Bawa Kuyini*
RMIT University
College of Global, Urban and Social Studies, Australia
bawa.kuyini@rmit.edu.au

Boitumelo Mangope
University of Botswana, Department of Educational Foundations
mangopeb@ub.ac.bw

Thenjiwe E. Major
University of Botswana, Department of Educational Foundations
majorte@ub.ac.bw

Bramwell Koyabe
University of Botswana, Department of Educational Foundations
koyabeb@ub.ac.bw

Marina Spar
University of Botswana, Department of Educational Foundations
seanokengngwako@yahoo.com

Abstract

Inclusive schools have become the hopeful contexts to support the empowerment of students with intellectual and developmental disability (IDD) through measures more likely to guarantee meaningful school outcomes. Following in the footsteps of the UK SEN Policy Research Forum's recent publication about the accountability framework for education (AFE), this paper examines education policy, provisions, and outcomes for students with IDD in Botswana and proposes a different approach for improvement. The paper charts the history of special education provision, details policy and implementation issues that culminate in limited educational outcomes, including transition to further education/employment. The question of whether meaningful outcomes can be achieved for this cohort with current school arrangements and practices is deliberated. The accountability framework is used as a lens to argue for the articulation of policies and measures that would lead to improved school practices and outcomes. In adopting the accountability framework, an argument is made for caution about avoiding the market-driven dimension of accountability due to the risk of accentuating unequal outcomes and social injustice. The paper recommends the deployment of the framework in research as a first step to identify strengths and weaknesses with IDD education and enable the set-up of policy and implementation mechanisms for better outcomes.

1.0 Introduction

In line with universal human rights framework, students with IDD have a right to
equality of access to education and to meaningful schooling outcomes. Against this background
of rights and social justice, schools and teachers have an obligation to facilitate the achievement
of meaningful outcomes. However, across the world, it is doubtful whether these goals are
being realised, leading to questions about what can be done to change the narrative. Pincelli
(2012) drives home this point when he wrote:

> As an educational society we claim to be doing all that we can to help this population
> of students reach their full potential, but are we really? The post-school outcomes for a
> student with a disability are not all that different than they have been in the past. They
> are not expected to be gainfully employed, live independently, be self-satisfied, and
> have a social life (p.3).

Even with the implementation of inclusive education, which was a paradigm shift from
segregation, integration and mainstreaming, there are concerns that the many challenges such
as limited curriculum content, instructional adaptations, school arrangements, insufficient
monitoring, and cultural barriers have led to minimal improvement in outcomes (Byrne, 2019;
Downing, 2010; Imray & Colley, 2017).

Globally, research on achievement outcomes for students with IDD is unanimous in the
conclusion that many students don't achieve meaningful outcomes and that more needs to be
done to achieve better academic, social and post school outcomes (Dell'Anna et al., 2020;
World Bank, 2022). In their review of the literature, Dell'Anna et al. (2020) concluded that
learning outcomes of students were moderately in favour of school inclusion of both academic
achievement and adaptive skills. Social outcome results showed that inclusive settings offer
more access to instructional time and peer interaction, although they reported marginalisation
during class activities and social isolation within the peer group.

Past research has canvassed the role of several intersecting factors implicated in the less
than impressive educational outcomes for students with IDD. These factors include unequal
access (Stevens & Wurf, 2020), resourcing (Johnstone & Chapman, 2009; Sharma et al., 2007),
inadequate teacher training (Carew et al., 2018; Chhabra et al., 2010; Loreman et al., 2013),
low quality of classroom instruction and adaptations (Kunter et al., 2013; Mangope, 2016; Pitten Cate et al., 2018; Stronge et al., 2007; Taub et al., 2017) and poor transitions (Nolan &
Gleeson, 2017; Winn & Hay 2009).

In Botswana, previous and current education policies have articulated a desire to
achieve better educational outcomes for students with disabilities including those with IDD.
The current Inclusive Education Policy (2011) calls for varied support to all students and aims
to ensure that students with IDD will achieve desirable academic and non-academic outcomes

(Government of Botswana, 2011). Despite these laudable objectives, limited research on this theme shows that students with IDD do not achieve meaningful educational outcomes, and Dart (2007), Mangope (2017), Mukhopadhyay et al. (2012) have all concluded that students with IDD do not achieve as well as their counterparts without disabilities, with many experiencing limited transition opportunities to other levels of education and/or employment.

Dart (2007) concluded that many students with IDD in primary school units hardly transited to secondary education. Specifically, while there was a total of about 600 students with IDD in primary schools, there was no student with IDD in secondary schools. On the other hand, there were 116 students with visual impairment (VI) at primary level and 28 at secondary level. And there were 291 students with hearing impairment (HI) at primary and 60 at secondary level. These figures evidence the reality that despite students with ID being the largest population at primary school level, they were least represented at higher levels of education. The same trend was observed in Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) centres, where only about 0.06% transited to such institutions compared to about 10% for their counterparts with VI and HI (Dart, 2007). Transition to employment was also low for this population as shown in about 21% of the general disability population being employed against only 1% of the IDD population (Dart, 2007). Moswela and Mukhopadyyay (2011) also showed that in 2011, about seven students with HI and 12 students with VI were enrolled in higher education institutions, compared to only one student with IDD.

In the face of this grim reality and more recent debates about how to make schools accountable to students with special educational needs/disabilities (SEND), this paper aims to canvas the issues relating to educational provision and outcomes for students with IDD in Botswana by responding to the following questions: a) What are the limitations of current provisions? b) How do the outcomes align or not align with policy goals? c) Does Botswana need a different philosophy to ensure better outcomes for students with IDD? and d) How can the accountability framework for education be used to support meaningful outcomes for students with IDD? The justification for focusing on students with IDD in Botswana is that it is the largest disability group and there is reasonable empirical evidence about limited educational outcomes for this cohort. Such information is not available on other groups of students with disabilities.

2.0 Students with IDD in the Botswana school system: An historical perspective

Students with IDD have had a long history of being considered for special education provision, beginning in segregated special school settings in the 1960s, (Abosi, 2000; Dart, 2007). These schools were built and operated mainly by non-governmental organizations rather than the Government of Botswana, which preferred the mainstreaming approach (Matale, 2002) to the education of learners with disabilities. In 1977, a policy on education known as Education for Kagisano (Education for Social Harmony) was developed and adopted by the Botswana Government. The philosophy of Kagisano implied universal access to education built on the concept of 'mainstreaming' where children with disabilities were allowed to attend general education schools in their neighbourhoods (Matale, 2002).

Despite the open and broad intent of the policy, access to schools was limited for students with disabilities (Government of Botswana, 2015). In response to the concerns about limited access to quality education for students with disabilities, the government made considerable progress in acceding to international policies and laws that aimed to increase access to quality education for all children (Revised National Policy on Education, 1994, Education Act, NDP 6, 7, 9, 11; Inclusive Education Policy of Botswana, 2011; Vision 2016, Vision 2036). In the process of addressing access to education, several initiatives have been implemented, including training of teachers for learners with special needs, building special classes in existing general education schools, opening of an office responsible for special needs in the office of the President, and developing special education programs at tertiary institutions. However, substantial numbers of children with disabilities are still not in school and those in school are receiving substandard education because implementing inclusive education is a major challenge to schools (Mangope, 2016; Nthitu et al., 2012).

3.0 Inclusive Education Policy and students with IDD

In the early to mid-2000s, the Government of Botswana adopted the concept of inclusive education at policy level, which is defined as one that includes and meets the needs of all, including those of learners with special educational needs, whatever their gender, life circumstances, health, disability, state of development, capacity to learn, level of achievement, financial, and whatever their circumstances. This initiative culminated in the development of the current Inclusive Education Policy (2011). As an educational strategy, inclusive education has been justified globally as a means of improving the quality of education for all children as it focuses on breaking the barriers to access quality education (UNESCO, 1994). The Government of Botswana ratified the Convention of the Rights of the Child (1989) and is a signatory of the Declaration on Education for All (1990) and the Salamanca Declaration (1994). These documents call for the provision of public education to all children, regardless of their physical, intellectual, emotional, social, linguistics or other conditions. As a signatory to these international policies Botswana is bound to ensure that the goals of these initiatives are realized.

The current Inclusive Education Policy of 2011 outlines several commitments seeking to enhance access to education for children and adults from disadvantaged and vulnerable backgrounds. Some of the commitments are that the Government of Botswana commits to ensuring that all learners, including those who have never been to school before, those who dropped out, and those with special needs and/or risk of failure, will be encouraged and supported to access education. The Government further commits that vocational training mechanisms will be made relevant and responsive to the children's needs, and that teachers' skills will be strengthened for effective teaching of diverse learners. Furthermore, schools, through resource intensification, will be made learner-friendly, and proper structures and mechanisms will be put in place to ensure smooth implementation of the policy.

Although the new inclusive education policy emphasises rights of students with special needs as captured in the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, it is becoming increasingly clear that some students

with special needs still miss out. This is partly the result of shifting from an emphasis on building/running special schools to mainstreaming, integration and inclusive education (Mangope, 2017). Special schools, with their emphasis on creating mono-categorical learning needs environments for specific student groups such as vision or hearing impairments, have advantages. They allow for specialised teaching around particular common learning needs of a disability group and facilitate the creation of critical mass in terms of staffing, teaching, and efficient use of resources. These ingredients lead to better learning and skill development and better outcomes for students. However, these special schools have been criticized for their inability to enhance social learning that occurs more naturally in general education environments and are blamed for contributing to difficulties with post-school transition and participation in society which students with IDD experience (Dart, 2007). The Inclusive Education Policy of 2011 was an attempt to address some of these issues, but as noted above, the expansion of inclusive educational provision, while addressing rights and social justice issues, can also marginalise some groups who are better off in special schools and classrooms.

The Botswana Government's unique approach to inclusive education for students with IDD focuses more on the setting up of special units within mainstream schools. There are more than 40 special units for learners with intellectual disabilities (Government of Botswana, 2015). All public special units for students with IDD are located in government primary schools. The teaching approach for students in the special units is a combination of pull-out and full participation in the larger classrooms with year-level peers. Some research suggest that the use of special units has disadvantaged students with IDD and militates against progress to further education (Mangope, 2016). In addition, the Education and Training Sector Strategy Plan (ETSSP) of 2015 notes that equity is a problem for students with special needs (Government of Botswana, 2015). In relation to technical and vocational education, the plan states specifically that *"Currently TVET institutions (Colleges and Brigades), are not able to accommodate learners with disability…. The TVET sector has no capacity to fully support the learning of students with disability"* (p.98).

4.0 Teacher training for teaching students with special educational needs

The University of Botswana is one of the higher institutes of learning that is non-discriminatory in terms of admission. The university has a Disability Support Services Unit (DSSU) that provides support for all learners with special needs. Presently, DSSU offers learner support programs for students with hearing impairment, visual impairment, learning disabilities, speech and language impairments or communication disorders, chronic health impairments, multiple conditions, cognitive impairments, psychiatric conditions, and physical impairments.

According to the Government of Botswana (2015) and Mangope (2016) teacher training institutions have adjusted their training regime to include components of inclusive teaching strategies as a response to demands of the inclusive policy. In addition, many teachers in the field have been provided with in-service training to upskill them to effectively implement inclusion. Resources have been procured/supplied to schools to facilitate learning for all students, including those with special needs. However, reports still indicate challenges relating

to the adequacy of teacher training, resourcing and access to post-primary education and vocational training (Government of Botswana, 2015; Mangope, 2017).

5.0 Limitations of current provisions: Policy and research outcomes

In order to analyse the limitations of current provisions, a summary of policy articulation, implementation issues, and research about practice and outcomes is presented. Research has blamed poor educational outcomes on conceptualization of educational provision, claiming that segregation in special schools was hindering optimal achievements of student with ID. In moving from integration to mainstreaming and inclusive education from the 1990s to early 2000s, a key objective remained improving access and outcomes for students with IDD (Mangope et al., 2018). However, Dart (2007) still indicated modest outcomes. Part of the reasons for this poor outcome, according to Mangope et al. (2018), was the restrictive nature of instructional practice in special units as defined by mainstreaming policy. The coming into force of the 2011 Inclusive Education Policy which endorsed broad placement of students with IDD in special units within mainstream schools was seen as ray of hope for better outcomes, since inclusive settings support better academic and social outcomes through more instructional time than special schools (de Graaf & de Graaf, 2016; de Graaf & van Hove, 2015; Dessemontet et al., 2012; Matzen et al., 2010; Taheri et al., 2017). However, outcomes have still not improved in Botswana (Mangope et al., 2018).

In her conclusion to another study, Mangope (2017) asserted that a fundamental issue in Botswana is the conceptualization and implementation of education for students with IDD. The move from a pure and exclusive special education provision to inclusive education has been poorly understood, and stakeholders' (principals, teachers, and special education teachers) conceptualization of inclusive education is 'flawed.' Mangope (2017) further makes the point that principals and teachers were not on the same page regarding what inclusive education means for students with disabilities. School heads, special education teachers and the SPED officer had a limited understanding of the concept of inclusive education despite their respective positions and qualifications. The result of such lack of clarity has meant that there are differences in how schools craft school level policies for inclusion and how inclusion is implemented in classrooms. Schools where special units existed had different approaches to those without special units, with potential for differential outcomes for students with IDD.

Another reason for the limited educational outcomes for students with IDD is the seeming mismatch between policy and what schools are producing. The current inclusive education policy does not specifically articulate how evidenced-informed measures, which are pertinent to the effective implementation of inclusive education, are practicalised in schools and classrooms. The policy is devoid of processes and procedures that guide implementation in schools. Therefore, there is need to review the policy and practices of educational provision for student with disabilities including those with IDD and to bring forth a useful framework for innovative policies, teaching approaches and how to achieve better outcomes.

Furthermore, the education policy has preferenced the use of special units for students with IDD, and while no evidence exists about the defining role of this approach to poor

outcomes, an evaluation of this arrangement is required. The emphasis on the placement in special units implies less focus on teaching quality and students' experiences as part of the broader community of learning in schools. Teaching in special units is seen as an add-on to the mainstream (Mangope, 2017). A similar issue is observed in the UK by Starbuck (2020) who notes that "in reality SEND has always been viewed as something different or separate…we see a disjointed view of SEND and mainstream… They make policy for education and then focus on SEND separately" (p. 159). An add-on program is on the fringe of mainstream and often misses out in many mainstream learning opportunities and activities, including monitoring and evaluation. In this regard, a holistic approach to framing education towards better outcomes requires a new approach/philosophy for Botswana. This is essential so that whatever the conceptualization of inclusive education, the same expectations will apply to schools, principals, and teachers to deliver meaningful educational outcomes.

Finally, Education and Training Sector Strategy Plan (ETSSP) of 2015 identified issues of accountability in relation to vocational education at the government ministries, which affects outcomes and equally applies to special needs provision. The report observes that the existence of multiple accountability points at the ministerial level, with different ministries responsible for various aspects of Technical and Vocational Education sector (TVET), has rendered the sector fragmented, dysfunctional and poorly coordinated. The report calls for strengthening "governance structures for greater accountability of the TVET sector to ensure that institutions deliver to their mandate, and that the sector makes noticeable impact and contributions" (p.98). The special education sector in Botswana mirrors the structure, limited functioning and efficiency of the VET sector and the clarion call for change in the TVET applies to special needs educational provision.

6.0 A different philosophy towards better outcomes for students with IDD: Is the accountability framework the answer?

As research has evidenced, there is need to ensure the development of innovative school, curriculum design, teaching approaches and how students transition to further education and work. Fundamental to the success of this exercise is the choice of relevant framework(s), and in our opinion positioning research as critical first step to the exploration, understanding and implementation of such an innovative approach. Different models and frameworks are recommended in the literature for delivering better educational outcomes. The Effective Schools Framework (Ainscow, 2001; Gartner & Lipsky, 2000) considers many critical pedagogical arrangements and emphasises professional leadership, shared vision and goals, a facilitating learning environment, concentration on teaching and learning, purposeful teaching, high expectations, monitoring progress, pupil rights and responsibilities, home-school partnership, among others (Sammons et al., 1995). The Quality-of-life Framework, taking a lifespan approach, focuses on broader outcomes, including adaptive and employment skills outcomes. However, given that the input aspects of schools affect outcomes, attention should also be given to how schools and school staff contribute to these outcomes.

Based on the above, we argue for a different philosophy, which promotes outcomes and skills development beyond basic academic skills. Schools should aim to achieve goals such as

functionalism, independence, dignity/self-worth, etc within family and community, and progression to further education and employment. Since policy pronouncements are critical to realistic delivery of education, policies should include principles and directions for how to translate goals into pragmatic actions in schools/classrooms that lead to outcomes for students with IDD, as well as how stakeholders account for their actions. As the current IE policy in Botswana does not contain these principles and directions, we argue for the adoption of an accountability framework in education (Anderson, 2005; McLaughlin & Rhim, 2007) with respect to policy, school organisation, instructional delivery and transitions, and that research should be the first step in this process.

7.0 Accountability framework for education in Botswana
7.1 Accountability framework

In choosing and arguing for accountability framework, we follow the lead of previous research (Anderson, 2005; McLaughlin & Rhim, 2007) and more recent articulation of accountability in education by the SEN Policy Research Forum in the UK, whose work was published in the JORSEN in 2020. In this volume, Jonathan Roberts, Jane Starbuck, and others (2020) provide great insights into accountability framework which are helpful in our framing of the accountability approach for Botswana.

Roberts (2020) describes accountability as an attractive concept that can be contested, and difficult to enact in practice. Yet, it is a mechanism for creating powerful systems, imposing control, giving meaning to actions, and can have real impact. He further notes that " if designed and implemented successfully, accountability systems can be forceful drivers of improvement" (p.150). The purposes of accountability systems, Roberts (2020) posits, include holding responsible, incentive and constraint, service improvement, control and signalling to policy makers, building confidence and empowerment, and dialogue with parents and other stakeholders about educational performance. These features are essential for reforming the IDD education policy, school structures and practice in Botswana.

In framing the parameters of accountability, Anderson (2005) and McLaughlin and Rhim (2007) hold two different views. Anderson (2005) stated that an accountability framework in education comprises three systems: (a) compliance with regulations, (b) adherence to professional norms, and (c) is results-driven. McLaughlin and Rhim (2007) on the other hand suggest that there are only two dominant forms of accountability, standards-driven accountability and market-driven accountability. Both perspectives on accountability could be useful for Botswana. However, a market-driven accountability approach (McLaughlin & Rhim, 2007) to outcomes for students with IDD will be risky in terms of its potential to maintain the enduring legacy of unequal access and provisions for students with disabilities. In a market-driven approach, which is informed by the Neo-Liberal agenda of the centrality of markets, outcomes for students with IDD in relation to the world of work will be curtailed. Market-driven approaches are interested in profits, and they champion meritocracy in an unequal education system, whereas results-driven approaches as articulated by Anderson (2005) emphasise equality of outcomes and are more likely to achieve social justice. In this regard, since students with IDD are already disadvantaged, we recommend a results-driven

accountability framework, which we envisage will support meaningful inclusion and equality of outcomes for such students. Deriving from the above, an accountability framework to education in Botswana should incorporate both the Anderson (2005) and the McLaughlin and Rhim, (2007) approaches, but devoid of the market- driven dimension.

In adopting an accountability framework for IDD Education in Botswana, we see the merits of pursuing direct policy change and crafting mechanisms for holding stakeholders responsible for failures and successes. However, the paucity of research in Botswana means that there are many unknowns about the current policies, how they are pragmatized in schools and whether at all they are adequate. Therefore, we see research and policy review with a robust accountability plan as logical first steps preceding policy change and implementation. In this case, the first steps in the agenda to deploy an accountability framework will be research in education policy relating to IDD in schools and a policy review which aligns with the evaluation dimension of accountability (Roberts, 2020). In essence, the research and review should aim to meet the underlying objectives of the standards-driven accountability, (compliance with regulations, and adherence to professional norms), and results-driven accountability (meaningful outcomes for all). This exercise will provide insights into policy guidelines and directives about how schools design learning environments, teaching approaches, staff expectations and transition programs that lead to optimal educational outcomes.

7.2 Parameters of accountability
7.2.1 Standards-driven accountability vision
In respect of a standards-driven vision, policies are currently not prescriptive enough to set minimum standards for school practices and teaching approaches that would lead to similar outcomes for students with IDD as their peers without disabilities. Therefore, a policy review will seek to set standards, following research that explores how schools differ in terms of what their special units offer to students with respect to learning environments, instructional delivery, and staff expectations. Different conceptualizations/definitions of inclusive education have impact on practice elsewhere (Dell'Anna et al., 2020) and in Botswana (Mangope, 2017) because these conceptualizations/definitions influence school staff roles and expectations. Staff expectations are important in establishing standards and affect student outcomes (Kuyini & Paterson, 2013). Therefore, policy review should include expectations of schools and classroom teachers to ensure that meaningful learning takes place for students with IDD as relating to academic, social, and vocational outcomes.

7.2.2 Compliance and professional standards
Accountability systems, as structures of meaning, signalling, incentive, and constraint, can cause changes in stakeholder behaviour (Roberts, 2020), and are therefore able to exact compliance on the part of governments and school staff. In this regard, policies should require compliance in several key areas of concern in Botswana. Presently, there is a wide range of practices in Botswana schools which also means that different schools have different approaches to skills training (academic and vocational) and transition to further education and employment. The Ministry of Education and Skills Development does not have an overarching policy about how schools organise learning environments and teaching or how transition

programs are implemented by schools for students with disabilities in general, or specifically for students with IDD. In an accountability framework, schools will have some indicative guidelines and will need to implement programs that meet compliance with regulations, adhere to professional norms and are results-driven as demanded by the objectives of IDD educational provision.

As observed in the UK, indicators for school inspections are very helpful in ensuring accountability (Whittaker, 2020). Botswana is therefore more likely to achieve better outcomes for students with IDD if the accountability framework with standard indicators becomes part of the repertoire of approaches to educational provision. We recommend the implementation of accountability framework through policies and guidelines that require strict compliance by school staff on matters of school learning environments, upholding professional standards in the education of students with IDD, inclusive teaching approaches for these students, and designing and running wraparound transition programs that start from primary through to secondary school. Specifically, policies should have indicators of what learning should occur; they should require adequate and sustainable resourcing of schools and spell out standards or near-universal approaches about how students develop skills for further education and employment. The latter point also implies that an articulation of a comprehensive transition framework for students with IDD and those with special needs is required. Currently there is limited understanding of how transitions work and virtually no research has been conducted in this area in Botswana. In an accountability framework, there will be need for Botswana to develop a broad research agenda into transitions and transition planning, explore different areas of school transition practice, on how current transition programs support better student outcomes, and how best to achieve meaningful outcomes for students with IDD. One of the key benefits of research in the area is that it will uncover current issues around schools and classroom practices. It will also lay the foundation for the development of a comprehensive and culturally appropriate transition framework for schools.

7.2.3 Results-driven accountability vision

To implement an accountability framework in this space, policy should require the development of systems in schools that ensure students achieve the same educational outcomes as their peers at various stages of schooling, and these outcomes should be evaluated. In this respect, research should be used to establish how current classroom practices, testing and assessments inform student progression and achievement beyond baseline, and how these are compared across the education system, including how they inform instructional modifications/adaptations and reform. This exercise would ensure that students are moving towards meaningful school outcomes. To achieve these aims, we propose a research agenda framed around (a) recognition and realisation of rights, and (b) an analysis of educational input, process, output, impact, and outcomes. Proposed research goals under these two domains are detailed below.

7.2.3.1 Recognition and realisation of human rights

The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Botswana Inclusive Education Policy of 2011 endorse the right to education. Research in this regard will

focus on right to education in terms of access, equity, respect for unique developmental needs, outcomes, and participation in society. In an accountability framework, these rights will become the basis for creating mechanisms for access, resourcing, teaching, and ensuring equitable outcomes in line with social justice principles. As citizens, students with IDD and other disabilities should be able to access and achieve in education to meet Botswana's human rights and social justice obligations. Social justice is about schools "providing an education which gives the less privileged access to the knowledge they need to succeed" (Whittaker, 2020, p. 157). And while recognitive and distributive justice is easy to debate and agree upon by governments and schools, outcome justice requires vigilance and rigour on the part of policy makers, schools, and teachers. Unequal outcomes for students with IDD are clear in achievement statistics and research reports world-wide. In Botswana, if schools are to meet their social justice obligations, access rights should match or mirror outcome rights. Research in this area will therefore support both results-driven accountability and standards-driven goals.

7.2.3.2 (a) Quality of input and process factors

In the UK, Whittaker (2020) states that school inspections are conceptualised as "a force for improvement in children and young people's lives… through intelligent, responsible and focused inspection and regulation" (p.158). In Botswana, research on this dimension should follow the UK framework, unearthing what is happening in classrooms and providing a clear picture of how the relevant indicators can be monitored towards better education outcomes for students with IDD.

School inspections in Botswana, designed to ensure accountability, are intermittent, not well coordinated, and any findings from this exercise are yet to be translated into policies or actions that can change how things are done in IDD education (Government of Botswana, 2015). Since school indicators of input and process factors need to be properly understood before inspections can verify their effectiveness, exploring the status of these quality of input and process factors will therefore be another way to support the standards-driven accountability framework. Research in the quality of input area therefore will focus on learning environments, availability of resources, teachers' knowledge and skills, class sizes, relevant curriculum, administrative input, students' input, and stakeholder involvement. Similarly, in terms of quality of process, the focus of research will be on teaching and assessment behaviour and processes, competence in teaching, learning-support effectiveness, and administrative effectiveness. Research should also explore post-school outcomes, which need to be consolidated through pre-planning at an early age. The picture of transition programs in Botswana is unclear and there is at least anecdotal and observed evidence that transition planning starts very late in the education journey of students with IDD. In the USA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires for students with an Individualized Education Program (IEP), especially students with IDD to begin transition planning at early age. Transition needs often include vocational training, social skills development, and self-determination. In this regard, the essential role of researching current transitional processes become more apparent. In Botswana, this will entail baseline surveys to identify the different transition arrangements in schools, how efficient and sustainable they are as foundation for developing a uniform, more integrated transition framework.

7.2.3.2 (b) Quality of output, outcomes, and impact factors

Outputs are the results or outcomes of an effective and efficient special education system, while impact is a measure of the extent to which the sector system is effective, efficient, and sustainable. Whittaker (2020) reports that as part of an accountability framework in the UK, which aims to achieve social justice, school inspectors make "judgement about the quality of education [by] considering the extent to which schools are equipping pupils with the knowledge and cultural capital they need to succeed in life. For pupils with SEND this means making sure they have the knowledge and skills they need for whatever comes next in their lives" (p.157). One element of the inspection methodology in the UK is a "deep dive, which gathers evidence on curriculum intent, implementation and impact ….. Deep dives focus on what pupils know, remember, and can do as a result of the curriculum they have been taught, and how well they are building their learning towards specified end points" (p. 158).

In an accountability framework for Botswana, there is need to have tangible curriculum objective-based outputs in respect of student achievement in examinations (internal and external), knowledge and skills, including progressing toward specific milestones, attitudes and aspirations, performance and behaviour, post-school outcomes, and transition to work. In this area, research and policy review will therefore focus on how provision of access and inclusion support progression and equity, the rates of dropout, completions, and rates of transition to further education and employment. In relation to outcomes for students, research and policy review will also entail outcome analysis, and investigate quality of outcomes in terms of how current curriculum outcome objectives are measured, and number of students with IDD transitioning to further education and employment, and efficiency of existing systems. Understanding these outcomes is essential in the recognition of the unique human rights of students with IDD and will be helpful steps towards consolidating rights and needs, as well as the realisation of social justice.

12.0 Conclusion

Botswana is a signatory to several international protocols seeking to equalise educational opportunity for students with disabilities and the Government has been at the forefront in promoting access through the philosophy of Kagisano. This paper has attempted to chronicle the issues of access and outcomes for students with ID in Botswana. It is evident that while there is a paucity of research in this area, available research indicates limited educational outcomes for this cohort of students, justifying a different approach and the critical role of research. The 2011 inclusive policy has laudable ideas for supporting education, but a different approach to provisions for those with IDD as canvassed in this paper may be needed. The adoption of an accountability framework was discussed, and an argument made for caution about including the market-driven dimension of the framework due to the risk of furthering unequal outcomes and accentuating social injustice. Preference is given for the adoption of the accountability framework for research into IDD education policy and processes, highlighting how research, guided by this framework, could set the stage for identifying strengths and weaknesses in the existing IDD education arena, and set up mechanisms for better student outcomes. The paper makes recommendations on how research into key dimensions can inform

the adoption of the accountability framework in policy and educational practice, and in doing
so sets a research vision for improving educational outcomes for students with ID in Botswana.

References

Abosi, O. (2000). Trends and issues in special education in Botswana. *The Journal of Special
Education, 33*(1), 48-53.

Ainscow, M. (2007). From special education to effective schools for all: A review of progress
so far. In L. Florian (Eds), *Sage Handbook of Special Education* (pp.146-159). London,
Sage Publications.

Anderson, J.A. (2005). Accountability in Education. IIEP Education Policy Series. UNESCO:
Paris. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000140986

Byrne, B. (2019). How inclusive is the right to inclusive education? An assessment of the UN
convention on the rights of persons with disabilities' concluding observations.
International Journal of Inclusive Education, *26*(3), 1–18. doi:10.1080/13603116
.2019.1651411

Carew, M., Deluca, M., Groce, N., Fwaga, S. & Kett, M. (2018). The impact of an inclusive
education intervention on learning outcomes for girls with disabilities within a
resource-poor setting. *African Journal of Disability* (Online) 2226-7220.
DOI:10.4102/ajod .v9i0.555

Chhabra, S., Srivastava, R. & Srivastava, I. (2010). Inclusive Education in Botswana: The
perceptions of School Teachers. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies 20*(4), 219-228.

Dart, G. 2007. Provisions for learners with special educational needs in Botswana: A situational
analysis. *International Journal of Special Education, 22*(2), 56-66.

de Graaf, G. & van Hove, G. (2015). Learning to read in regular and special schools: A follow-
up study of students with Down syndrome. *Life Span & Disability*, *18*(1), 7–39.

de Graaf, G. & de Graaf, E. (2016). Development of self-help, language, and academic skills
in persons with Down syndrome. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual
Disabilities*, *13*(2), 120–131.

Dell'Anna, S., Pellegrini, M. & Ianes, D. (2019). Experiences and learning outcomes of
students without Special Educational Needs in inclusive settings: A systematic review.
International Journal of Inclusive Education, *25*(8), 944-959 doi:10.1080/13603116
.2019.1592248

Dessemontet, R. S., Bless, G. & Morin, D. (2012). Effects of inclusion on the academic
achievement and adaptive behaviour of children with intellectual disabilities. *Journal
of Intellectual Disability Research*, *56*(6), 579–587.

Downing, J. E. (2010). *Academic instruction for students with moderate and severe intellectual disabilities in inclusive classrooms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Gartner, A. & Lipsky, D. K. (2000). "Inclusion and School Restructuring: A New Synergy." In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for Caring and Effective Education: Piecing the Puzzle Together* (pp. 38–57). Paul H. Brookes.

Government of Botswana. (1994). *The revised national policy on education* (Government Paper No. 2 of 1994). Government Printers.

Government of Botswana. (2011). *National report on the development of education: Inclusive education: The way of the future.* Ministry of Education and Skills Development. Government Printers.

Government of Botswana. (2015). *Education and Training Sector Strategic Plan.* Government Printers. https://www.gov.bw/sites/default/files/2020-03/ETSSP %20Final%20Document_2.pdf

Imray, P. & Colley, A. (2017). *Inclusion is dead. Long live inclusion*. Routledge.

Johnstone, C. J. & Chapman, D. W. (2009). Contributions and Constraints to the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Lesotho. *International Journal of Disability 56*(2), 131–148.

Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Baumert, J., Richter, D., Voss, T. & Hachfeld A. (2013). Professional competence of teachers: Effects on instructional quality and student development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(3), 805–820.

Kuyini, A.B. & Paterson, D. (2013). School principals' expectations of teachers to implement inclusive education and teachers' understanding of those expectations in Australian schools. *Special Education Perspectives, 22*(2), 31-43.

Loreman, T., Sharma, U. & Forlin, C. (2013). Do pre-service teachers feel ready to teach in inclusive classrooms? A four-country study of teaching self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(1) 27-44.

Mangope, B. (2017). Inclusive practices for learners with intellectual disabilities in primary schools in Botswana: what are teachers doing to enhance inclusion? *Mosenodi Journal, 20*(1), 32-47.

Mangope, B. (2016). *Inclusion or Exclusion: Education of learners with intellectual disabilities in special units in Botswana primary schools* (Unpublished PhD dissertation), University of Botswana.

Mangope, B., Otukile-Mongwaketse, M., Dinama B. & Kuyini, A.B. (2018). Teaching practice experiences: The voices of University of Botswana Special Education Student Teachers. *International Journal of Wholeschooling, 14*(1), 57-91.

Matale, J. L. (2002). *Structures and resources in the education system for learners with special needs.* [Paper presentation] Curriculum Development and Evaluation Seminar on Curriculum and Special Education, August, 7-9, 2002, Seventh Biennial Report, 1999-2000, (pp. 1-80). Educational Publications Division, Ministry of Education, Gaborone.

Matzen, K., Ryndak, D. & Nakao, T. (2010). Middle school teams increasing access to general education for students with significant disabilities: Issues encountered and activities observed across contexts. *Remedial and Special Education*, *31*(4), 287–304.

Moswela, E. & Mukhopadyay, S. (2011). Asking for too much? The voices of students with disabilities in Botswana. *Disability & Society, 26*(3), 307–319. DOI:10.1080 /09687599.2011.560414

Mukhopadyay, S., Molosiwa, S. M. & Moswela, E. (2009). Teacher trainees' level of preparedness for inclusive education in Botswana schools: Need for change. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, *2*(2), 51-58.

Mukhopadhyay, S., Nenty, H. J. & Abosi O. (2012). Inclusive education for learners with disabilities in Botswana primary schools. *Sage Open,* https://doi.org/10.1177 /2158244012451584

Nolan, C. & Gleeson, C. I. (2017). The Transition to Employment: The Perspectives of Students and Graduates with Disabilities. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research 19*(3) 230–244. doi:10.1080/15017419.2016.1240102.

Nthitu, J.M., Kithard, H. & Sayed, A. (2012). *Teachers' perspectives on inclusion of disabled learners in Botswana*. [Unpublished Masters Thesis]. University of Zambia. www.lcint .org/download.php?id=941

Pincelli, M. (2012). *Post-School Outcomes for Students with an Intellectual Disability*. [Unpublished Masters thesis]. St. John Fisher College. https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu /cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1278&context=education_ETD_masters

Pit-ten Cate, I., Markova, M., Krischler, M. & Krolak-Schwerdt, S. (2018). Promoting inclusive education: The role of teachers' competence and attitudes. *Insights into Learning Disabiliti*es, *15*(1), 49-63.

Roberts, J. (2020). Thinking about accountability, education and SEND. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *20*(2), 150–156.

Sammons, P., Hillman, J. & Mortimore P. (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research.* Inst. of Education and Office for Standards in Education, London. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED389826

Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2007). What concerns pre-service teachers about inclusive education: An international viewpoint? *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 4*(2), 95-114.

Starbuck, J. (2020). Should accountability for SEN/Disabilities be separate or embedded within a general accountability framework? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 20*(2), 159–162

Stevens, L. & Wurf, G. (2020). Perceptions of inclusive education: A mixed methods investigation of parental attitudes in three Australian primary schools, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *24*(4), 351-365, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2018.1464068

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T.J., Tucker, P. D. & Hindman, J. L. (2007). What is the relationship between teacher quality and student achievement? An exploratory study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *20*(2),165–184.

Taheri, A., Perry, A. & Minnes, P. (2017). Exploring factors that impact activity participation of children and adolescents with severe developmental disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *61*(12), 1151–1161.

Taub, D.A., McCord, J. & Ryndak, D. (2017). Opportunities to learn for students with extensive support needs: A context of research supported practices for all in general education classes. *The Journal of Special Education, 51*(2), 127-137. 0022466-91769626, DO - 10.1177/0022466917696263

UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca statement and framework of action on special needs education. (Salamanca, Spain, UNESCO, Ministry of Education and Science). https://www.academia.edu/28017177/the_salamanca_statement_and_framework_for_action_on_special_needs_education_world_conference_on_special_needs_education_access_and_quality.

Whittaker, N. (2020). Education inspection framework 2019 –'Inspecting the substance of education, *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *20*(2), 156–158.

Winn, S. & Hay, I. (2009). Transition from school for youths with a disability: Issues and challenges. *Disability & Society 24(1*), 103–115. doi:10.1080/09687590802535725.

World Bank (2022). *Disability inclusion and accountability framework*. World Bank. Washington. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en /437451528442789278 /pdf/Disability-inclusion-and-accountability-framework.pdf