

Advisory Functions That The Inclusion Support Centers Develop As A Contribution To Inclusive Education In Paraguay

Dr. Obioma Okoye

Enugu School of Art and Design, Nigeria

Abstract

As part of the transformation process associated with Inclusive Education, it has been proposed that Special Education Centers should develop consultation functions aimed to promote inclusion processes in ordinary schools. In Paraguay, these ideas led to the transformation on Special Education Centers to Centers for Supporting Inclusion (CAI). This paper presents results from a descriptive phenomenological study focused on the consultation tasks and functions developed by CAI professionals. The participants of the study were 16 CAI professionals distributed in four different CAIs. Data gathering was conducted through in-depth, semi-structured interviewing. Results point that these professionals are incorporating consultation functions and tasks with the teachers, but at the same time remain mainly oriented to give individual response to the students showing more specific educational needs. Furthermore, they highlight the absence of a conceptual consultation model that guides their intervention. It is concluded that the transformation in which CAI are involved needs to be supported, and that adopting a constructive educational consultation model could be useful in this respect.

Keywords : special education centers; inclusion support centers; including education; consultation.

1. Introduction

One of the great challenges of current education is the transformation of schools into friendlier and more accessible environments for the diversity of students, through the promotion of better learning and participation opportunities for all, especially those groups that, due to gender conditions, culture, disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic situation, etc. may be at risk of discrimination or exclusion from the regular educational system. From this point of view, the school, as a space to be transformed, must be given the opportunity to incorporate and use support systems and resources that help in this transformation process towards inclusive education (Unesco, 2016).

One of the resources that can play a relevant role in this transformation comes from the advisory function that special education centers seek to provide, acting as support centers for inclusion, within the framework of joint and collaborative work (Lago and Onrubia, 2008; Onrubia and Minguela, 2020; Solé and Martín, 2011) between the professionals of these inclusion support centers and the teams of regular schools, aimed at building improvements at the institutional level. This advisory function can contribute to helping regular schools in the analysis of their situation and context with respect to inclusion, and to determine diversified actions and supports that facilitate and promote improvement processes for inclusion. (Ainscow, 2004, 2017; Booth and Ainscow, 2002; Echeita, 2009; Giné et al., 2020a, 2020b; Puigdemívol and Petreñas, 2019; Sandoval et al., 2019).

The present work is part of a broader investigation in which it is intended, through a descriptive phenomenological study, to describe and analyze, from the perspective of its protagonists, the advisory functions that are being developed in the particular case of the Centers of Support for Inclusion (CAI) in Paraguay. The

CAIs are special education centers that are in the process of transforming into inclusion support centers, directing their intervention to support and advise regular schools for the inclusion of students with disabilities. In this new role, the CAI seek to support the educational change that is proposed from inclusion. This article presents results about two specific questions addressed in the research: (i) what are the advisory functions and tasks that CAI professionals are developing with regular schools, and (ii) from what references are they developing these functions, and to what extent are they included? among these references a collaborative model of advice.

1.1 Special education centers as inclusion support centers

Many of the current legislations and educational agendas of various countries highlight the processes of improvement and transformation of their educational systems towards a more inclusive and quality approach. The report carried out by UNESCO (2020) describes that one of the current forms that characterizes the transition process towards a more inclusive educational system is the gradual conversion of special schools into resource centers, understood as specialized professionals, teaching materials, technologies. adapted and pedagogical advice, placed at the service of ordinary schools. In other words, special education centers must go through a process of transformation into inclusion support centers in order to complement each other and support schools in the process of educational and social inclusion of people with greater needs for educational support. and thus gradually eliminate the separation that exists between special education and regular schools. The establishment of regulations related to the promotion of inclusive education and the need to ensure inclusion for all without discrimination, to have adequate facilities, or to provide the necessary support to people with disabilities to

facilitate their training within an inclusive educational system. of quality at all levels of regular education, helps to understand the need for transformation and the transition that regular schools require to improve their educational response to diversity (UNESCO, 2006, 2015, 2020). Achieving this will not only depend on the desire and transformation initiatives that the special education centers or regular schools have, but will be largely determined by the legislation of each country, since these legislations will help in the recognition of the profile and the priority functions that special education centers must fulfill as inclusion support centers.

This transformation process will help special education centers to change the way they understand and provide their educational service, recognizing themselves as a key piece of the process of educational inclusion of students with disabilities, and valuing their contribution in the creation of structures and practices oriented to improve the educational response, and to be an instrument that helps to recognize and eliminate all the barriers present in the practices, policies and culture of the centers, and that are limiting the inclusion process (Echeita et al., 2011, Font and Roura, 2004). This change will also help to recognize themselves as organizations of excellence and support for inclusive education (Giné et al., 2020b), and to understand that they play an active role in achieving common objectives between schools, students and families.

From this new model of educational care and intervention, special education centers must guide their intervention from a dual function, as proposed by several experiences (Carbonell et al. 2007; Font and Roura, 2004; Giné et al., 2020b; Rojas and Olmos, 2016, Rappoport et al., 2019). Firstly, these centers must be configured as centers for the provision of individualized support aimed at developing the

capacities and skills of students with disabilities and in this way help in the student's participation in all the activities proposed by the schools. From this function, special education centers are valued as spaces specialized in the care and education of students with disabilities, since they have both material and professional resources that serve as mediators for the schooling process of students with disabilities. Secondly, special education centers must become resource and support centers for school inclusion, supporting schools through advice on inclusive practices and strategies, conducting training and workshops for school professionals, supporting teachers in monitoring specific cases, and supporting families in the student inclusion process.

1.2 Collaborative counseling within a constructive educational model of psychopedagogical intervention as a support element in the transformation of schools in an inclusive direction

The constructive educational model of psycho-pedagogical intervention (Sol é and Martín, 2011) is part of a process of progressive change in the way in which psycho-pedagogical intervention professionals approach and carry out their actions in the school context. This new form of intervention has focused its efforts on improving educational practices, taking into account the educational institution and the different systems that make it up. In this regard, the institution is understood as an open, complex system exposed to the relationships that develop between the different participants (students, families, professionals, etc.). For Huguet (2006), the educational center is a complex community where relationships, communications, networks and barriers develop that change according to the needs and diversity of each subsystem.

From this approach, the psychopedagogical advisor, as a strategic professional, must propose new ways of carrying out the intervention, helping to enhance the teaching processes of teachers and the learning of students. In these ways, the establishment of a collaborative relationship with educational centers and teachers occupies a fundamental place. In this sense, Lago and Onrubia (2011a, 2011b) describe that the role of the advisor should be that of a process expert for the construction of improvements in educational practices, who works from a collaborative, non-hierarchical or prescriptive relationship with teachers. and with the school institutions themselves, helping to create “zones of institutional development” in which improvements can be generated and school practices, policies and cultures transformed. For his part, Solé (1997) describes the advisor within an educational improvement process from two aspects. First of all, the advisor must contribute as an agent of change who helps the institution through collaborative work and joint construction with other professionals, through processes of analysis and reflection of practices. Secondly, the advisor must help achieve the different educational objectives of the center, specifying this work of collaboration and joint construction through actions that help improve practices, build relationships between professionals, and stimulate collaboration . training and professional growth of the members of the institution.

The constructive educational model of psychopedagogical intervention adopts the purpose of improving educational quality through school transformation. Within this transformation, the commitment towards an inclusive educational system becomes more evident and necessary, understanding that educational inclusion must occur in a processual manner in the constant search to improve educational quality by eliminating barriers to learning and participation of the diversity of

students (Ainscow, 2004). From this logic, the response to diversity is the response of all members of the institution for the entire student body and not only for those whose needs require exceptional resources (Solé and Martín, 2011). In this sense we understand diversity from the individual differences of each of the students, and that the work of building improvements must be oriented towards the interests and needs of this diversity. For Onrubia (2009), the intervention must be given from an interactionist conception of individual differences, emphasizing not only the particular characteristics of the students, but the interaction between these characteristics and the help and support that the student receives within the different contexts in which it participates. From this framework, psychopedagogical intervention is then conceived as a way to improve educational practices in a contextualized, preventive, optimizing and collaborative way ; a form that responds, on the one hand, to the dynamic and changing nature of schools, and on the other, to the specific educational attention needs that students require (Lago and Onrubia, 2008).

2. Method

Taking into account the objectives of the research, it has been decided to carry out an investigation with a qualitative approach. This approach allowed us to approach the reality of the participants from their natural context and the meanings that the participants attribute to reality from their own experience (Willig, 2013). From this approach, and through a descriptive phenomenological study (León and Montero, 2015) based on in-depth semi-structured interviews, we explore the advisory functions developed by CAI professionals in a contextualized manner, and taking into account the perception of the different participants. of the study.

2.1 Participants

The broader study of which this article is part focuses both on the professionals who make up the inclusion support centers (CAI) in Paraguay and on the teachers of the regular schools advised, to try to analyze the joint work that they come developing in the creation of more inclusive schools. 16 professionals participated in this extensive study, including teachers, psychologists and psychopedagogues from four Inclusion Support Centers, and 8 teachers from four regular schools advised by these professionals, belonging to different cities in Paraguay, both in urban areas and in rural areas. rural. The selection of participants has been developed based on two criteria: i) that the CAIs are currently carrying out practices related to counseling, ii) that these counseling practices are considered successful within the school context.

The data we present in this article correspond exclusively to the CAI professionals participating in the study.

2.2 Data collection

Individual in-depth semi-structured interviews were used as the main source of data collection. Due to the situation of the COVID-19 pandemic at the time of data collection, the interviews were carried out virtually. The interviews started from a script determined in advance about the relevant information that needed to be obtained (Bisquerra, 2009) and were aimed at knowing different aspects of the experience and practice of our interviewees, from the use of a set of open questions that the researcher used to guide the interview towards the topics of interest of the research (León and Montero, 2015). The interview scripts were organized into blocks and sub-blocks, which were adjusted according to the role of the participants (advisor – advised). Table 1 presents these blocks and sub-blocks for

the entire interview. The results presented in this article are fundamentally associated with the first two blocks indicated, in the case of CAI professionals.

Table 1. Blocks and sub-blocks of the semi-structured interviews

| Blocks | Sub - blocks | Recipients |
|--|---|--|
| General characterization of CAI | General characterization of CAI Functions and tasks performed in general Specifically advisory functions Common requests for advice from schools Regular CAI Consulting Offers Most common purposes of advisory processes Advised those who are regularly supported (students, individual teachers, teaching teams, directors, families...) Most common content/topics of advice | CAI Professionals School professionals |
| References that guide the advisory action of the CAI | Regulatory references Theoretical references References from practice Degree to which it is considered necessary to have a more explicit | CAI Professionals |

| | | | |
|---|-------|---|--|
| | | framework/references for advisory action | |
| | | Form of relationship between advisor and teacher/s | |
| Ideas about counseling | about | <p>Elements that distinguish advice from other functions/tasks of the CAI</p> <p>Purpose that advice should have (corrective, preventive, enriching)</p> <p>Focus that the advice should have (individual/context)</p> <p>nature that the advice should have (direct/indirect)</p> <p>Forms of relationship that should be established with teachers and schools</p> <p>Importance that it is believed that the advisory function should have in the overall performance of the CAI</p> | CAI Professionals |
| Assessment and satisfaction in relation to the counseling process | and | <p>Personal satisfaction regarding counseling processes</p> <p>Satisfaction as a team with respect to advisory processes</p> | CAI Professionals School professionals |

Assessment and satisfaction with respect to the place that advisory functions and tasks occupy in their overall functions and tasks

Global assessment of the impact of the advisory processes carried out from the point of view of inclusion

Source: self made.

2.3 Data analysis

To analyze the data, we have used content analysis. This technique allows the description and interpretation of the meaning of textual material, such as semi-structured interviews, through a systematic coding procedure (Cho and Lee, 2014).

To begin this analysis, inductive coding was carried out. This approach involves a data coding process without a pre-existing system of categories (Braun and Clarke, 2006), beyond the objectives and questions that govern the study. The contributions of the participants were worked on systematically to identify common meanings, group them into categories of meaning and then into themes, according to the hierarchy established by the researcher (Willig, 2013). The analysis helped to organize all the data related to the support and advice work carried out by the participants, giving us a global and contextual vision of their reality. In the course of analysis, various “tactics” are used to generate meaning from the data (Miles et al., 2020), such as identifying patterns and themes, grouping or making contrasts and comparisons, and counting frequencies. According to these authors, frequency counting constitutes a pertinent

tactic within qualitative analysis, which can allow, in interaction with other tactics used, to help search for regularities and trends of meaning in qualitatively interpretable data, for example, in terms of relevance or recurrence.

To corroborate the categorization, the assignment of codes to each category was refined until the final coding was obtained, which made it possible to establish the frequency of citations and the number of participants of each code and each category. The coding process was carried out following a back-and-forth interactive procedure. To ensure the reliability of the analysis, a qualitative consensus process between judges was followed (Creswell, 2014) based on collaborative coding (Smagorinsky, 2008). This technique consists of carrying out the coding process jointly between two coders. The coding is systematically discussed between both researchers, the information is reviewed and limited until agreements are established on each code.

3. Results

Below are the results of the analysis of the interviews carried out with the professionals who make up the inclusion support centers (CAI). This presentation is organized into two sections, which correspond to each of the two questions that we pointed out in the Introduction as the objective of this article. Therefore, at first the results are collected regarding the functions and tasks carried out by CAI professionals and the place that advisory functions and tasks occupy in them; and in a second moment, the results related to the references that, according to the analysis of the interviews, frame the advisory processes developed by the CAI professionals are described.

3.1 Functions and tasks developed by the professionals of the inclusion support centers

The analysis allowed us to identify a total of 21 codes that, according to their own description, include the functions carried out by CAI professionals. Based on the various functions and tasks indicated, we have made a categorization based on who these tasks and functions are carried out with, and what their nature is. These categories are described in Table 2.

Table 2. Categories where the codes obtained from the interviews carried out with CAI professionals are grouped.in relation to their functions and tasks.

| Student area | | |
|---|---|---|
| Categories | Codes | Code Description |
| 1. Individual educational support tasks for students at the CAI | 1.1. Initial assessment of the student | Initial assessment of the student, carried out at the CAI, which will serve to recognize educational needs, establish the type of reasonable adjustment that will be implemented and help in the beginning of the advising process for school teachers. |
| | 1.2. Individual educational support for the student | Pedagogical support for students carried out at the CAI, aimed at improving their capabilities and skills. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 2. Individual clinical support tasks for students at the CAI | 2.1. Clinical support services for students within the CAI | Clinical and therapeutic support for the student, carried out at the CAI. |
| 3. Tasks carried out by CAI professionals on the student inclusion process | 3.1. Beginning and development of the process of incorporating the student into regular school | Tasks aimed at organizing the inclusion process based on the initial analysis of the situation of the child, families and school. |
| | 3.2. Evaluation and monitoring by CAI professionals of the student's incorporation into regular school | Tasks aimed at verifying compliance with the recommendations given to those advised, and making adjustments to the process for the effective inclusion of the student. |
| family area | | |
| Categories | Codes | Code Description |
| 4. Support tasks for families regarding the student inclusion process | 4.1. General advice to families about the inclusion process | Advice tasks for families on the student inclusion process. |
| | 4.2. Monitoring of the inclusion process with | Tasks related to monitoring the educational inclusion |

| | families | process of students carried out jointly between CAI – families. |
|---|--|---|
| Teaching areas and technical teams | | |
| Categories | Codes | Code Description |
| 5. Pedagogical and organizational advice tasks carried out for school teams | 5.1. Curriculum psychopedagogical advice to teachers and technical teams of schools | Pedagogical advisory tasks for teachers and institutional technical teams of regular schools related to strategies, methodology and content to be developed with the included students. |
| | 5.2. Advice to teachers on reasonable adjustments | Pedagogical and administrative advice on the preparation, implementation and monitoring of reasonable adjustments. |
| | 5.3. Organization of visits to schools as an essential part of advising teachers on specific cases | Organization of institutional visits in relation to dates, time and topics to be discussed between CAI professionals and teachers from regular schools. |

| | <p>5.4. Establishment of permanent forms of communication CAI – between the CAI and regular teachers</p> | <p>It is established that the forms of communication between the CAI and regular schools can be developed in person at the CAI, in the schools, by video calls, messages or other technological means that facilitate communication during the counseling process.</p> |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Institutional scope</p> | | |
| Categories | Codes | Code Description |
| <p>6. Case study and monitoring tasks developed in teams between the CAI and regular schools</p> | <p>6.1. Case study in mixed teams between CAI professionals and regular schools</p> <p>6.2. Study and monitoring of cases in teams formed by CAI professionals</p> | <p>Team meeting between CAI professionals and regular schools with the purpose of carrying out specific case studies of included students.</p> <p>Internal meeting of CAI professionals to study and monitor specific cases in relation to the counseling and inclusion process.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 7. Training tasks | 7.1 Provide training for teachers and workshops for teachers and technical teams and technicians of regular schools on general topics related to educational | Training and workshops carried out by the CAI to regular schools on topics related to educational |
| | regular schools on general topics proposed inclusion. by the CAI | |
| | 7.2. Provide training for workshops for teachers and technicians of regular schools on topics requested by them according to need and specific cases. | Specific training for teachers, technical team and directors of regular schools in relation to their needs and specific cases. |
| 8. Tasks of organizing the institutional relationship of the CAI with the regular schools | 8.1. Information tasks for schools in relation to the global inclusion process | Information tasks for schools in relation to the global inclusion process in accordance with current national and international regulations. |
| | 8.2. Link between the school and the pedagogical supervision of the area | CAI mediation tasks on the pedagogical, administrative and case monitoring needs between schools and pedagogical supervisions, |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | which arise during the inclusion process. |
| | 8.3. Organization of the institutional relationship with schools that request help for students who are not enrolled in the CAI | Advising tasks on general topics to schools that request help for students who are not enrolled in the CAI. |
| | 8.4. Generally clarify the function and role of the CAI in the process of supporting schools | Tasks aimed at explaining the functions carried out by the CAI during advising regular schools, as a way of building its identity as a reference in the process of inclusion of students with educational needs. |
| | 8.5. Clarify the functions of the professionals that make up the CAI | Tasks aimed at describing the functions that each of the professionals that make up the CAI team develops in the process of supporting schools. |
| 9.Emerging modifications due to the pandemic | 9.1. Work modifications during the pandemic | Emerging modifications regarding the counseling format developed during the |

pandemic.

Source: self made.

The categories have been organized taking into account who or with whom the work carried out by CAI professionals is carried out, and the nature of this work. Thus, categories 1, 2 and 3 correspond to tasks focused on direct attention to the student within the CAI, which focus, on the one hand, on improving the student's personal and academic skills and that help their inclusion process, and on the other hand, in everything related to organizing the student's incorporation into school. For its part, category 4 includes tasks focused on care and support for families, before and during the inclusion process of their children. Categories 5, 6 and 7 are focused on the work that CAI professionals carry out with teachers: individual counseling tasks during the sessions they carry out during visits to schools (5), teamwork tasks between the CAI and schools for monitoring specific cases (7), and training tasks (6). As for category 8, this has an institutional dimension: its reference is the schools as a whole, and it focuses on information, coordination and communication by the CAI of everything related to the inclusion process; This process is developed mostly according to the demands and needs of the schools. Finally, category 9 refers to the impact of the COVID–19 pandemic on the work process between the CAIs and regular schools.

In Table 3 we can see the nine categories ordered from greatest to least presence (number of citations) in the interviews. The number of quotes that make up each category is indicated, the number of participants to whom the codes of each category correspond, as well as the number of CAIs to which those interviewees correspond for the different codes.

Table 3. Frequency of appointments, number of participants and centers obtained for the codes obtained from the interviews carried out with CAI professionals in relation to their functions and tasks.

| Categories | Appointment frequency | Number of CAI interviews | number |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------|
| 5. Tasks of pedagogical and organizational advice to teachers of regular schools in relation to specific cases | 145 | 16 | 4 |
| 8. Tasks of organizing the institutional relationship of the CAI with the regular schools | 82 | fifteen | 4 |
| 1. Individual educational support tasks for students at the CAI | 56 | 13 | 4 |
| 3. Tasks carried out by CAI professionals on the student inclusion process | 29 | 12 | 4 |
| 6. Case study and monitoring tasks developed in teams between the CAI and the schools | 29 | 13 | 4 |
| 7. Training tasks for teachers and technical teams of schools | 23 | 10 | 4 |
| 2. Individual clinical support tasks | twenty-one | eleven | 4 |

| | | | |
|---|-----|----|---|
| for students at the CAI | | | |
| 4. Family support tasks | 22 | 8 | 4 |
| 9. Emerging modifications due to the pandemic | 14 | 9 | 3 |
| Total | 421 | 16 | 4 |

Source: self made.

We could highlight that the tasks of advising teachers are those that appear in the most citations, but they represent a third of the total; From this indicator, advice would occupy an important, but minority, place in the tasks and functions of the CAI. For its part, the work with teachers is, as a whole, clearly focused on specific cases (categories 5 and 6), and the tasks and functions of direct support to students also have, together (categories 1, 2 and 3) an important weight in terms of appointments (a quarter of the total).

3.2 References on which CAI professionals rely to guide the advice they develop with regular schools

The analysis of the interviews also helped us identify those references that CAI professionals use to establish their advisory model when working with schools. Professionals refer to three priority references. Table 4 shows the codes that make up this analysis.

Table 4. Categories and codes obtained from the interviews carried out with CAI professionals in relation to the references that they rely on to guide the advice they develop with regular schools

| Categories | Code | Code Description |
|------------|------|------------------|
|------------|------|------------------|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 1. References on advisory functions | 1.1. The practice itself as a reference | The practice itself as a model that guides the advice that CAI professionals carry out with schools. |
| | 1.2. Legal regulations as a reference | Paraguayan national regulations that guide the intervention work of CAI professionals with schools. |
| | 1.3. The training and qualification of CAI professionals as a reference | Importance that CAI professionals give to training and training on inclusion and that helps guide their intervention with schools. |
| 2. Absence of an advisory model for CAIs | 2.1 Absence of an advisory model for CAIs | The absence of an advisory model that guides CAI intervention with schools is the main difficulty. |

Source: self made.

As can be seen, the professionals interviewed describe their own practice as one of the great references. Here they emphasize success stories within the process of inclusion of students with educational support needs, which they systematically replicate and improve as a way of creating their own institutional model of intervention. As the next reference, the current national regulations are described, with Law No. 5136 of Inclusive Education of Paraguay being the most cited. In

article No. 5 of said law, the Ministry of Education and Sciences establishes that it will guarantee students with specific needs the necessary support and the detection of barriers to learning and participation from the moment they join educational institutions. The majority of CAIs base their transformation also based on what is established in this Law. Finally, professionals state that individual training and training on issues related to educational inclusion and everything that this entails can be a key element when time to build a model that guides your intervention with schools. This analysis also highlights that the absence of an advisory model is a major limitation for CAIs to develop their advisory function and become references in this inclusion process. The lack of a model delays the process of transformation and construction of one's own identity as an Inclusion Support Center at the service of schools.

In Table 5 we present a table ordered from highest to lowest frequency with the number of citations of the indicated codes. The category of “Referents on advisory functions” appears with the largest number, but it can be seen that there is not much difference in relation to the category of “Absence of an advisory model for CAIs”.

Table 5. Frequency, number of participants and centers obtained for the codes on the References that CAI professionals rely on to guide the advice they develop with regular schools

| Categories | Codes | Appointment frequency | Number of CAI interviews | CAI number |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| 1. References on advisory | 1.1. The practice itself as a reference | 14 | 8 | 4 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|----|---------|---|
| functions | | | | |
| | 1.2. Legal regulations as a reference | 8 | 6 | 3 |
| | 1.3 The training and qualification of CAI professionals as a reference | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 2. Absence of an advisory model for CAIs | 2.1. Absence of an advisory model for CAIs | 18 | 10 | 4 |
| | Total | 44 | fifteen | 4 |

Source: self made

4. Discussion and conclusions

The results obtained paint, in our interpretation, a very nuanced picture of how the CAI professionals participating in the research are facing the challenge of incorporating advisory functions and tasks into regular schools as support for the process of change and improvement thereof. , and with it the Paraguayan educational system, in an inclusive direction (Ainscow, 2004, 2017; Booth and Ainscow, 2002; Echeita, 2009; Giné et al., 2020a, 2020b; Puigdellívol and Petreñas, 2019, Sandoval et al., 2019). Thus, and on the one hand, the results reflect that these professionals are incorporating advisory functions and tasks to teachers and regular schools, and that these tasks have an important place in

relation to the set of functions and tasks they perform. At the same time, the results reflect an orientation of their work that is still very focused on attention to individual cases, and also a relevant weight of the functions and tasks of direct attention to students.

We find this nuanced nature of the results, first of all, in the declared tasks of pedagogical and organizational advice to teachers in regular schools in relation to specific cases that professionals report (category 5). As we have pointed out, these tasks are the most frequently referred to in the quotes, which seems to support their relevance in the set of tasks they carry out. At the same time, they appear in around a third of the total citations, which indicates that they are not yet clearly predominant tasks. When we internally consider the different codes that make up the category, nuanced elements also appear. On the one hand, the reference to the establishment of permanent and stable forms and strategies of communication between CAI professionals and schools and teachers points to a type of systematic and continuous relationship, from which it is possible to consider joint and collaborative work. and that can allow CAI professionals to be perceived as a substantive support resource in the process of transforming schools in an inclusive direction. The reference to the tasks of pedagogical advice to teachers and institutional technical teams of regular schools related to strategies, methodology and content to be developed with the included students also points in the same sense. On the other hand, the advisory tasks and functions appear focused on supporting reasonable adjustments, and therefore more focused on the individual student than on the classroom as a whole, and it is also noted that these tasks are based on “visits.” to the centers, that is, in a presence of CAI professionals in the

centers that is labeled more as something brief and punctual than as something continuous and with a certain temporal extension.

The results on the remaining functions with more weight in the quotes from the interviews reinforce this nuanced characterization. On the one hand, the weight of the tasks of organizing the institutional relationship of the CAI with the regular schools (category 8, the second in number of citations) underlines that the professionals of the CAI seek to establish a relationship that goes beyond the interventions punctual and that has the school as a system as its interlocutor (Huguet, 2006). We find it interesting and significant, in this sense, that among these tasks those that have to do with clarifying the functions and role of the CAI, as a whole, in supporting schools, and also the functions of each of the professionals who form the CAI. Also the training tasks of teachers and technical teams of schools (category 7) point to an institutional dimension that can support a global transformation of schools. At the same time, and on the other hand, other tasks and functions aimed at teachers show a focus on the “cases” of students with more difficulties (category 6: case study and monitoring tasks developed in teams between the CAI and the schools). To this we can add the weight (as we said, about a third of the total references in citations) that maintain the functions of direct attention to students, both educational and clinical, and also with a component of administrative monitoring (categories 1 2 and 3). Also, attention to families (category 4) focuses on the families of students with the most difficulties.

Along with this nuanced panorama in relation to the functions and tasks assumed by CAI professionals, we find the data relating to what references these tasks are being addressed, according to the participants, especially noteworthy. It is very notable, in our opinion, that the absence of an advisory model that guides CAI

intervention with schools is highlighted prominently and as the main difficulty. We understand that this absence is very important both to indicate the objectives and priorities of the intervention in schools (what to advise on and why) and to guide the forms and strategies of intervention (how to advise). A constructivist educational model of intervention can be very useful in both senses (Lago and Onrubia, 2011a, 2011b; Solé and Martín, 2011). In the absence of this model, the results show that it is the practice itself, as well as the current legislation and the professionals' own training, that they use as a reference to guide their actions. Again, we can make a nuanced interpretation of this. On the one hand, the use of one's own practice as a reference seems to reflect an awareness of the need to review and improve that practice and a reflective look at it. Likewise, having legislation that supports the actions of CAI professionals in favor of inclusion is undoubtedly necessary and relevant. On the other hand, without a clear conceptual reference and a model that guides the advisory processes, the possibility of reflecting on the advisory practice itself that allows it to be improved is very limited, and legislation or regulations can set references, but hardly provide instruments. and practical action guides for the actions of professionals.

In summary, and based on the results presented, it seems possible to affirm that the CAI develop a wide range of functions and tasks, with different recipients and of a diverse nature, where the main focus is the students with special educational needs enrolled within the CAI and their process of inclusion in regular education. In this regard, the functions and tasks they perform are largely linked to ensuring the presence of these students in regular schools, guaranteeing their effective inclusion and the implementation of reasonable adjustments. The majority of CAI professionals who participate in the study describe that advising teachers is

fundamental to achieving inclusive education, and that visits to schools constitute a main element that structures the advisor's work with those advised.

According to this, we can conclude that these centers are in the process of constructing and transforming their identity as references in advisory processes within an inclusive line (Carbonell et al., 2007; Font, 2004; Giné et al., 2020 ; Rappoport et al., 2019; Rojas et al., 2016) and also in the search for an advisory model adjusted to current demands that guides the work they have been doing with schools. Legislative support and a position of constant review of one's own practice are elements that can undoubtedly help in this process of construction and transformation. However, it seems necessary, to sustain and promote this process more effectively, to provide the CAIs and the professionals who work in them with an explicit advice model that allows them to guide in practice both the content of their actions and the strategies and forms of work of these. A constructive educational model of intervention, and in particular the proposals of this model around the collaborative nature of the advisory relationship and joint work between advisors, teachers and schools, can be useful in this regard, at least on a triple level (Lago and Onrubia, 2011a, 2011b; Onrubia and Minguela, 2020; Solé and Martín, 2011). Firstly, reinforcing the functions and tasks of CAI professionals who have a more clearly advisory and institutional dimension, supporting the change and transformation of centers and classrooms as more inclusive contexts for all students. Secondly, helping to move from a view of inclusion focused on attention to cases to a more global, preventive and enriching view. And, thirdly, helping to formalize a certain conception of what it means to work collaboratively with teachers and regular schools, and to have strategies and tools for intentional,

planned, systematic and explicitly oriented collaborative work to improve practices. .

References

Ainscow, M. (2004). The development of inclusive educational systems: What are the levers of change? *Journal of educational change*, 5(4), 1-20.

Ainscow, M. (2017). Making schools more inclusive: Lessons from analyzing international research. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5(1), 39-49.

Bisquerra, R. (2009). *Educational Research Methodology*. Madrid: The Wall.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Guide for the evaluation and improvement of inclusive education*. Index for Inclusion. Madrid: University Consortium for Inclusive Education.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Carbonell, E. Capellas, M., Creuheras, M., Escudero, G. and Milian, M. (2007). Transformation of a special education center into a center that provides resources for the educational inclusion of students with great barriers to learning and participation. *EEC ASPASIM-20 anys d'un process*. Areas of psychopedagogy and orientation . 21 , 37-43.

Cho, JY and Lee, EH. (2014). Reducing confusion about grounded theory and qualitative content analysis: Similarities and differences. *The Qualitative Report*, 19 (64), 1-20.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th. Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Echeita, G. (2009). Educational inclusion processes since the Salamanca Declaration. A balance between painful and hopeful. In C. Giné (Coord.), D. Duran, J. Font, and E. Miquel, Inclusive education. From exclusion to full participation of all students (pp. 25-47). Barcelona: Horsori.

Echeita, G., Parrilla, A. and Carbonell, F. (2011). Special education to the debate. RUEDES Magazine of the University Network of Special Education, 1(1), 35-53.

Font, J. (2004). Schools that help each other. Pedagogy Notebooks. 331, 63-65.

Giné, C., Duran, D., Font, J. and Miquel, E. (2020a). Inclusive education. From exclusion to full participation of all students. Barcelona: Horsori.

Giné, C., Font, J. and Díezde, A. (2020b). Special education centers, support for inclusion. Areas of psychopedagogy and guidance . 53(3), 34-48.

Huguet, T. (2006). Learning together in the classroom: an inclusive proposal. Barcelona: Graó.

Lago, JR and Onrubia, J. (2008). A general advisory strategy for improving educational practice. Faculty. Journal of Curriculum and Teacher Education, 12(1), 1-13.

Lago, JR and Onrubia, J. (2011a). Psychopedagogical advice and improvement of educational practice. Barcelona: Horsori.

Lago, JR and Onrubia, J. (2011b). An advisory model for the improvement of educational practices. In E. Martín, and J. Onrubia (Coords.), Educational guidance: processes of innovation and improvement of teaching (pp.11-32). Barcelona: Graó.

León, OG and Montero, I. (2015). Research methods in psychology and education (4th ed.) . Madrid: McGraw-Hill.

Miles, MB, Huberman, AM and Saldaña. J. (2020). Qualitative Data Analysis. A Methods Sourcebook . (Fourth Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Onrubia, J. (2009). Transform to adapt, adapt to include: a psychoeducational look at inclusive education. In C. Giné (Coord.), D. Duran, J. Font, and E. Miquel, Inclusive education. From exclusion to full participation of all students (pp.49-59). Barcelona: Horsori.

Onrubia, J. and Minguela, M. (2020). An inclusive reflection on the functions of psychopedagogical intervention professionals. Areas of psychopedagogy and guidance, ๑๕ (3), 13-24.

Puigdellívol, I. and Petreñas, C. (2019). Evolution and meaning of educational support: the function of support in inclusive schools. In I. Puigdellívol, C. Petreñas, B. Siles, and A. Jardí (Eds.), Support strategies in the inclusive school: An interactive and community vision (pp. 19-64). Barcelona: Graó.

Rappoport, S., Sandoval, M., Simón, C. and Echeita, G. (2019) Understanding inclusion support systems: three inspiring experiences. Culture and Education, 31(1), 120-151.

Rojas, S. and Olmos, P. (2016). Special education centers as resource centers within the framework of an inclusive school. Review for a debate. Faculty. Journal of Curriculum and Teacher Education, 20(1), 323-339.

Sandoval, M., Simón, C. and Echeita, G. (2019). Inclusive education and attention to diversity from educational orientation. Madrid: Synthesis

Smagorinsky, P. (2008). The Method Section as Conceptual Epicenter in Constructing Social Science Research Reports. *Written Communication*, 25(3), 389-411.

Solé, I. (1997). The constructivist conception and advice to centers. *Childhood and Learning*, 77, 77-95.

Solé, I. and Martín, E. (2011). An educational model for guidance and counseling. In E. Martín, and I. Solé (Coords.). *Educational guidance: intervention models and strategies* (pp.13-32). Barcelona: Graó.

UNESCO (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/documents/tccconvs.pdf>

UNESCO (2008). International education conference 48th meeting. Inclusive education: The path to the future. <https://bit.ly/3Njz62s>