ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

An Evaluation of Support Facilities for Inclusive Education in Primary Schools: Perspectives of Head Teachers in Gilgit-Baltistan

Muhammad Hadi Haideri
Mhadi578@yahoo.com
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Special Education, Division of Education, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Dr. Zahida Parveen
zahida.parveen@ue.edu.pk
Associate Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Education Lahore
Corresponding Author: * Muhammad Hadi Haideri Mhadi578@yahoo.com

Received: 12-06-2025 **Revised:** 17-07-2025 **Accepted:** 01-08-2025 **Published:** 13-08-2025

ABSTRACT

This research assesses the availability of support facilities for inclusive education in primary schools in Gilgit-Baltistan. This study offers valuable insights from head teachers to evaluate the effectiveness, accessibility, and adequacy of available support services within the inclusive education framework, based on the perspectives of 138 head teachers across six districts of Gilgit-Baltistan. A quantitative, descriptive research design was employed using a structured checklist comprising 39 items covering five thematic areas: physical infrastructure, technological support, human resources, curriculum and instructional materials, and institutional policy and support systems. Descriptive statistics revealed significant deficiencies, with over 75% of schools lacking basic inclusive features such as ramps (84.5% No), accessible toilets (84.8%), and trained teachers (72.5%). Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and sign language interpreters were also limited, reported in only 18.8% and 26.1% of schools respectively. One-way ANOVA results showed statistically significant differences across districts ($p < .001$), with Gilgit and Skardu performing better in teaching support and curriculum areas, while Diamer consistently ranked the lowest across all indicators. The findings highlight uneven implementation and under-resourced conditions for inclusive education, underscoring the urgent need for policy intervention, teacher training, and equitable resource distribution.

Key words: *Inclusive Education, Support Facilities, Primary Schools, Gilgit-Baltistan*

INTRODUCTION

An inclusive classroom is a learning environment in which the intellectual, physical, and social needs of all students, including those who have different learning abilities along with mainstream learners, are met in a single setting (Bano, 2024). However, in Pakistan, it was introduced around the last two decades (Bano, 2024).

Inclusion in education means that regardless of individual differences or students' "unique characteristics, interests, abilities, and learning needs" (UNESCO, 1994, p. 8), all students are welcomed, cared for, and equally valued, and are provided with fair and equitable learning, participation, and educational opportunities (Woodcock, 2022). The philosophy of inclusive education recognizes that every student has their own unique learning strengths and needs, and educational systems need to appreciate and accommodate this diversity, and importantly, make sure that this is able to occur within mainstream classes at students' local schools (Woodcock, 2022).

Support facilities play a vital role in helping reflective educators develop professionally by enhancing their self-evaluation, commitment, accountability, and independence. These facilities create learning

environments that enable teachers to apply diverse teaching methods and improve their competencies in inclusive education (Irshad, 2024).

Globally, there has been a continuous push over the past 30 years to include learners with disabilities in mainstream education settings. However, true inclusion is only possible when students have access to all necessary resources and support systems that facilitate effective and meaningful learning (Irshad, 2024).

In Gilgit-Baltistan, inclusive education has been slowly emerging at the school level. A study by Bano, Qutoshi & Jalani (2021) examined perceptions of Early Childhood Development teachers in Gilgit regarding inclusive teaching of visually impaired learners. Although educators understood inclusive education's significance, they reported shortages of special needs staff, inadequate resources, rigid curriculum, and overcrowded classrooms as major barriers (Bano, 2024). This highlights deficiencies in support infrastructure that directly impact inclusion. Most educational leaders and guardians across Pakistan view implementing an inclusive education system as a problem rather than an essential solution for equal opportunities. Research shows that teachers and parents need better understanding to support inclusive education programs (Rafique, 2024).

This study, therefore, aims to fill a critical knowledge gap by evaluating support facilities for inclusive education in primary schools of Gilgit-Baltistan, from the perspective of head teachers. It investigates: Physical Infrastructure: Are buildings adapted to accommodate children with disabilities? Assistive Materials & Learning Aids: Availability and appropriateness of learning devices. Human Resources & Training: Presence of support staff and access to continuous professional development. Institutional Support & Administrative Backing: School leadership's role in sustaining inclusion practices.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to UNICEF, there are an estimated 240 million children with disabilities worldwide. Like all children, children with disabilities have ambitions and dreams for their futures. Like all children, they need quality education to develop their skills and realize their full potential.

Inclusive education is the most effective way to give all children a fair chance to go to school, learn and develop the skills they need to thrive. Inclusive education means all children in the same classrooms, in the same schools. It means real learning opportunities for groups who have traditionally been excluded not only children with disabilities, but speakers of minority languages too. Inclusive systems value the unique contributions students of all backgrounds bring to the classroom and allow diverse groups to grow side by side, to the benefit of all. (UNICEF, n.d.)

Inclusive education in Pakistan

The act of Inclusive Education is becoming step by step in Pakistan. Training arrangements are likewise concentrating on the idea of Inclusive Education in Pakistan. In the field of examination in Education, the specialists and researchers are advancing their proposals for Inclusive Education, as it unquestionably give chances to the uncommon special needs students to exceed

Expectations in their field of scholastics alongside typical special needs students at standard. However, still the idea of Inclusive Education needs to be elucidated. The impression of inclusive instruction stakeholders is not yet clear. There is an unusual assorted qualities in the thoughts and observation about Inclusive Education. (Basit, 2022).

Inclusion at School Level

Inclusive education improves the social structure and also enables to increase the opportunities to inculcate a positive environment. This can be done by the school leaders which include the staff and the

management of the school. Inclusion can be implemented if the leaders raise awareness of the teachers regarding this term. It is very essential for the leaders to stay committed to the ideology of inclusion and hence develop behaviors that help in promoting inclusion for the students which are faced with any type of disability. In addition, leaders should inculcate in the mindsets of the teachers a clear understanding of what inclusion is. There should be a support system for the staff of the school by the leaders in making them understand their responsibilities to guide the underprivileged students. Another duty of the teachers is that they promote diversity among all the students and do not isolate any of the students on the basis of any shortcoming. These leaders also prove to cement the relationships between the schools and the communities. (Ehsan, 2018)

At the school level, teachers must be trained, buildings must be refurbished and students must receive accessible learning materials. At the community level, stigma and discrimination must be tackled and individuals need to be educated on the benefit of inclusive education. At the national level, Governments must align laws and policies with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and regularly collect and analyses data to ensure children are reached with effective services. (UNICEF, n.d.)

Roles of Head Teachers in inclusive education

Head teachers serve as the central drivers of school culture and inclusion. Their leadership styles shape the way inclusive policies are adopted and sustained. In particular, culturally responsive leadership helps facilitate inclusive practices by promoting democratic and value-based decision-making within schools. (Neves, 2023). Head teachers play an essential supervisory and evaluative role by monitoring the implementation of inclusive strategies, collaborative planning among teachers, and using feedback and student outcomes to identify training needs and institutional gaps. (Rafique U. &., 2021). Head teachers are pivotal resource managers within schools. They mobilize and allocate both material and human resources (e.g., ramps, assistive devices, support staff) to make inclusive education functional. In Pakistan, headteachers are acknowledged as resource coordinators, community liaisons, and advocates for inclusive infrastructure. (Shah, 2024).

Importance of Support Facilities in Inclusive Education

In addition to teaching staff, infrastructure is also a part that needs to be considered for inclusive schools, it cannot be denied that not all-inclusive schools fulfill the facilities and infrastructure according to the needs of children with special needs**.** The maximum possible educational facilities and infrastructures must be provided when referring from this perspective so that learning activities of children with special needs can be carried out properly. (Simorangkir, 2021). Digital education technologies and e-learning help Pakistan brings education facilities to every student who needs them. The latest research demonstrates how e-learning approaches successfully enhance inclusive education delivery to students with disabilities who live far from educational institutions. School facilities without electric ramps, accessible teaching places and smart learning devices prevent students with disabilities from taking full part. Although Pakistan supports inclusive learning through national policies and global initiatives these efforts encounter major difficulties in actual implementation. The problems with implementing inclusive education come from public perceptions, missing support systems, incomplete government rules and insufficient teacher preparation. (Dr. Uzma Rafique, 2024).

Inclusive Education steps in Gilgit Baltistan

Regional implementation and teachers' preparedness in Gilgit-Baltistan: In Gilgit-Baltistan, efforts to promote inclusive education have been tangible progress through targeted teacher training initiatives. According to the schools 2030 report, around 400 teachers in Gilgit-Baltistan and Chitral received professional development on inclusive education from Aga Khan University, including training on the use

of assistive aids. This marks a significant step in equipping educators with the tools to better support students with diverse learning needs in mainstream classrooms. Despite this advancement, Respondents noted that many teachers continue to struggle with implementing inclusive practices due to limited exposure to child-centered pedagogy and a lack of in-school resources. The training programme, while beneficial, have not fully overcome the challenges posed by entrenched traditional teaching methods and low awareness of learning differences. As such, the provision of support facilities remains inconsistent, particularly in rural areas where accessibility to specialized services is still a significant barrier. (Grimes, 2022).

Promoting Accessibility and Inclusivity in Education: The partnership will strive to make educational environments more accessible and inclusive, breaking down barriers that individuals with special needs often face. This will involve both physical accessibility improvements and the creation of inclusive curricula and teaching methods.

Developing Innovative Programs and Resources: By creating new and effective educational programs and resources, the partnership aims to cater specifically to the unique needs of individuals with special needs, ensuring they receive the highest quality of education. (Baig, 2024).

A 2023 study in Frontiers in Psychology considered the role of social-media-based communities of inquiry (COI) in fostering equitable educational intentions among pre-service teachers in Gilgit-Baltistan. The authors argued that leveraging digital tools can bridge gaps in resources, promote collaborative learning, and equip future educators to better support inclusive classrooms in remote regions. (Imdad Ullah, 2024).

Statement of the problem

Despite national and international efforts, many primary schools in Gilgit-Baltistan lack essential support facilities for inclusive education. Basic needs like accessible infrastructure, learning materials, technology, and trained staff are missing in most schools. This limits head teachers' ability to implement inclusion effectively. Without proper support systems, students with disabilities face ongoing inequality. There is a clear need to assess existing facilities to identify gaps and guide policies for improving inclusive education in the region.

Objectives of the Study

1) To assess the availability of physical infrastructure supporting inclusive education in primary schools.
2) To evaluate the technological, instructional, and human resource support available to children with disabilities.
3) To analyze the extent of policy implementation and administrative readiness for inclusive education.
4) To examine the differences in support facilities across school types (general, inclusive, and special).
5) To recommend practical strategies for strengthening inclusive practices in the regions primary education sector.

Significance of the study

This study is significant as it addresses a critical and often neglected dimension of inclusive education in Gilgit-Baltistan, a geographically isolated and resource-constrained region of Pakistan. The evaluation of support facilities such as accessible infrastructure, specialized learning resources, assistive technologies, trained personnel, and administrative support is essential to understanding whether schools in Gilgit-

Baltistan are truly prepared to accommodate children with diverse learning needs. Given that head teachers serve as frontline educational leaders, their perspective provides valuable insights into both the strengths and limitations of current institutional capacities. Their views can reveal gaps in policy implementation, infrastructural barriers, and professional training shortfalls that might not be visible through official data alone.

METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study was quantitative and descriptive in nature. The target population consisted of 1,335 head teachers across the ten districts of Gilgit-Baltistan. A multistage sampling technique was employed to select the sample. In the first stage, six districts—Gilgit, Ghizer, Skardu, Ghanche, Diamer, and Astore were randomly selected from the total of ten districts. In the second stage, proportional stratified sampling was applied based on district-wise strata to ensure fair representation. Using this method, a total sample of 138 head teachers was selected for the study. The district-wise distribution of the sample was as follows: Gilgit – 16 teachers, Ghizer – 18 teachers, Skardu – 24 teachers, Ghanche – 17 teachers, Diamer – 50 teachers, and Astore – 13 teachers.

A structured and validated Dichotomous Questionnaire was utilized to collect data across five thematic areas: Physical Infrastructure, Technical Support, Human Resources, Curriculum and Instruction, and Institutional Policy and Support Systems. The checklist comprised demographic information along with 39 close-ended yes/no items designed to assess the status of inclusive practices in schools.

Data were collected through in-person visits and digital surveys, ensuring coverage of remote and accessible schools alike. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. Data were analyzed using SPSS, with descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) and inferential statistics (ANOVA) applied to explore differences between distracts or demographic groups.

Ethical considerations were carefully observed throughout the research process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and the confidentiality of their data was strictly maintained. No identifying information was disclosed in any publication or report. Additionally, ethical approval was secured from the institutional ethics review committee prior to data collection.

DATA ANALYSIS

Table. 1: Analysis at the Basis of Demographic

Sr	Variables	Group	Frequency	Percentage %
1	**Gender**	Male	112	81.2%
		Female	26	18.8%
2	**Area**	Rural	126	91.3%
		Urban	12	8.7%
3	**Training**	Yes	26	18.8%
		No	112	81.2%
4	**Current School Setting**	General	131	94.9%
		Inclusive	2	1.4%
		Special	5	3.6%

5	**Age**	20-30	13	9.4%
		31-40	41	29.7%
		41-50	51	37.0%
		51-60	33	23.9%
6	**Head Teacher Experience**	1-5	35	25.4%
		6-10	62	44.9%
		11-15	37	26.8%
		16-20	4	2.9%
7	**Division**	Gilgit	34	24.6%
		Baltistan	41	29.7%
		Diamer	63	45.7%
8	**Districts**	Gilgit	16	11.6%
		Ghizer	18	13.0%
		Skardu	24	17.4%
		Ghanche	17	12.3%
		Diamer	50	36.2%
		Astore	13	9.4%

Table 1 shows the demographic distribution of 138 respondents. Most were male (81.2%) and from rural areas (91.3%). Only 18.8% received relevant training, while 81.2% did not. Most respondents were from general schools (94.9%), with 1.4% from inclusive and 3.6% from special schools. The 41–50 age group was largest (37.0%), followed by 31–40 (29.7%), 51–60 (23.9%), and 20–30 (9.4%). Most head teachers had 6–10 years of experience (44.9%), followed by 11–15 (26.8%), 1–5 (25.4%), and 16–20 (2.9%). Respondents were from Diamer (45.7%), Baltistan (29.7%), and Gilgit (24.6%) divisions, and six districts: Diamer (36.2%), Skardu (17.4%), Ghizar (13.0%), Ghanche (12.3%), Gilgit (11.6%), and Astor (9.4%).

Table. 2: Descriptive Statistics for Physical Infrastructure Facilities (N = 138)

Items	Frequency		Percentage %	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Ramps for wheelchair	16	122	11.6	84.5
Accessible toilets	21	117	15.2	84.8
Resource room	32	106	23.2	76.8
Adjustable desks and chairs	59	79	42.8	57.2

Availability of assistive technologies.	46	92	33.3	66.7
Quiet space or sensory room.	26	112	18.2	81.8
Teachers trained in differentiated instruction.	38	100	27.5	72.5
Formal policy on inclusive education	28	110	20.3	79.7
Funding for inclusive education resources	13	125	9.4	90.6
Learning materials	57	81	41.3	58.7

Note. Response scale: 1 = No, 2 = Yes

Table 2 presents the availability of physical infrastructure facilities for inclusive education in primary schools in Gilgit-Baltistan. Only 11.6% of schools had ramps for wheelchairs, and 15.2% had accessible toilets, indicating limited accessibility. Resource rooms (23.2%), quiet/sensory rooms (18.2%), and formal policies on inclusive education (20.3%) were also scarce. Only 27.5% of schools had teachers trained in differentiated instruction. Assistive technologies were available in 33.3% of schools, adjustable desks and chairs in 42.8%, and learning materials in 41.3%. Funding for inclusive education was reported in just 9.4% of schools, with "No" responses ranging from 57.2% to 90.6% across items. These findings reveal significant gaps in infrastructure for inclusive education.

Table. 3: Descriptive Statistics for Technological Support Facilities (N = 138)

Items	Frequency		Percentage %	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Sufficient teaching staff	40	98	29.0	71.0
Parent involvement	67	71	48.6	51.4
Professional workshops	23	115	16.7	83.3
Local Collaboration	35	103	25.4	74.6
Evacuation plans	29	109	21.0	79.0
Availability of staff	29	109	21.0	79.0
Use of teaching aids	21	117	15.2	84.8
Adapted curriculum	45	93	32.6	67.4
Monitoring and evaluation	12	126	8.7	91.3
Inclusive transport facilities	68	70	49.3	50.7

Note. Response scale: 1 = No, 2 = Yes

Table 3 presents the availability of technological support facilities for inclusive education in primary schools in Gilgit-Baltistan. Most facilities are limited: only 8.7% of schools had monitoring and evaluation systems, 15.2% used teaching aids, and 16.7% offered professional workshops. Sufficient teaching staff (29.0%), local collaboration (25.4%), evacuation plans (21.0%), and staff availability

(21.0%) were also scarce. Adapted curricula were reported in 32.6% of schools, while parent involvement (48.6%) and inclusive transport facilities (49.3%) were nearly balanced but still insufficient, with "No" responses ranging from 50.7% to 91.3%. These findings indicate significant gaps in technological support for inclusive education.

Table. 4: Descriptive Statistics for Human Resources and Support Systems (N = 138)

Items	Frequency		Percentage %	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
School building equipped	31	107	22.5	77.5
Universal Design for Learning	40	98	29.0	71.0
Peer support programs	102	36	73.9	26.1
Awareness campaigns	37	101	26.8	73.2
Representation of students with PWD	53	85	38.4	61.6
Communication channels for parents	63	75	45.7	54.3
Accessible library materials	29	109	21.0	79.0
Inclusive extracurricular activities	64	74	46.4	53.6
Anti-bullying policy	31	107	22.5	77.5
Partnerships with NGOs	33	105	76.1	23.9

Note. Response scale: 1 = No, 2 = Yes

Table 4 presents the availability of human resources and support systems for inclusive education in primary schools in Gilgit-Baltistan. Peer support programs were prevalent (73.9% Yes), and partnerships with NGOs were common (76.1% Yes). However, most other facilities were limited: only 22.5% of schools had equipped buildings, 29.0% implemented Universal Design for Learning, and 21.0% had accessible library materials. Awareness campaigns (26.8%), anti-bullying policies (22.5%), and representation of students with disabilities (38.4%) were also scarce. Communication channels for parents (45.7%) and inclusive extracurricular activities (46.4%) were nearly balanced but insufficient, with "No" responses ranging from 23.9% to 79.0%. These findings highlight significant gaps in human resources and support systems for inclusive education.

Table. 5: Descriptive Statistics for Curriculum & Instructional Materials (N = 138)

Items	Frequency		Percentage %	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Regular maintenance	43	95	31.2	68.8
Sign language interpreters	36	102	26.1	73.9
Implementation of (IEPs)	26	112	18.8	81.2
Inclusive events	29	109	21.0	79.0
Track resource utilization	37	101	26.8	73.2
Inclusive play equipment	31	107	22.5	77.5
Health and safety measures	30	108	21.7	78.3
Review of teacher performance	40	98	29.0	71.0
Regular consultation students with PWd	27	111	19.6	80.4

Note. Response scale: 1 = No, 2 = Yes

Table 5 presents the availability of curriculum and instructional materials for inclusive education in primary schools in Gilgit-Baltistan (N = 138), with responses coded as 1 (No) or 2 (Yes). Data were collected on nine items. Availability was limited across all items: regular maintenance was reported in 31.2% of schools, review of teacher performance in 29.0%, and tracking resource utilization in 26.8%. Sign language interpreters (26.1%), inclusive play equipment (22.5%), health and safety measures (21.7%), and inclusive events (21.0%) were scarce. Implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) (18.8%) and regular consultation with students with disabilities (19.6%) were the least available, with "No" responses ranging from 68.8% to 81.2%. These findings indicate significant deficiencies in curriculum and instructional support for inclusive education.

Table 6: One-Way ANOVA Results of Head Teachers' Perspectives Based on Districts

Factors		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical Infrastructure	Between Groups	1.426	5	.285	7.697	.000
	Within Groups	4.893	132	.037		
	Total	6.319	137			
Technological Support	Between Groups	1.794	5	.359	11.451	.000
	Within Groups	4.137	132	.031		
	Total	5.931	137			
Human Resources	Between Groups	1.446	5	.289	6.819	.000
	Within Groups	5.599	132	.042		
	Total	7.045	137			
Curriculum & Instructional Materials	Between Groups	4.158	5	.832	16.276	.000
	Within Groups	6.745	132	.051		
	Total	10.903	137			

Table 6 shows that the one-way ANOVA results revealed significant differences in support facilities for inclusion in primary schools across six districts of Gilgit-Baltistan (Gilgit, Ghizar, Skardu, Ghanche, Diamer, and Astor) in terms of physical infrastructure, teaching support, human resources, and curriculum instruction. “Significant differences were observed across all variables ($p < .001$). For physical infrastructure, $F(5, 132) = 7.697$, with LSD post-hoc tests indicating that Ghanche and Diamer scored higher than Gilgit, Ghizer, and Skardu, while Astor scored lower than Ghanche and Diamer. For teaching support, $F(5, 132) = 11.451$, with Skardu outperforming Ghanche, Diamer, and Astor; Gilgit surpassing Ghizer and Diamer; and Ghanche and Astor scoring higher than Diamer. For human resources, $F(5, 132) = 6.819$, with Gilgit outperforming all other districts, Skardu exceeding Ghanche and Diamer, and Ghizer scoring higher than Diamer. For curriculum instruction, $F(5, 132) = 16.276$, with Gilgit and Skardu scoring higher than Ghanche, Diamer, and Astor, while Ghanche and Astor outperformed Diamer.

SUMMARY

This study aimed to evaluate support facilities for inclusive education in primary schools across six districts of Gilgit-Baltistan. Using a quantitative and descriptive research design, a sample of 138 head teachers was selected through multistage and proportionate stratified sampling. Data were collected via a structured checklist addressing five thematic areas: Physical Infrastructure, Technological Support, Human Resources, Curriculum and Instruction, and Institutional Policies. Descriptive and inferential statistics (including ANOVA) were applied to assess the availability and district-wise variation in inclusive education support systems.

FINDINGS

Descriptive statistics revealed limited availability of inclusive education facilities. For physical infrastructure, only 9.4% of schools had funding, 11.6% had ramps, and 15.2% had accessible toilets. Technological support was scarce, with 8.7% reporting monitoring systems and 15.2% using teaching aids. Human resources showed strengths in peer support (73.9%) and NGO partnerships (76.1%), but only 21.0% had accessible library materials. Curriculum and instructional materials were deficient, with 18.8% implementing IEPs and 19.6% consulting students with disabilities. ANOVA results indicated significant differences across districts ($p < .001$): Ghanche and Diamer outperformed others in physical infrastructure ($F(5, 132) = 7.697$), Skardu and Gilgit excelled in technological support ($F(5, 132) = 11.451$), Gilgit led in human resources ($F(5, 132) = 6.819$), and Gilgit and Skardu surpassed others in curriculum and instruction ($F(5, 132) = 16.276$). Diamer consistently scored lowest.

DISCUSSION

The findings highlight a major shortfall in the inclusive education system of Gilgit-Baltistan. Despite policy-level emphasis on inclusion, most primary schools are not equipped to support learners with disabilities. The limited availability of IEPs and sign language interpreters—confined only to special and inclusive setups—raises concerns about access and equity for children in general schools, which constitute the vast majority.

The data also suggest that inclusive readiness is influenced by demographic and contextual factors. Experienced and older head teachers tend to report better perceptions of support facilities, possibly due to institutional knowledge or greater access to professional networks. However, the lack of trained personnel, adapted materials, and proper infrastructure even in general schools points to systemic weaknesses.

Regional disparities, especially the consistently lower scores from Diamer, reveal gaps in policy implementation and resource allocation. Such differences indicate that inclusive education remains fragmented, under-resourced, and unequally distributed across the region.

CONCLUSION

Inclusive education in Gilgit-Baltistan's primary schools remains underdeveloped and unevenly distributed across districts. The overall picture reveals substantial gaps in physical infrastructure, training, assistive technology, policy implementation, and curriculum adaptation. Despite national and international commitments to inclusive education, practical translation into the schooling system remains limited. Without immediate intervention, these gaps risk further marginalizing students with disabilities.

This study concludes that inclusive education support facilities in Gilgit-Baltistan primary schools are grossly insufficient and unevenly implemented. Most general schools lack foundational resources like IEPs, trained staff, assistive technology, and sign language services. While some improvements are visible in isolated inclusive or special school settings, the broader system has yet to integrate inclusion effectively into the mainstream. These gaps not only limit educational access but also threaten the fundamental right to education for children with disabilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Expand Inclusive Services in General Schools

Immediate policy action is needed to ensure that Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), sign language interpreters, and assistive supports are introduced in general schools—not just in special or inclusive setups.

Address Regional Disparities

Prioritize under-resourced divisions like Diamer and Astore by improving infrastructure, deploying trained teachers, and ensuring equitable distribution of inclusive education resources.

Teacher Training and Professional Development

Launch systematic, ongoing training programs for head teachers and classroom educators focusing on inclusive teaching strategies, differentiated instruction, and disability awareness.

Establish Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms

Create district-level monitoring cells to regularly assess the implementation of inclusive education practices and identify gaps in policy execution and resource use.

Community Awareness and Engagement

Engage parents, community leaders, and disability rights advocates in school-based inclusion programs to promote acceptance, awareness, and collaborative support for children with disabilities.

Infrastructure Development

Invest in essential facilities such as ramps, accessible toilets, quiet rooms, resource rooms, and assistive technologies to remove physical and learning barriers for students with special needs.

REFERENCES

Baig, F. (2024). *gbgoodwillmovement.com*. Retrieved from gbgoodwillmovement.com: https://gbgoodwillmovement.com/inclusive-education-steps-in-gilgit-baltistan/

Bano, S. Q. (2024). Teaching visually impaired students in inclusive classrooms at early childhood level: Early childhod development teachers perceptions in the context of gILGIT. *Journal of inclusive education, 8*(1), 137-153.

Basit, A. A. (2022). INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN: PERSPECTIVES OF STAKEHOLDERS. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 1426-1435.

Dr. Uzma Rafique (Corresponding author)1, S. A. (2024). Inclusive Education And Its Prospects In Pakistan: A Critical Analysis. *Migration Letters*.

Ehsan, M. (2018). Inclusive Education in Primary and Secondary Schools of Pakistan: Role of Teachers. *American Scientific Research Journal for Engineering, Technology, and Sciences*, 40-61.

Grimes, P. &. (2022). *Understanding learning differnces across schools 2023 contexts.* Unicef Pakistan.

Imdad Ullah, M. Z. (2024). Integrating social media-based community of inquiry with theory of planned behavior to promote equitable educational intentions among pre-service teachers in Gilgit Baltistan, Pakistan. *Frontiers of Psychology*, 1-14.

Irshad, M. A. (2024). Towards Inclusive Classrooms: Identification of the Role of Teachers in Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment. *journal of asain development studies, 13*(3), 1323-1332.

Kazmi, .. K. (2023). The effect of teacher's attitudes in supporting inclusive education by catering to diverse learners. *Frontiers in education*, 1-10.

M, E. (2018). Inclusive Education in Primary and Secondary Schools of Pakistan: Role of Teachers. *American Scientific Research Journal for Engineering, Technology, and Sciences*, 40-61.

Muhammad Awais Irshad1, R. M. (2024). Towards Inclusive Classrooms: Identification of the Role of Teachers in Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment. *Journal of asain development studies, 13*(3), 1323-1332.

Neves, C. A. (2023). Headteachers and Inclusion: Setting the Tone for an Inclusive School. *Education Sciences*, 1-13.

Rafique, .. A. (2024). Inclusive Education and its prospects In Pakistan: A critical Analysis. *Migration Letters*.

Rafique, U. &. (2021). Implementation of Inclusive Education in Pakistan: A Case of School Culture. *Global Educational Studies Review, ,* 133-144.

Shah, D. B. (2024). School Leadership and Management in Sindh Pakistan: Examining Headteachers' Evolving Roles, Contemporary Challenges, and Adaptive Strategies. *Education Sciences*, 1-15.

Simorangkir, M. R. (2021). Inclusion School Education Facilities And Infrastructure. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 22-25.

UNICEF. (n.d.). Retrieved from UNICEF | FOR EVERY CHILDREN: https://www.unicef.org/education/inclusive-education

Woodcock, S. S. (2022). Teacher self-efficacy and inclusive education practices: Rethinking teachers' engagement with inclusive practices. *Elsevier*, 1-12.