

Research Article

Cite this article: Soto Gallardo, C. (2026). Supports for Students with Intellectual Disabilities in Chile: Policy, Practice, and Cultural Tensions in a Rights-Based Framework. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 24, e2026086. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2026.24.86>

Received October 3, 2025

Accepted November 28, 2025

Keywords: Quality of life, inclusive supports, right to education, inclusive education, intellectual disabilities.

Author for correspondence:

Cristian Soto Gallardo

✉ crisotog2@gmail.com

✉ Carrera Educación Diferencial, Facultad de Educación, Universidad San Sebastián. Puerto Montt, Chile.



OPEN ACCESS

© The Author(s), 2025. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

Supports for Students with Intellectual Disabilities in Chile: Policy, Practice, and Cultural Tensions in a Rights-Based Framework

Cristian Soto Gallardo 

Abstract

Background/purpose. This study examines the perceptions of teachers, educational assistants, and local administration representatives regarding the supports provided to students with intellectual disabilities in public schools in Puerto Montt, Chile.

Materials/methods. A qualitative multiple-case study design was employed, selecting three institutions with the highest concentration of students with intellectual disabilities. Semi-structured interviews and focus groups were conducted with 31 participants, and data were analyzed using deductive coding.

Results. Results reveal a gap between inclusive policies and their practical implementation, characterized by insufficient teacher training, limited collaborative work, and an individualistic professional culture. Supports primarily target socioemotional outcomes, neglecting key dimensions of quality of life, such as self-determination and social inclusion.

Conclusion. The findings underscore that achieving effective inclusive education requires not only robust policies but also cultural transformation within schools and the active involvement of students in shaping supports. Key recommendations include strengthening teacher training, developing indicators to monitor social outcomes, and promoting shared responsibility among schools, families, and communities. By providing new empirical evidence from Latin America, this research broadens the international debate on the implementation of rights-based inclusive education frameworks in socioeconomically vulnerable contexts.

1. Introduction

The United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (United Nations [UN], 2006) establishes the principle of equality before the law and obliges States Parties to guarantee full access to health, education, employment, and civic participation for persons with disabilities. Within this framework, the social model of disability emphasizes that barriers arise not from the impairment itself but from the interaction between individuals and their environments. This perspective underscores the need for systemic transformations that move away from segregated services toward individualized and inclusive outcomes (Verdugo et al., 2021).

Implementing such a perspective requires a comprehensive understanding of disability as a dynamic and context-dependent phenomenon. According to the World Health Organization's International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (WHO, 2001), disability results from the interaction among personal factors, health conditions, and environmental factors that can facilitate or hinder participation. This view aligns with the rights-based framework, which holds governments responsible for ensuring non-discrimination, equal opportunities, accessibility, and participation. This shift moves inclusive education from a programmatic aspiration to a rights-driven mandate (Rodino, 2015; Lawson & Beckett, 2020; Luckasson et al., 2023). Integrating these perspectives highlights that inclusive education requires coordinated efforts involving policies, institutional practices, and pedagogical adjustments.

Despite progress in policy, there is strong evidence of a gap between policy and practice in many countries. Research shows that, although inclusive education policies exist, insufficient teacher preparation, limited collaboration, and structural inequities often hinder effective implementation. Studies comparing countries suggest that levels of teacher cooperation vary, with some countries showing greater collaboration and others adopting more individualistic approaches (McKenzie & Dalton, 2017; Singal et al., 2018).

At the international level, there is a notable gap in the literature on how the biopsychosocial and rights-based frameworks are operationalized in middle-income countries, particularly in urban Latin American contexts. Most empirical studies on inclusive education remain concentrated in high-income countries, resulting in limited knowledge about how support systems for students with intellectual disabilities are developed in regions with different structural, cultural, and policy conditions (Artiles, 2015; Moriña, 2020; Watkins et al., 2022). Additionally, few studies integrate the perspectives of multiple school-level stakeholders, e.g., teachers, educational assistants, and local administrators, even though these groups play a central role in providing support. This gap limits our understanding of how international policies are put into practice in diverse settings.

Although Chile has enacted policies to promote inclusive education, evidence indicates that implementation has been uneven, and structural inequities persist. These findings suggest that the challenges observed in Chile reflect broader global patterns.

Within this context, there is a clear research gap: little is known about how different educational actors in Chile, such as teachers, educational assistants, and representatives of local administrations, perceive the supports provided to students with intellectual disabilities in urban mainstream schools. This gap is significant because support provision is a core component of the biopsychosocial and rights-based perspectives, yet its concrete implementation remains insufficiently documented internationally in comparable urban contexts.

Building on the previous context, this study examines the perceptions of teachers, educational assistants, and local administration representatives regarding the supports provided to students with intellectual disabilities in mainstream schools in Puerto Montt, Chile. In addition, the study incorporates specific objectives to identify tensions between regulatory requirements and their

practical implementation in schools, and to analyze discrepancies between the supports mandated by legal frameworks and those actually delivered in everyday classroom practice. By situating these findings within an international and cultural framework, the research contributes to understanding how rights-based policies can be translated into inclusive practices and how systemic, cultural, and pedagogical barriers continue to shape students with intellectual disabilities' educational experiences.

2. Literature Review

In Chile, several key laws and decrees have been passed over the past two decades to promote inclusion. These include the General Education Law (Law 20.370, 2009), Decree 170 (2009) regulating school integration programs, the Equal Opportunities and Social Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities Law (Law 20.422, 2010), the School Inclusion Law (Law 20.845, 2015), and Decree 83 (2015) mandating curriculum diversification. While these policies demonstrate a strong commitment to international standards, their implementation has been uneven, particularly in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas (MINEDUC, 2013; UNICEF, 2021).

Intellectual disability is defined as significant limitations in both intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior, which manifest in conceptual, social, and practical skills. These limitations arise during the developmental period (i.e., before age 22). The American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD, 2021) emphasizes that assessing intellectual disability requires consideration of the individual's typical community environment, cultural and linguistic diversity, and differences in communication, sensory, motor, and behavioral functioning.

Inclusive supports within schools are understood as strategies, resources, or interventions that enhance student participation and learning (Arnaiz, 2019). Frameworks such as the Quality of Life model identify essential domains—including self-determination, interpersonal relationships, social inclusion, personal development, and rights—which must be addressed to achieve genuine inclusion (Schalock, Luckasson, & Tassé, 2021). However, evidence indicates that in Chile, supports often focus narrowly on socioemotional development while neglecting self-determination and community participation (Ducarre, 2023).

In the Chilean context, several empirical studies emphasize that cultural and territorial diversity significantly shape how inclusive education is interpreted and implemented. For example, research in schools serving Indigenous Mapuche communities shows that inclusion practices are often intertwined with local cultural expectations and community participation, highlighting tensions between standardized national policies and culturally grounded pedagogies (Quilaqueo, Quintriqueo, Torres & Muñoz, 2014). Similarly, studies of migrant students in urban public schools reveal that teachers frequently struggle to integrate linguistic diversity and intercultural dialogue into everyday classroom practices, directly affecting the provision of inclusive supports (Valdés et al., 2024).

Local research also shows persistent inequities between schools in high- and low-income communities. For instance, López et al. (2018) documented that inclusive policies are interpreted differently depending on school leadership cultures and available resources, while Florian (2013) found that Special Education Needs Programs (PIE) often reproduce segregating dynamics by concentrating support on administrative compliance rather than collaborative pedagogical practices.

From a theoretical perspective, the Chilean literature reflects ongoing debates between different models of disability and inclusion. Scholars have highlighted tensions between medical–psychometric approaches embedded in diagnostic regulations, like those found in Decree 170, and broader social or rights-based frameworks that call for systemic transformation (Soto, 2024). These debates mirror international discussions about whether inclusion can be achieved through individualized support

alone or requires structural changes in curriculum, assessment, and school culture (Slee, 2019; Ainscow, 2020).

These Chilean and international studies highlight that inclusion is not only a technical or programmatic process but a cultural, ethical, and political one, shaped by contextual power relations, professional cultures, and community expectations. Their findings provide a broader framework for understanding how school-level actors interpret and enact inclusive supports for students with intellectual disabilities within complex sociocultural contexts.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a qualitative multiple-case study design, which enables in-depth exploration of complex educational phenomena within real-life contexts (Stake, 2005). The approach is particularly suitable for investigating diverse stakeholders' perceptions, as it integrates multiple perspectives and facilitates an ecological understanding of inclusive education practices (Yin, 2018). By adopting an interpretive paradigm, the study sought to capture the meanings that teachers, educational assistants, and administrators attribute to inclusive policies and practices in schools with high socioeconomic vulnerability.

This design aligns clearly with the study's research questions, which seek to understand how educational actors interpret and implement supports for students with intellectual disabilities, making an interpretive, multi-case approach appropriate for capturing variations across school contexts.

3.2. Participants

The study was conducted in municipal primary schools in Puerto Montt, Chile—a city characterized by high levels of socioeconomic inequality, cultural diversity, and variability in access to specialized support services. Three schools were purposively selected based on the following criteria:

1. High Vulnerability Index (Índice de Vulnerabilidad Escolar, IVE) above 90%, indicating systemic risk factors associated with dropout and educational exclusion.
2. At least 20% of students enrolled in the School Integration Program (PIE), ensuring the presence of students with intellectual disabilities and other support needs.
3. A long-standing implementation of PIE since the enactment of Decree 170 (2009), enabling participants to reflect on practices that have been sustained and institutionalized over time.

The study involved 29 education professionals, including 26 women and three men. The sample included general classroom teachers, special education teachers, and educational assistants with a minimum of one year of experience in PIE. In the Chilean context, this category encompasses multidisciplinary support professionals, such as psychologists, speech and language therapists, and occupational therapists, who play a central role in addressing students' multidimensional support needs. Their participation in the focus groups enabled the study to capture diverse perspectives on pedagogical, socio-emotional, and therapeutic support.

Additionally, two local administrators from the Ministry of Education were included to provide insights into regional policy implementation. This combination of school-based practitioners and policy actors was considered adequate to ensure data richness and depth, in line with the principles of purposive sampling in qualitative research (Palinkas et al., 2015).

Although a multidisciplinary group of educational assistants participated, some professional roles were missing, particularly social workers, who were not part of the selected schools. Additionally,

students and families were excluded because the study focused on how school staff interpret inclusive policies. While this approach supports the study's analytical focus, it does limit the range of perspectives. These sample limitations are acknowledged and discussed in the methodological limitations section.

3.3. Procedure

Data were collected between March and June 2023 using two complementary techniques:

Semi-structured interviews with local administration representatives ($n = 2$), exploring perceptions of inclusive policies and systemic challenges.

Focus groups with teachers and educational assistants ($n = 29$) were structured around a validated guide addressing inclusive cultures, practices, and supports.

Interviews lasted 45 to 60 minutes, while focus groups lasted 60 to 90 minutes. All sessions were conducted in person at the participating schools, following a standardized protocol to ensure procedural consistency across cases.

The interview and focus group protocols were validated through expert judgment (Blessing & Chakrabarti, 2009). A panel of three university researchers with expertise in inclusive education evaluated each item for relevance, clarity, and coherence on a 4-point Likert scale. Items scoring below three were revised or eliminated, ensuring the reliability and validity of the instruments.

3.4. Data Production and Analysis

The analytic framework aligned directly with the research questions, enabling the coding structure to capture how participants described supports, barriers, and policy–practice tensions. This ensured methodological coherence between the study's aims and its analytic procedures.

All interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using NVivo 14 software. A deductive coding process was applied, guided by the study's theoretical framework. Example codes included: "Policies" to capture references to legislation and institutional regulations; "School Cultures" to reflect the shared values and practices within the schools; "Teaching Practices" to document instructional and support strategies; and "Inclusive Supports" to identify resources and interventions that facilitate student participation. Additional subcodes emerged inductively, reflecting context-specific nuances of inclusive education in urban Chilean schools. Codes were iteratively compared across data sources to ensure consistency and triangulation (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2019).

Theoretical saturation was deemed reached when no new codes or categories emerged from the data, strengthening the comprehensiveness of the analysis (Fusch & Ness, 2015).

3.5. Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in compliance with ethical research standards. Authorization was obtained from municipal authorities and school principals, and all participants provided informed consent. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured throughout the process. Ethical approval was granted by the University of Granada Ethics Committee (No. 3634/CEIH/2023).

3.6. Methodological Limitations

The study is limited by its focus on professional perspectives, which may reflect institutional views rather than students' lived experiences. Moreover, the sample comprised only three schools in a single Chilean city, limiting the generalizability of the findings. However, the purposive sampling of schools with high vulnerability and significant PIE enrollment ensured maximum relevance and

transferability to contexts where the challenges of inclusive education are most pronounced (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Future studies should incorporate students' and families' voices through participatory methods and expand to diverse geographic and cultural contexts to enhance external validity.

These limitations imply that the findings primarily reflect institutional perspectives rather than students' and families' lived experiences. As a result, the interpretations presented in this study should be understood as partial and situated within professional discourses, which may not fully capture the complexity of support provision in everyday school life.

4. Results

4.1. Policies, Cultures, and Inclusive Practices

Classroom teachers, educational assistants, and local administration representatives consistently reported significant limitations in current support structures for students with intellectual disabilities. They highlighted that while educational policies are robust on paper, their implementation is hindered by substantial gaps, including insufficient professional training, excessive bureaucracy, and noncompliance with regulations, including the time allocated for collaborative work.

A local administration representative stated: "The population that the PIE program serves today is not the same as in 2011... their needs are different, and the structural design is now insufficient." This testimony illustrates a mismatch between current regulations and students' actual needs. A special education teacher added, "A new decree comes out, and we are the last to receive training." This lack of timely professional development strains school staff's capacities and highlights the gap between policy and practice.

Classroom teachers also emphasized structural and training limitations: "We face barriers in schools; it is not that inclusive education regulations are missing, but there is a lack of preparation to work with the diversity of students arriving." They further noted the scarcity of ongoing professional development: "Besides the bureaucratic model, our professional training is very limited to address the diversity of students." Special education teachers indicated that non-compliance with established norms directly affects service quality, such as the mandated hours per student: "Colleagues here suffer the most... the three hours per student with a permanent diagnosis are not respected."

Regarding school culture, participants agreed that all efforts should focus on ensuring that students, with or without disabilities, can learn in inclusive settings. They emphasized that inclusion is not optional but a right, requiring high-quality education that acknowledges individual characteristics. However, testimonies also revealed barriers to collaborative work, including mistrust and a professional culture of individualism: "In some schools, people are very guarded; they do not share information or strategies; they keep to themselves." A special education teacher stressed the importance of prioritizing students' common good: "The student's well-being comes first... with this principle, you can provide everything necessary."

Two main strategies were identified in practice: pedagogical advising and collaborative work. Pedagogical advising, led by the special education teacher, creates a hierarchical relationship in which the specialist guides classroom teachers: "Our approaches include pedagogical advising, which is the most common, or co-teaching and collaborative work, which is ideal." Collaborative work aims to develop professional communities where pedagogical decisions are designed, implemented, and evaluated jointly: "Teachers consult me, I consult them, they receive suggestions... we have coordinated work," and "Since the year before last, we have incorporated classroom team meetings for all teachers of a grade, along with professionals." These strategies aim to reduce hierarchical dependency and encourage shared responsibility, though their implementation remains inconsistent.

4.2. Inclusive Supports

Participants described supports focused on personalized education, the use of pictograms, and curricular adaptations, particularly in assessment. These adaptations address individual needs without modifying general curriculum objectives and facilitate learning within the classroom: "Students need more personalized attention... they may learn through images or pictograms... these adaptations help them acquire what they need," explained a special education teacher.

Teachers described using a variety of resources to engage and motivate learning: "Various resources, PowerPoint, videos, songs, guides, colors... more concrete work in mathematics using multi-base cubes... we start from zero and advance with students who are falling behind," said a special education teacher. Peer collaboration is also promoted through group organization, in which designated leaders support their classmates' learning: "We work in groups of five students... the leader is empowered to collaborate with peers... it works quite well," a classroom teacher reported.

However, participants emphasized the need to increase both the number and diversity of support professionals, as current limitations result primarily in socioemotional gains, with delays in cognitive, curricular, and life skills development: "I think the program would improve if support professionals such as occupational therapists were mandatory... they make a difference," stated an educational assistant, while a special education teacher added: "Students show progress and more confidence, but academically they are still behind; more professionals are needed to provide support."

Overall, while current supports contribute to certain individual and socioemotional advances, the limited availability of resources and professional collaboration limit their overall effectiveness, impeding alignment between academic objectives and broader quality-of-life goals for students with intellectual disabilities.

5. Discussion

5.1. Inclusive Policies, Cultures, and Practices

Chile has ratified key international frameworks such as the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2006) and enacted national regulations, including Decree 170 (2009), the School Inclusion Law (20.845, 2015), and Decree 83 (2015), all of which formally commit the country to an inclusive education system. These policies are recognized by teachers, teaching assistants, and ministry representatives, who value initiatives such as the School Integration Programs. Yet, the data reveal that implementation remains constrained by structural barriers that hinder sustainability.

Initial and ongoing teacher education are insufficient to equip professionals with the skills needed to address diversity meaningfully (Florian, 2015). This is compounded by limited time and resources for professional collaboration, reinforcing the gap between policy and practice (Verdugo et al., 2021).

Comparative research has documented similar gaps between policy and practice, in which legislative advances outpace the development of professional skills and the resources needed for implementation (Hincapié et al., 2018; Singal et al., 2018). These studies provide a useful comparison, suggesting that the structural and training shortfalls reported by participants reflect broader systemic patterns in middle-income contexts rather than isolated local anomalies.

In contexts of high socioeconomic vulnerability, these gaps perpetuate a deficit-oriented approach, placing responsibility primarily on support teachers rather than fostering shared pedagogical responsibility (Bouck & Park, 2016).

As a result, students with intellectual disabilities remain largely invisible in practice. While policy has promoted access and retention, tensions persist in achieving genuine inclusion, understood as full participation and recognition of students' voices in educational processes (Schalock & Verdugo, 2007). Although the School Inclusion Law was a milestone in guaranteeing equity, it has not been accompanied by a systemic transformation in teacher preparation or sustained professional development policies capable of enabling inclusive practices at scale.

This tension is echoed in international critiques warning that access-focused reforms may produce "policy saturation" without deep pedagogical transformation, increasing student presence while failing to secure meaningful participation (Slee, 2019; Ainscow, 2020). Framing our findings within these critiques helps explain why formal inclusion does not automatically translate into participatory school cultures.

At the cultural level, the findings highlight persistent individualism among teachers, reflected in a reluctance to share strategies and collaborate. This dynamic reinforces hierarchical practices in which the special education teacher assumes a central advisory role rather than fostering horizontal and shared pedagogical responsibility. Consequently, an assistentialist model persists, limiting schools' ability to develop collaborative professional communities that embody inclusive values (Booth & Ainscow, 2016).

5.2. Inclusive Supports

Teachers and teaching assistants place significant emphasis on curricular adaptations to support access, such as simplified assessments, pictograms, and diversified materials, in response to students with intellectual disabilities' immediate needs. These practices, which align in part with Chilean Decree 83 (2015), aim to ensure classroom accessibility and have shown positive effects on student motivation and socioemotional development. However, the emphasis of these strategies reflects a reductionist view of support, confined to pedagogical instrumental measures while neglecting other fundamental dimensions of learning and inclusion.

International research highlights that inclusive supports must be seen as a multidimensional framework that goes beyond the provision of materials or methodological adjustments. The Quality of Life model proposed by Schalock and Verdugo (2007), along with frameworks from the UN (2006) and the OECD (2021), emphasizes that supports should not only secure curricular access but also address self-determination, interpersonal relationships, community participation, and preparation for adult life. In this regard, the findings reveal a critical tension: while professionals report progress in socioemotional development, there is a persistent gap in cognitive achievements and preparation for independent living (Heras et al., 2020).

Longitudinal and outcome-focused studies indicate that, without integrated supports spanning school, family, and community, improvements in socioemotional domains do not reliably predict improved adult outcomes (e.g., employment, independent living). This evidence underscores the importance of linking classroom interventions to broader transition and community supports (Shogren et al., 2019; Clegg et al., 2018).

Another key issue is the limited availability of multidisciplinary teams. Although special education teachers are recognized as central figures in providing supports, participants repeatedly noted the absence of occupational therapists, speech-language specialists, psychologists, and other professionals essential to a holistic response. This gap narrows the scope of interventions and reinforces the perception that progress is concentrated primarily in emotional well-being rather than functional learning or life skills development.

Evidence from Chile and other middle-income countries shows that shortages of multidisciplinary staff, such as occupational therapists, speech-language therapists, and

psychologists, are systemic rather than specific to individual schools. Reports from UNICEF (2021) highlight persistent regional inequities in access to specialized professionals, while McKenzie and Dalton (2017) demonstrate that limited staffing capacity constrains the implementation of comprehensive support systems aligned with quality-of-life and inclusive education frameworks. This suggests that the staffing constraints reported by participants reflect structural resourcing problems rather than isolated management choices.

Recent research (Shogren et al., 2019; Luckasson et al., 2023) warns that the lack of interdisciplinary teams not only reduces educational opportunities but also perpetuates inequalities during the transition to adulthood.

Finally, the findings underscore the limited involvement of families and communities in inclusive supports. While collaborative work among teachers is valued, supports remain largely confined to the classroom, with no clear strategies to strengthen shared responsibility between schools and the broader social environment. This stands in contrast to UNESCO (2020) recommendations, which stress the importance of inter-institutional and community partnerships to ensure inclusive and sustainable pathways.

In summary, the category of inclusive supports illustrates partial progress but also exposes structural and cultural limitations that prevent the full realization of a rights-based approach. Overcoming these tensions requires a paradigm shift: moving from predominantly pedagogical and curricular supports toward a holistic approach that integrates academic, social, and life domains, while systematically involving families, communities, and multidisciplinary teams.

6. Conclusion

The findings of this study show that while Chile has made significant progress in adopting a rights-based legislative framework and implementing inclusion programs, critical tensions persist between policy, culture, and practice. The gap between normative expectations and schools' actual capacities shows that the education system continues to reproduce practices that, while adaptive, remain largely assistive and limited in scope.

At the policy level, the absence of robust initial and continuing teacher education, together with insufficient human resources and protected time for collaboration, undermines the implementation of legislation. At the cultural level, entrenched teacher individualism hinders the consolidation of inclusive professional communities, reinforcing the disconnection between rights discourse and daily practice. At the practical level, supports are primarily focused on immediate curricular adaptations, while essential dimensions of the Quality of Life model—such as self-determination, social inclusion, and preparation for adulthood—remain underdeveloped.

These tensions reveal that, while the system is formally inclusive, it does not yet guarantee educational trajectories consistent with a rights-based approach. The critical conclusion is that the inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities remains in a transitional stage: visible normative and socioemotional progress has been achieved, but deep structural and cultural changes are still required to ensure meaningful learning and dignified life projects.

The main limitation of this study is the absence of students' voices, which limits the analysis to a partial rights-based perspective. Future research should integrate accessible methodologies that allow students with intellectual disabilities to share their experiences and actively participate in the research process. This approach would not only enhance the validity of findings but also align with the principle of self-determination that underpins inclusive education.

7. Suggestion

To strengthen support for people with intellectual disabilities, the following measures are proposed:

a) Embed rights-based approaches and the Quality of Life framework into initial and continuing teacher education, using pedagogical strategies that prepare teachers for diversity. This could be operationalized through national teacher education standards set by the Chilean Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) and implemented by universities and the CPEIP, with mandatory modules on inclusive pedagogy and Universal Design for Learning.

b) Establish monitoring indicators that assess not only academic outcomes but also social, emotional, and community participation results. Agencies such as the Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación could integrate multidimensional indicators aligned with quality-of-life domains, complemented by school-level monitoring tools co-developed with local education authorities.

c) Guarantee the active participation of students with intellectual disabilities in defining their supports through adapted methodologies. Schools could adopt structured decision-making tools (e.g., visual choice boards, person-centered planning instruments) and allocate time within PIE teams for individualized planning sessions.

d) Ensure the presence of stable multidisciplinary teams in schools, expanding support beyond the role of the special education teacher. This may involve increasing funding through the School Integration Program (PIE) and incentivizing municipalities to hire occupational therapists, psychologists, and speech and language therapists on full-time contracts.

e) Strengthen school–family–community partnerships so that inclusion transcends the classroom and contributes to building autonomous life trajectories. Municipalities and local intersectoral networks (health centers, social services, disability offices) should coordinate community-based programs and transition-to-adulthood pathways, supported by publicly funded initiatives.

Although the proposed recommendations are relevant and feasible, several obstacles may constrain their effective implementation. Many schools operate under restricted budgets and unstable funding streams, limiting their ability to hire multidisciplinary teams and sustain professional learning communities. In addition, institutional fragmentation across education, health, and social services often creates coordination gaps that delay timely support and reduce the effectiveness of rights-based interventions. Cultural resistance to change within school communities, combined with limited time for collaborative planning, may further hinder the adoption of participatory practices aligned with the Quality of Life framework. Addressing these challenges requires not only technical guidance but also sustained political commitment, long-term financing, and governance structures capable of ensuring coherent intersectoral action.

Declarations

Author Contributions. The author has read and approved the final version of the article to be published.

Conflicts of Interest. The author declares no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Granada (No. 3634/CEIH/2023).

Data Availability Statement. It is reported that, for ethical reasons related to data confidentiality, these data are not publicly available.

Acknowledgments. During the preparation of this manuscript, the author used ChatGPT to improve the writing and English translation of the content. The author has reviewed and edited the output and takes full responsibility for the content of this publication.

References

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD). (2021). *Intellectual disability: Definition, classification, and systems of supports* (12th ed.). AAIDD. <https://www.aaidd.org/intellectual-disability/definition>
- Articles, A. J. (2015). *Beyond responsiveness to difference: Social justice and disability in education*. Educational Researcher, 44(5), 293–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2014.934322?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26medium%3Darticle
- Blessing, L., & Chakrabarti, A. (2009). *DMR: A design research methodology*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84882-587-1>
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2016). *The index for inclusion: A guide to school development led by inclusive values* (4th ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- Bouck, E., & Park, J. (2016). Inclusion of students with an intellectual disability. In J. Bakken & F. Obiakor (Eds.), *General and special education inclusion in an age of change: Impact on students with disabilities* (Vol. 31, pp. 31–50). Emerald Group Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/s0270-401320160000031004>
- Clegg, J., Stackhouse, J., & Stevenson, J. (2018). Educational outcomes of students with intellectual disabilities: Evidence from Europe. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 62(12), 1047–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12457>
- Ducarre, L. M. (2023). Redefining the right to quality education for autistic children through a neurodiverse perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 26(1), 366–379. <https://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.1043>
- Florian, L. (2013). La educación especial en la era de la inclusión. ¿El fin de la educación especial o un nuevo comienzo? *Revista Latinoamericana de Educación Inclusiva*, 7(2), 27–36. https://revistas.ucecentral.cl/revistainclusiva/article/view/7_2_003
- Florian, L. (2015). Inclusive pedagogy: A transformative approach to individual differences, but can it help reduce educational inequalities? *Scottish Educational Review*, 47(1), 5–14. https://brill.com/view/journals/ser/47/1/article-p5_3.xml
- Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408–1416. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss9/3>
- Gobierno de Chile. (2009, 17 de agosto). *Ley N.º 20.370 establece la ley general de educación*. Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. <https://bcn.cl/29xpy>
- Gobierno de Chile, Ministerio de Educación. (2009, 14 de mayo). Decreto 170: Fija normas para determinar a los alumnos con necesidades educativas especiales que serán beneficiarios de las subvenciones para educación especial. Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=1012570>
- Gobierno de Chile. (2010, 3 de febrero). *Ley N.º 20.422, Establece normas sobre igualdad de oportunidades e inclusión social de personas con discapacidad*. Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. <http://bcn.cl/2wtaz>

- Gobierno de Chile, Ministerio de Educación. (2015). Decreto 83: Aprueba criterios y orientaciones de adecuación curricular para estudiantes con necesidades educativas especiales de educación parvularia y educación básica. <https://especial.mineduc.cl/normativa/decretos-e-instructivos/>
- Gobierno de Chile. (2015, 29 de mayo). *Ley N.º 20.845, de Inclusión Escolar, que regula la admisión de estudiantes, elimina el financiamiento compartido y prohíbe el lucro en establecimientos educacionales que reciben aportes del Estado*. Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional de Chile. <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=1078172>
- Heras, I., Amor, A. M., Verdugo, M. Á., & Calvo, M. I. (2021). Operationalisation of quality of life for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities to improve their inclusion. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 119, 104093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2021.104093>
- Hincapié, D., Duryea, S., & Hincapié, I. (2019). *Education for all: Advancing disability inclusion in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Inter-American Development Bank. <https://publications.iadb.org/en/education-all-advancing-disability-inclusion-latin-america-and-caribbean>
- Lawson, A., & Beckett, A. E. (2020). The social and human rights models of disability: towards a complementarity thesis. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 25(2), 348–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1783533>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- López, V., Gonzalez, P., Manghi, D., Ascorra, P., Oyanedel, J. C., Redón, S., Leal, F., & Salgado, M. (2018). Políticas de inclusión educativa en Chile: tres nudos críticos. *Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas*, 26(157). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3088>
- Luckasson, R., Schalock, R., Tassé, M., & Shogren, K. (2023). The intellectual and developmental disability shared citizenship paradigm: Its cross-cultural status, implementation, and confirmation. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 67(1), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12992>
- McKenzie, J., & Dalton, E. (2017). Implementation of educational provision for children with severe to profound intellectual disability in the Western Cape: From rights to reality. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(3), 287–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2017.1313394>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- MINEDUC. (2013). *Orientaciones técnicas para programas de integración escolar*. <https://especial.mineduc.cl/implementacion-dcto-supr-no170/orientaciones/>
- Moriña, A. (2020). *Inclusive education in higher education: Challenges and opportunities*. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(1), 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1254964>
- OECD. (2021). *Inclusive education for students with disabilities: Policies and practices*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlr0f0vcpw2-en>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed-method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>

- Quilaqueo, D., Quintriqueo, S., Torres, H., & Muñoz, G. (2014). *Saberes educativos mapuches: Aportes epistémicos para un enfoque de educación intercultural*. Chungará: Revista de Antropología Chilena, 46(2), 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0717-73562014000200008>
- Rodino, A. M. (2015). La educación con enfoque de derechos humanos como práctica constructora de inclusión social. *Revista IIDH*, 61, 201–223. <https://repositorio.iidh.ed.cr/items/388838ac-5e80-4c66-808f-0ca54bb69110>
- Schalock, R., & Verdugo, M. (2007). El concepto de calidad de vida en los servicios y apoyos para personas con discapacidad intelectual. *Siglo Cero*, 38(4), 21–36. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12365/18060>
- Schalock, R., Luckasson, R., & Tassé, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Intellectual disability: Definition, diagnosis, classification, and systems of supports* (12th ed.). American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. <https://doi.org/10.1352/1944-7558-126.6.439>
- Shogren, K., Wehmeyer, M., Martin, J., et al. (2019). Impact of inclusive supports on life outcomes of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 16(2), 109–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jppi.12264>
- Singal, N., Kotiranta, A., & Kettunen, S. (2018). Inclusive education in low- and middle-income countries: Policy, practice and evidence. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 63, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2018.05.004>
- Slee, R. (2019). Belonging in an age of exclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(9), 909–922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1602366>
- Soto, C. (2024). La hibridez del modelo de evaluación psicopedagógica en las políticas de Educación Especial en Chile. *Psicoperspectivas. Individuo y Sociedad*, 23(1). <https://dx.doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-Vol23-Issue1-fulltext-2977>
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 443–466). SAGE Publications.
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. <https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373718>
- UNICEF. (2021). *Inclusive education*. <https://www.unicef.org/education/inclusive-education>
- Valdés, R., Catalán, R., Jiménez, F., Poblete, R., Abett de la Torre, P., & Martínez, S. (2024). The self-taught school: Inclusion of foreign students according to public action in Chile. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.32.8677>
- Verdugo, M., Schalock, R., & Gómez, L. (2021). El modelo de calidad de vida y apoyos: la unión tras veinticinco años de caminos paralelos. *Siglo Cero*, 52(3), 9–28. <https://doi.org/10.14201/scero2021523928>
- Watkins, A., & Donnelly, V. (2022). Connecting Research, Policy, and Practice to Promote Inclusive Education. In: Peters, M.A. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Teacher Education*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-8679-5_38
- WHO. (2001). *International classification of functioning, disability and health (ICF)*. <https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health>

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

About the Contributor(s)

Cristian Soto Gallardo, PhD in Education Sciences from the University of Granada, Spain, holds a master's degree in education with a specialization in Educational Assessment from the University of La Frontera, Chile. He is a Differential Education (Special Education) teacher with a specialization in Learning Disorders and holds a bachelor's degree in education from the University of Los Lagos, Chile. He also completed a Diploma in Higher Education Management and Research Methodology at Santo Tomás University and a Postgraduate program in Language Disorders and Intellectual Disability at the University of Viña del Mar. With 20 years of experience in primary, secondary, and higher education, he has served as a teacher in school integration programs, as an academic, and as a director of undergraduate and postgraduate programs. He is currently a Research Professor in the Differential Education (Special Education) program at Universidad San Sebastián, Patagonia campus, and has published several articles and book chapters on inclusive education policies in recent years.

Email: crisotog2@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1654-7281>

Publisher's Note: *The opinions, statements, and data presented in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributors and do not reflect the views of Universitepark, EDUPIJ, and/or the editor(s). Universitepark, the Journal, and/or the editor(s) accept no responsibility for any harm or damage to persons or property arising from the use of ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content.*
