

# Where We Were Then: An Illuminative Evaluation of Teacher Knowledge, Beliefs and Practices in Relation to Level 2 Learning Programmes and Inclusion in a Mainstream Post-Primary School

This article reports the findings of the first phase of a case study exploring the impact of collaborative whole-school professional development (CWPD) to enact Level 2 Learning Programmes (L2LP) in a mainstream post-primary school. In Phase 1, a baseline in relation to the school's existing engagement with and knowledge, practice, and beliefs around L2LP and inclusion, was established in order to ascertain the staff CWPD needs and inform the subsequent design, implementation, and evaluation of the whole-school professional development in phase two which are reported elsewhere (Flood, 2019). Though the research explored the voices of students, parents, teachers, and special needs assistants (SNA), this article will focus on teachers' perspectives and practices. Sixteen teachers, including the principal and the special educational needs coordinator (SENCO), participated in phase one of the research. The findings suggest that despite a stated commitment to inclusion, there were significant gaps in teachers' knowledge and understanding of policy in relation to L2LP and how to plan for and implement these in their classroom practice.

*Keywords:* professional development, L2LP, post-primary, teachers, inclusion, curriculum

---

**MARGARET FLOOD** is the Education Officer for Inclusive Education and Diversity with the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment. **ANNA LOGAN** is an Associate Professor at the School of Inclusive and Special Education, Dublin City University Institute of Education, St. Patrick's Campus DCU.

---

*Corresponding author:* [margaret.flood@ncca.ie](mailto:margaret.flood@ncca.ie)

## INTRODUCTION

The Level 2 Learning Programmes (L2LP) were introduced as part of phase one of the new Framework for Junior Cycle<sup>1</sup> (FJC) in 2014. The aim of the L2LP is “to make the curriculum more accessible to students with special educational needs” (NCCA, 2016, p.6), in this instance students with low mild to high moderate general learning disabilities (GLD). The underlying principle of inclusion is promoted in the L2LP by advocating a student-centred and flexible approach to planning and assessment. A Level 2 Learning Programme is designed to meet the strengths and needs of the student in the context of the student’s school.

The L2LPs recognise the foundations for inclusive education established in Irish legislation (NCCA, 2014), building on the work of previous inclusion documents for students with GLD and special educational needs (SEN) (DES, 2007a; 2007b; NCCA, 2007). As part of the Framework for Junior Cycle, L2LP<sup>2</sup> have embraced the vision set out by the Department of Education and Skills (DES) to “enable post-primary schools to provide a quality, inclusive and relevant education with improved learning outcomes for all students, including those with special educational needs” (DES, 2012, p.1). The intention is that students participating in L2LP in mainstream post-primary settings engage with their individual L2LP learning outcomes (LOs) in their mainstream classes and, where appropriate, through small group or one-to-one classes.

### **Teacher Engagement with Inclusive Education**

The role of teachers is critical in enacting inclusive education policy initiatives such as L2LP (Forlin & Lian, 2008), as it is the day-to-day action of front-line staff that determines the effectiveness of the policy (Lipsky, 1981; Gilson, 2015). Teachers’ knowledge, skills, understanding, and attitudes impact their own and their schools’ capacity to create inclusive learning environments (Shevlin, Winter & Flynn, 2013). Preparing teachers for effective engagement with policy initiatives requires addressing the readiness of teachers cognitively, psychologically, and technologically (Cheng & Cheung, 1995; Cheng, 2005). The analysis of teacher readiness to engage with new initiatives offers an opportunity for policy makers to consider the position of those who are tasked with enacting the policy at school level. Recognising what stage of preparedness teachers are at will enable policy

---

1 FJC is the overarching curriculum framework for the first three years of post-primary education in Ireland. See <https://ncca.ie/en/junior-cycle/framework-for-junior-cycle/>

2 L2LP: Level 2 refers to the level on the Irish National Framework of Qualifications, in which the Junior Cycle Certificate is at Level 3. See [https://www.qqi.ie/Articles/Pages/National-Framework-of-Qualifications-\(NFQ\).aspx](https://www.qqi.ie/Articles/Pages/National-Framework-of-Qualifications-(NFQ).aspx)

makers to plan and put in place the supports required to prepare teachers to positively engage in the policy initiative.

Understanding of policy objectives influences teachers' attitude and willingness to engage with policy enactment (psychological readiness). This, in turn, can affect teachers' technological readiness and competency, and their professional development (PD) (Cheng & Cheung, 1995; Cheng, 2005). Similarly, inclusive education practices can be enhanced through the development of the three dimensions of knowing, doing, and believing (Rouse, 2007) or knowledge, practice, and belief (Opfer & Pedder, 2011). If two of these aspects are in place, the third is likely to follow. If teachers gain new knowledge and are supported to put this into practice, then their beliefs and attitudes relating to inclusive practices will change over time (Rouse, 2007; 2008). If teachers believe in inclusive education and are given the support to enact new practices, they are likely to develop new knowledge and skills (Rouse, 2008). Recording the attitudes of Greek secondary teachers (n= 365) towards inclusion, Koutrouba, Vamvakari and Theodoropoulos (2008) found that attitudes were positive when teachers had specialised knowledge, experience, and further professional development (PD). The absence of these factors resulted in a lack of confidence and preparedness. This highlights the necessity for specialised knowledge, experience, and PD for all teachers to advance inclusive practices in teachers' classrooms across the school environment (Brennan, King & Travers, 2019).

## **RESEARCH APPROACH**

To explore the impact of collaborative whole-school PD on the enactment of L2LP, this research first gathered information to assess the situation before designing a CWPD programme. The research approach was a predominantly qualitative case study that used multiple methods of data collection in a purposively sampled post primary school. Phase one comprised an illuminative evaluation of the school's previous efforts to enact L2LP. This was an important approach as illuminative evaluation is a formative process that emphasises interpretation and understanding rather than measuring success against pre-determined criteria (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972). This, combined with its attention to the views of all stakeholders' perspectives (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972; Maxwell, 1984), met the purpose of gaining an insight into the enactment process of L2LP pre-intervention which would in turn inform decisions pertaining to phase two. Ethical procedures were informed by the 'Ethical guidelines for education research' (British Education Research Association (BERA), 2011) and the study was reviewed and approved by the Dublin City University Research Ethics Committee.

Sixteen teachers, including the principal and (SENCO) participated in phase one. Findings in relation to L2LP knowledge, understanding and practice were drawn from multiple data sources as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Data Sources**

<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>Documentary analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Documentation: school mission statement, admission policy and additional support needs (ASN) policy</li> <li>• Teachers Documentation: 2 long term schemes of work, 6 subject planning checklists &amp; 2 lesson plans, 2 individual education plans (IEP).</li> </ul>
<b>Individual interviews</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• principal and SEN coordinator ( SENCO)</li> <li>• 2 students and 2 of the students’ parents</li> </ul>
<b>Focus groups</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 teacher focus groups with 11 participants in total</li> <li>• 1 SNA focus group with 3 participants</li> <li>• 1 focus group with 3 Professional Masters in Education (PME) student teachers</li> </ul>
<b>Classroom Observations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 classes: Music, Geography, Home Economics</li> </ul>

## **FINDINGS**

The findings from phase one are reported in terms of the school commitment to inclusion, the role of the principal and SENCO, teacher knowledge of L2LP, L2LP in practice and PD for inclusion and L2LP.

### **A Commitment to Inclusion**

Analysis of the data evidenced a commitment to inclusion, with L2LP forming one part of this. However, there was a significant gap between teachers’ perceptions of their understanding of L2LP and the accuracy of their L2LP knowledge. The school’s commitment to the principles of partnership, accountability, transparency, inclusion, and respect for diversity, parental choice and equality were stated in its mission statement and Admission Policy. The schools’ Additional Support Needs (ASN) Policy (n.d) outlined the schools’ intention to be inclusive and “*work with students in an equitable manner that respects and develops the students’ learning potential and sense of self-worth and dignity*” and engage with external inclusive education policies. The introduction of L2LP for some students was referred

to. However, the Admissions Policy and curriculum link on the school website listed junior cycle subjects and short courses available but not L2LP. The staff<sup>3</sup> demonstrated an awareness of the diversity of students attending the school and the responsibility of teachers, SNAs, and leadership to include every learner and provide appropriate programmes such as L2LP in the school. The SENCO observed that: *“as a group we are getting to grips with just the basic understanding of L2LPs but apart from that we haven’t had a major amount of engagement”* and noted the collaborative nature of inclusion and L2LP and the difficulties of getting all teachers to collaborate for this purpose.

### **Role of the Principal and SENCO**

In interviews, the principal and SENCO highlighted their responsibilities for communicating and enacting whole-school SEN policies and planning. They noted the importance of resources (time, teacher availability, and PD), structures and teachers’ commitment to inclusive teaching approaches such as team-teaching to enact the ASN Policy and L2LP. With respect to school readiness for enacting L2LP, the SENCO spoke about the school having a lack of knowledge and limited focus on pedagogy and the tools to teach L2LP, suggested a lack of awareness of students who may benefit from L2LP and reflected on the barriers to enacting L2LP saying: *“it’s just a lack of knowledge and a lack of understanding, because even my interpretation of who was able to access L2LPs has actually changed since September.”*

### **Teacher Knowledge of L2LP**

Data from focus groups support the SENCO’s concerns about lack of teacher knowledge, with teachers having less knowledge than the principal and coordinator. Nine of the eleven teachers who participated in focus groups spoke positively about L2LP and the benefits for their students. However, interview data highlighted teacher misconceptions about L2LP and the student cohort L2LP are designed for. Staff explanations of L2LP exemplified this confusion. Six teachers and the principal spoke about L2LP in their subjects as if the L2LP were traditional Junior Cycle level 3 subjects differentiated for level 2. Eight teachers demonstrated an assumption that students participating in L2LP studied mainstream Junior Cycle subjects but learned and expressed their knowledge in different ways.

Classroom observations supported the idea of differentiation and the accommodation of different learning styles. Summary field notes (Table 2) recorded the observation of inclusive practices but there was no evidence of including L2LP learning outcomes into the lessons.

---

3 ‘Staff’ is used to refer to teachers, SNAs, the principal and SEN coordinator.

**Table 2: Summary Field Notes of Classroom Observations\***

Summary of practices observed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The <u>use of learning outcomes</u> on the board to focus lesson was evident in the three lessons.</li><li>• <u>Peer-to peer</u> learning was used in all lessons. This was scaffolded with individual teacher support for students requiring it.</li><li>• <u>Multiple means of representation</u> were evident. All classrooms had key subject terminology on flashcards or posters on the walls. Student work was displayed. Subject related posters, diagrams etc were on display. Written, visual (video clip, chart showing timelines etc) and verbal instruction/ explanations were given in Home Economics and Geography.</li><li>• <u>Differentiated worksheets</u> were used in Home Economics and Geography.</li><li>• <u>Student check-in</u> evident. There was student questioning in all classes to check understanding. Random selection of students by teacher for questioning was used in Music. It appeared that teacher had pre-selected questions for students with SEN in Home Economics Students raised hands to answer questions in Geography Student A reluctant to answer in Geography, teacher moved to another student then returned to student A.</li><li>• All subjects <u>theory based</u>. Music theory-based writing in copy. Home Economics theory based with group activities. Geography theory with video and active participation (in earthquake procedures for a school).</li></ul>
<p>* Note: This is a summary of practices that occurred in at least two of the three classroom visits for Music, Home Economics and Geography in Phase One of this study.</p>

### **L2LPs in Practice**

L2LPs in practice emerged as a significant theme in phase one and are presented here under three sub-headings: policy and practice, planning for L2LPs, and from planning to practice.

#### ***Policy and practice***

Staff reported a greater interest in day-to-day practical learning and teaching strategies than policy at whole-school or national level. Teachers spoke about sharing information, team-teaching, differentiation, behaviour strategies, and L2LPs. SNAs spoke about the practices they observed and participated in, such as group work, differentiation, and using the physical environment (for example placing a student near the window or using standing desks). Most staff referenced

the supportive staff culture in the school in terms of staying informed and getting help with students, activities, and policies. Nine teachers referred to the SENCO as a “*great source of information*” and mentioned looking up student profiles and using the additional needs communal forum on the school’s communication system, Schoology. The SENCO was surprised at teachers’ awareness of this communication system as she felt it was not being used due to a reliance on her giving verbal information on request.

### ***Planning for L2LP***

Teachers had planning time as part of Haddington Road<sup>4</sup> hours to create subject plans that reflected the school’s commitment to inclusive education and plan for L2LP. The principal expected differentiation and L2LP to form part of teachers’ planning and that this should be included in the PD intervention. The principal, coordinator and nine teachers noted the importance of planning for L2LPs and that it “*is seamlessly embedded within your planning*”. All eleven teachers and the SENCO stated that more time was needed to plan in a meaningful and collaborative manner.

*We don’t have the planning time required to successfully integrate L2LPs in anything more than on paper at this stage, the personalised and directed learning that we would need to successfully integrate L2LPs and just the overall resource of time for teachers to plan differentiated lessons, to discuss what’s working well, what isn’t working well with the students. That time for discussion is just completely unavailable to us in this school and probably every school (SENCO).*

*We tried really hard to implement them [L2LPs] last year but there’s not enough time to do it. Like you’re getting 20-40 minutes put aside a week to do your planning and every other student needs to be accommodated for too (Teacher).*

The principal agreed with the teachers, recognised teachers’ needs to have time to follow-up with each other after PD or meetings; to check-in, reflect and plan but questioned “*Who has the time to do that? Where does this time come from?*”

Schemes of work and subject planning checklist responses (Table 3) revealed the different stages of L2LP planning teachers were at. The checklists, completed by the teachers in subject area groups, produced positive responses regarding teachers’ perceptions of their subject planning. The response to individual planning linked

---

4 Haddington Road is a public service agreement between the government and public service unions. This agreement includes teachers working an additional thirty-three hours per annum. These hours can be used in a flexible manner to meet the needs of the school. They include whole-school staff meetings, small group meetings and individual hours.

to L2LPs was less positive. The SENCO felt teachers had “*a great start*” but momentum was lost when they did not know what to do next or where to find support.

**Table 3: Summary of Responses to Subject Planning Checklist**

<b>Subject Planning Checklist: Linking L2LPs and Subject Planning</b>			
<b>Subject Planning</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Common subject plans with links to Level 2 Learning Outcomes have been devised and written	5	1	Possible outcomes highlighted in plan
Expected learning outcomes are set out in written plans	4		
Individual planning is linked to the subject plan and/or L2LP and incorporates learning intentions developed to address students’ learning needs	3	3	
Individual teacher planning incorporates teaching and learning approaches that are clearly linked to expected learning intentions	5	1	
Timeframes are suggested for teaching various elements of the subject across the subject department	4	2	Corresponding outcomes highlighted in plan
There are links made between statements of learning, key skills and learning outcomes	6		
Links with other subjects/base class to support the consistent development of students’ key skills are incorporated in the subject plan	5	1	
The subject assessment policy is consistent with the whole-school assessment policy	4		
The subject assessment policy incorporates formative and summative assessment practices	5		
Written plans for assessment and the gathering of evidence align with planned student learning	3	2	Aspect of L3 portfolio
The plan incorporates opportunities for regular collective review of student work where teachers share professional practice	6		Regular department meetings  As I have no L2LP students currently in class, I have not found time to incorporate the L2LP fully into plans and schemes



However, there appeared to be a disconnect between teachers’ perceptions of their planning compared to the planning documents data. Seven teachers referred to their planning and embedding L2LPs into their schemes of work. All teachers were invited to submit their schemes of work. Two teachers responded, for first-year Business and second-year Music respectively. Six teachers reported not submitting their schemes because they had insufficient time, or the knowledge to complete the planning and five teachers looked for more examples and guidance to be better informed on how to incorporate L2LP into their planning.

The Business scheme of work linked Business and L2LP learning outcomes for the L2LP were not differentiated success criteria with L2LP criteria shown in bold and L3 criteria in italics (Table 4). However, the Music scheme suggested a lack of understanding of planning for L2LP. L2LP LOs were not identified in the scheme and success criteria were not differentiated.

**Table 4: Extract from Business Scheme of Work**

Unit of Learning	Learning Outcomes	Success Criteria/Differentiation
Level 3	Level 2	<b>Students’ work will show...</b>
Personal Finance: 1.1	PLU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>an ability to differentiate between a person’s basic needs and wants</b></li> </ul>
Personal Finance: 1.2	Numeracy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>an understanding of income and its different sources</b></li> </ul>
Personal Finance: 1.3 – Financial lifecycle	A4, A5, A6, A7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>an understanding of expenditure and the different types of expenditure within a household.</b></li> </ul>
Personal Finance: 1.12		<p><i>Students work will display</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a knowledge of how a person’s needs and wants change throughout the different stages of their lives.</i></li> <li>• <i>an understanding of what opening, closing and net cash are</i></li> <li>• <i>their ability to record income in a household budget</i></li> <li>• <i>the ability to record expenditure in a household budget.</i></li> </ul>

Note. This table represents the alignment of Level 3 and L2LPs LOs in the Business Scheme of work. The use of bold and italic font for level 2 and level 3 criteria respectively was how the teacher highlighted their differentiation for students doing L2LPs/requiring scaffolding and students doing Business respectively.

Lesson plans submitted by teachers for classroom observations further demonstrated a gap in the teachers' knowledge regarding planning for L2LP. The plans did not reference L2LP, or differentiation for students with SEN and two teachers expressed uncertainty about breaking down L2LP in this stage of their planning.

### ***From planning to practice***

Interview data indicated varying degrees of teacher confidence regarding putting L2LPs into practice. However, the SENCO was concerned that teachers were unaware of how L2LP would work for them and their students in the classroom and believed that more PD would help. *“Well, we’ve only had that one two-hour CPD training, so as far as I’m aware there’s no further training, which I think is a shame because individualised training could be beneficial.”* Focus group discussions revealed teachers' awareness of the gap between their planning and classroom practices.

*It’s very hard to practically implement them within the classroom then like it’s all well and good having it on paper but it’s not going to work if we can’t do it properly and have the time and resources to do it.*

*So, we’ve like, the best intentions in the world, we all really want to make this successful. We’ve all the planning basically done; it’s integrated into our schemes but just actually putting it into practice I find a challenge now. Where do we go next? Where do we go from here?*

All classroom teachers (n=14) volunteered to be observed and four were randomly chosen. The classroom observations showed no evidence of inclusion of L2LPs into the lesson. However, other inclusive practices, such as seating arrangements, visual cues, and peer-to-peer support, as well as teacher support were identified.

### **Professional Development (PD) for Inclusion and L2LP**

Most teachers interviewed felt their PD experiences did not adequately prepare them for inclusive practices such as L2LP in their teaching. Newly qualified (n=2) and student teachers (n=2) spoke about the lack of inclusive education instruction in initial teacher education. Longer serving teachers (n=7) noted a lack of appropriate PD for them, citing dictated and overly structured PD as reasons teachers may not engage fully with PD. In the year prior to the study, fifteen teachers and one SNA engaged in a two-hour whole-school L2LP session provided by the Junior Cycle professional development support team<sup>5</sup>. Teachers interviewed who attended this PD (n=7) felt this was insufficient and wanted more

---

5 See Junior Cycle for Teachers <https://www.jct.ie/home/home.php>

opportunities to have discussions and share resources, experiences, and practices with colleagues. All teachers, the principal and SENCO wanted to know how the L2LP would impact on their time in relation to planning and subjects.

Taking account of teachers' beliefs that more PD was required to support progression from planning to practice, teachers were asked what they would like to see included in the PD intervention for L2LPs that would be delivered in Phase 2. Key themes that emerged are outlined in Table 5. (For further details of the implementation and outcomes of the CWPD see Flood, 2019). When given the option to participate in the online PD sessions at home, all sixteen teachers chose to participate as a group after school via the 'Facetime' app.

**Table 5: Key Focus Areas for PD Intervention in Relation to L2LP**

Key areas for focus	Evidence
Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues and with teachers of the same subject area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important for subject teachers to have the opportunity and time to work with other teachers in their subject department and in other schools (focus group).</li> </ul>
Knowledge and understanding of L2LPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers (n=8) spoke about understanding different learning styles and needs and knowing how to teach L2LPs learning outcomes in their subjects. The SEN coordinator further developed this when she spoke about whole-school responsibility: <i>"I know that right now some teachers think 'well I'm Maths so I only need to know about Numeracy' for example. But I know from my sessions that it needs to be all teachers in all subjects, the SNAs, the caretaker and secretary can help too. We need to talk together to make decisions. This is really important for our CPD."</i> (interview)</li> <li>• Six teachers spoke about <i>"making sure we pick the right students for L2LPs"</i> (interview). The SEN coordinator was concerned about teachers' understanding of GLD as the criteria for L2LPs (personal communication).</li> </ul>
Practical examples relevant to students, teachers and subjects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers (n=7) requested strategies and practical examples of how to incorporate L2LP into practice in their subjects (focus group)</li> </ul>
Support in planning for L2LPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ten teachers requested support in planning</li> </ul>
Assessment and gathering evidence for L2LPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All teachers expressed the need to learn more about assessment for L2LPs to <i>"know how these students have reached their goal"</i>.</li> <li>• <i>Teachers</i> asked about measuring students' success without an exam and who is responsible for this: <i>"I know there's a portfolio but what do I, we, put in it? And who is responsible for marking it?"</i> (focus group). <i>I'm gathering evidence so there's something there but is it enough and is it just me responsible for saying pass or fail?"</i> (personal communications)</li> </ul>

## **DISCUSSION**

Teacher education has struggled to prepare and support teachers to enact inclusive education approaches, such as L2LP, in their classrooms (Travers et al., 2010). Teachers reported that previous teacher education relating to inclusion did not prepare them for inclusive practices in the classroom, or to teach L2LPs. Phase one findings reported here indicated that newly qualified and student teachers had not heard about L2LP in their initial teacher education (ITE) programmes, and the other participants had limited exposure to PD relating to L2LP. Teachers who had attended the two-hour PD felt that this was insufficient and wanted more opportunities to have discussions and share resources, experiences, and practices with colleagues. Only the SENCO had attended full day PD in the L2LP. All staff needed to understand the rationale for L2LPs, they wanted to know how the L2LP would impact on their time in relation to planning and subjects and wanted follow-up support after PD.

The findings also evidenced teacher's misconceptions about the nature of L2LPs and student eligibility for L2LPs, resulting in a fundamental lack of understanding for planning for learning and teaching. This lack of understanding may have contributed to the gap in teachers' perceptions of their planning and the reality of it in this phase. Furthermore, despite teachers reporting positively on their current planning and practice there was a lack of confidence and ownership to progress L2LP enactment from the school's initial steps. This gap in knowledge and practice despite inclusive beliefs highlights the argument that change is reciprocal (Rouse, 2008; Opfer & Pedder, 2011) and that the three dimensions of knowing, doing, and believing (Rouse, 2008) are interdependent. Indeed, change in just one dimension may not represent teacher learning as change in the three elements is required for learning to occur (Opfer & Pedder, 2011). However, teachers' belief in inclusive education meant teachers willingly submitted lesson plans without references to L2LP to receive feedback and guidance.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

This was a small scale study conducted in one purposively selected post primary school with a limited number of participants and thus the findings cannot be generalised. Nevertheless, the illuminative evaluation carried out in this research facilitated a detailed exploration of the phenomenon of L2LP enactment in one mainstream post-primary school.

The need for additional support to effectively enact L2LP was a consistent theme throughout interviews with teachers. The findings indicate that the school had started to engage with L2LP, but momentum was lost without support following initial PD in L2LP. This seems to reflect a rather piecemeal approach to junior cycle reform with a priority placed on level 3 subjects. Furthermore, the dependency of JCT on the cascading model and the optional two-hour transmissive session to deliver professional development in relation to L2LPs may have contributed to the gap in teachers' knowledge and practice regarding L2LPs.

Based on the findings outlined in this paper, this study established a baseline from which to develop the CWPD intervention that formed phase two of this research (see Flood, 2019).

Establishing a baseline for CWPD indicated where the school was in its journey with L2LP and identified the goals of the CWPD. It was evident from the findings that the approach needed to be responsive and facilitate collaborative discussions, inquiry and decision-making based on acquired knowledge and understanding of students with GLD and L2LPs. Illuminative evaluation of Phase 1 resulted in the following areas of focus for the CWPD:

- Knowledge of GLD and understanding and rationale of L2LPs
- Planning for L2LPs, including LOs at classroom and whole-school level
- Assessment and gathering evidence

Incorporating the three elements of belief, knowledge, and practice (Rouse, 2008; Opfer & Pedder, 2011) into each session would support teacher change. Finally, in response to teachers' desire to participate in PD together, this CWPD took a blended approach building in synchronous and asynchronous elements. Teachers met as a group in school and Facetime was used to communicate with the facilitator. Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, this represented an innovative and atypical approach to CWPD which in itself reflects the spirit of the case study school and staff in embracing inclusivity and flexibility.

## REFERENCES

- British Education Research Association (BERA) ( 2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. London: Author.
- Brennan, A., King, F., & Travers, J. (2019) Supporting the Enactment of Inclusive Pedagogy in a Primary School, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, DOI: [10.1080/13603116.2019.1625452](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1625452)

- Cheng, Y.C. (2005). A Comprehensive Framework for Analysis of Education Reform Policy. In: *New Paradigm for Re-engineering Education. Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects, vol 6*. Springer, Dordrecht
- Cheng, Y.C. & Cheung, W.M. (1995). A Framework for the Analysis of Educational policies. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 9(6), 10-21. doi: 10.1108/09510147538
- Department of Education and Science. (2007a). *Inclusion of Students with Special Educational Needs: Post-Primary Guidelines*. Dublin, Ireland: The Stationery Office.
- Department of Education and Science. (2007b). *Special educational needs: A continuum of support. Guidelines for teachers*. Dublin, Ireland: The Stationery Office.
- Department of Education and Skills. (2012). *A Framework for Junior Cycle*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Policy-Reports/A-Framework-for-JuniorCycle-Full-Report.pdf>
- Flood, M. (2019) *Exploring the Impact of a Collaborative Whole School Model of Continuous Professional Development on the Enactment of Level 2 Learning Programmes in a Mainstream Post Primary School*. Doctor of Education thesis, Dublin City University. <http://doras.dcu.ie/23761/1/Collaborative%20CPD%20Thesis%20Final%2010.09.19.pdf> ( accessed 4th September 2021)
- Forlin, C., & Lian, M-G.J. (2008). Contemporary Trends and Issues in Education Reform for Special and Inclusive Education in the Asia-Pacific Region. In C. Forlin & M-G. J. Lian (Eds), *Reform, Inclusion and Teacher Education: Towards a New Era of Special and Inclusive Education in Asia-Pacific Regions*. (p. 3-12). Abingdon, Australia: Routledge.
- Gilson , L. (2015). Michael Lipsky, ‘Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service’. In S.J. Balla, M. Lodge & P. Edwards, (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Classics in Public Policy and Administration*. Retrieved from: <http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/2305355/1/Gilson%20-%20Lipsky%27s%20>.
- Koutrouba, K., Vamvakari, M., & Theodoropoulos, H. (2008). SEN Students’ Inclusion in Greece: Factors Influencing Greek Teachers’ Stance. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 23(4), 413-421. doi: 10.1080/08856250802387422

- Lipsky, M. (1981). *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York, U.S.A.: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Maxwell, G.S. (1984). A Rating Scale for Assessing the Quality of Responsive/Illuminative Evaluations. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(2), 131-138. Doi: 10.2307/1163908
- National Council for Curriculum and Assessment. (2007). *Guidelines for Teachers of Students with General Learning Disabilities*. Retrieved from [http://www.ncca.ie/uploadedfiles/Overview\\_web.pdf](http://www.ncca.ie/uploadedfiles/Overview_web.pdf)
- National Council for Curriculum and Assessment. (2014). Level 1 Learning Programmes. Draft background paper. Retrieved from [http://www.juniorcycle.ie/NCCA\\_JuniorCycle/media/NCCA/Curriculum/Research/Background/Consultations/Level-1-Draft-Background\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.juniorcycle.ie/NCCA_JuniorCycle/media/NCCA/Curriculum/Research/Background/Consultations/Level-1-Draft-Background_Paper.pdf)
- National Council for Curriculum and Assessment. (2016). *Level 2 Learning Programmes: Guidelines for teachers*. Retrieved from [www.ncca.ie/en/Curriculum\\_and\\_Assessment/Inclusion/Special\\_Educational\\_Needs/Level\\_2\\_Toolkit/Guidelines\\_nc.pdf](http://www.ncca.ie/en/Curriculum_and_Assessment/Inclusion/Special_Educational_Needs/Level_2_Toolkit/Guidelines_nc.pdf).
- Opfer, V.D., & Pedder, D., (2011). Conceptualising Teacher Professional Learning. *American Educational Research Association*, 81(3), 376-407. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23014297>
- Parlett, M., & Hamilton, D. (1972). *Evaluation as Illumination: A New approach to the Study of Innovatory Programs*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED167634.pdf>
- Rouse, M. (2007). *Enhancing Effective Inclusive Practice: Knowing, Doing and Believing*. Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education.
- Rouse, M. (2008). Developing Inclusive Practice: A Role for Teachers and Teacher Education. *Education in the North*, 16(1), 6-13. Retrieved from <https://abdn.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/developing-inclusive-practice-a-role-for-teachers-and-teacher-education>
- Shevlin, M., Winter, E., & Flynn, P. (2013). Developing Inclusive Practice: Teacher Perceptions of Opportunities and Constraints in the Republic of Ireland. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 17(10), 1119-1133. doi: 10.1080/13603116.2012.742143
- Travers, J., T. Balfé, C. Butler, T. Day, M. Dupont, R. McDaid, M. O'Donnell, and A. Prunty. 2010. *Addressing the Challenges and Barriers to Inclusion in Irish Schools: Report to Research and Development Committee of the Department of Education and Skills*. Drumcondra: St. Patrick's College.