**Day of General Discussion on the Right to Education of Persons with Disabilities sponsored by: Fundación Universia and UNICEFCommittee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)Room XVII, Palais des Nations, Geneva 15 April 201512.00-13.00: Interactive panel on Non-exclusion on the basis of disability, reasonable accommodation and access to inclusive education systemsFive concerns revolving around genuine inclusion**

1. The need to overcome the lack of communication and synergies, and the programmatic “stalemates”, among four main inclusive education boxes: as a human right and public good, as special needs education and labelled categories, as responding to issues of marginality and poverty, and as the transformation of the education system.
2. The still strong prevalence of the normalcy and deviant paradigm, discourse and practice: regular/special schools, special education supports attached to the mainstreaming curricula and pedagogy, curriculum accommodation and the risk of lowering social and learning expectations.
3. Curriculum, pedagogy and assessment framed in the paradigm of individualized learning / support as going hand in hand with and functional to the prevalence of homogeneous learning environments. Diversity is not seen as a source for enhancing and democratizing learning opportunities, but more as a barrier and as a “disturbing” factor for learning.
4. Apprehension / fear / misunderstandings about the value-added and benefits of inclusion for the learners coming from diverse stakeholders. Politics, culture and education matter as confounded dimensions. Strong disputes and mixed feelings around the imaginaries of inclusive societies, social inclusion and inclusive education. One main challenge: understand and cope with community and parents’ concerns about learning opportunities “jeopardized” or “affected” (more subtle) by environments, settings and provisions made by students from diverse contexts, circumstances and capacities.
5. Cultures, mind-sets, policies and practices are still strong referred to the able / disable categories, and not recognizing sufficiently that every learner is special, diverse and unique. The discussion shouldn’t be about making the choice for one type school or another (even the most “inclusive school” can be a strong source of exclusion), or solely adjusting the curricula, the pedagogy and the assessment, but more crucially, ensuring effective personalized learning opportunities to every child. That implies a holistic vision of education and of the education system, systemic understanding of quality education and a repertoire of tools and mechanisms encompassing a wide range of learning opportunities and strategies under common rationale, foundations and expectations. Universalism and diversity goes hand in hand.