



Tempus



Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at Higher Education Institutions in Montenegro

WP 10 Project Management

Report

MNGT 10.1

Prepared by

Lefkothea Kartasidou, lefka@uom.edu.gr, UOM

Elisavet Pavlidou, elsa.paulidou@gmail.com, UOM

Joe Cullen, jcullen@arcola-research.co.uk, Arcola

Date 14/10/2014

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Tempus Project 516758-TEMPUS-1-2011-1-GR-TEMPUS-JPGR





1. INTRODUCTION.....3

2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE.....3

3. OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT.....5

4. EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE PROJECT.....8

5. BENCHMARKING AGAINST POLICY AND STANDARDS.....10

6. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX – LFM (REVISED) SINC@HE.....15

1. Introduction

The aim of this report is to give an overall perspective of the SINC@HE project. During the working visit in June 2014 at University of Macedonia all partners decided that it is necessary to have a report that will summarize all outputs and outcomes and also evaluate different aspects of the project. Thus the coordinator prepared a questionnaire based on the survival kit <http://www.european-project-management.eu/> and more specifically on the tools for project evaluation.

The report presents first the project management procedure that has been followed and the evaluation of the effective collaboration. Afterwards the results from the overall project evaluation survey and the impact of the project are presented. The report then links the results with WP1 in which a benchmarking exercise was carried out in order to give an overview of the situation at the beginning and at the end of the project. Finally a revised version of the LFM is presented since it has been asked from EACEA.

2. Project Management Procedure

Taking into account the variety of project partners and stakeholders, in the proposal was suggested the establishment of one body to support Quality Control and Monitoring and Management process. This body is called Project Management Board (PMB) consisting of 10 members that are the contact persons from 5 from EU and 5 from ME partners. PMB will coordinate the process for the completion of the project and will take action immediately in order to overcome when a problem occurs. The following rules shall apply:

- Composition: contact person, defined in application form, of each partner shall be member of the Project Management Board (PMB), with a proper mandate to negotiate on behalf of his/her institution. The participants may temporarily appoint a deputy to the PMB.
- Meetings: The chairman of each meeting shall be the PMB member coming from the host participant. The Chairman and Project Coordinator will jointly prepare in advance the agenda of the meeting, which will be reviewed by the other members and released and circulated by the chairman. Members and/or deputy members will attend the meeting. The chairman will take minutes of the meeting and send the minutes for comments to the PMB members within 15 working days; if no objections are raised within 10 working days, the minutes shall be considered as approved.
- Decision making: at each PMB meeting, no less than two-thirds of the members shall constitute a quorum. Decision –making will be by qualified majority (greater than 66%) among the present members (one vote per member). In case that the coordinator has profound objections concerning the compliance of a taken decision with the grant agreement or the legal basis of the Tempus program, the decision shall be frozen until the coordinator, will have clarified the matter with the Executive Agency. In case that no compliance should be asserted the decision will be cancelled.

The Internal QCM team and Project Management Board have the task to precisely determine the procedures for possible adjustments in case the project is not implemented as planned, and define them at the first meeting of the PMB. Internal QCM team and Project Management Board have agreed on the common mechanisms for efficient communication and synchronization between consortium partners and teams.

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

For each project activity within specific work package, a person in charge from each of involved partners will be determined and denoted in WPs briefing paper that will help the partners understand the process that has to follow and how each WP is going to be developed. WP leader will communicate directly to the person in charge and would also keep contact persons informed on each step performed during specific activity.

The WPs leaders are also responsible for synchronization between teams inside WP and project coordinator is responsible for synchronization between WPs. If any problems arise, the PMB needs to be informed and provide adequate feedback.

It was also agreed that the coordinator with the leading partner of the WP will develop a table which will include data that each leading partner must have available regarding the partners involved concerning working days and the planning of the working visits.

Furthermore the daily communication via email of skype with the coordinator was important in order to clarify content issues as well as financial and administrative issues.

The partners after the end of the project were asked to express their opinion concerning the collaboration among partners. The preconditions for an affective collaboration are a crucial foundation for team building. If one of the conditions is lacking collaboration can face bigger challenges. Partners were asked to carry out the evaluation mark in the table what is the situation in your team on each topic. The scale varies 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=somewhat disagree, 5=disagree 6=strongly disagree.

Table 1

Evaluation of the preconditions for effective collaboration

	Mean score
Communication tools and skills The project team had and used the best possible tools to communicate and had agreed on how to use them	2
Common goal The project team had a shared and clear understanding of the purpose and expected results	1,9
Trust Project Team Partners knew that each partner will deliver and do what is expected of them. The project team was able to create an open and appreciative space for diverse opinions	1,8
Common time The project team had enough common time to meet (virtual & face to face) to support, discuss, manage, lead solve problems etc.	1,7
Common tasks The project team had to do tasks which need two or more partners to work together.	1,6
Expertise in use Each partner team was respected and acknowledged and had used its expertise and special skills	1,5
Autonomy The project team and its partners individually had enough responsibility and power to make their own decisions and use their creativity	1,5

All statements are rated from partners very high since the mean score for each statement is above 1.5 (Strongly agree=1, Agree=2). Furthermore, for better management for scheduling meetings it was proposed to use doodle (www.doodle.com) but unfortunately this tool is not accessible for individuals with disabilities participating in the project so it was decided not to use this tool and continue communication via email and skype.

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

An online environment was established (LMS OLAT) by UNIMC for the development of WP2 and was meant to (a) set the proper tool to work in a collaborative way: Discussion forums, Collaborative writing spaces (wikis) and (b) gather and organize useful documents easily and quickly accessible.

The EU partners used the discussion forums to exchange viewpoints and documents. Unfortunately the site was not used by ME partners and additionally it has been reported that it was difficult to access the platform for individuals with disabilities within the partnership. For these reasons it was agreed not to continue using the platform. Link to the environment: <http://olat3.unimc.it/olat/dmz/>.

Most impressive is also the involvement of Non Consortium Members due to their experience in the field of supporting students with disabilities in HEIs'. In total 9 non consortium partners have participated in different activities during working visits: three from Greece, three from UK, and two from ME and one from Italy. This shows that the project is focusing on sharing as much knowledge as possible in order to ensure exploitation and sustainability. In that direction it is necessary to point out that there is a transfer of knowledge in other levels too. Since the educational system is very different among all partners, ME partners requested to visit, during planned working visits, other educational settings i.e. special primary or secondary schools in Greece and in Poland. More attention was given to partners without experience in Tempus Projects in order to avoid and anticipate any kind of problems and risks. For better communication during the working visit QPLN7.1 was decided to give deadlines for responding to emails. In order to support partners with less experience on project management issues as well as financial issues, the coordinator tried during each working visits to have one to one meetings with each partners so that any kind of management support can be provided.

3. Overall Evaluation of the project

This section is focusing on the project management issues where partners were asked to answer a checklist and open-ended questions. Concerning the checklist partners were asked to choose the level of agreement or disagreement concerning some statements that refer to the overall evaluation of the project (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=somewhat disagree, 5=disagree, 6=strongly disagree). Table 2 shows the mean score of the statements.

Table 2
Check list

Timetable	Mean score
Deadlines for delivering outputs/outcomes were respected.	2
Your communication within the partnership was as planned.	1,9
All activities have taken place according to the work plan and timing	1,7
The work load according to your estimation was acceptable.	1,7
Your communication within your institution was as planned.	1,4
Products and activities	
You are satisfied with the quality of your activities or products.	1,5
You have undertaken all activities you should have according to your work plan.	1,4
You have delivered all products (material, training day...) you were supposed to deliver.	1,3
Goals	
All goals are met accordingly.	2
I am satisfied with the quality of activities and products of the partnership.	2
The project has met its goals and objectives.	1,8
All activities were appropriately conceived for meeting the goals.	1,6
Learning	
Opinions and visions regarding the project subject have changed during the project circle.	2,5
European co-operation offered input I would never have obtained if I had not been a partner in this project.	2
We are all aware of each others' point of view regarding the support and inclusion of SwD.	2
We know each other well (professionally).	1,9
I have learned through being a partner in this project.	1,6

As we see in table 2 participants, concerning the timetable of the project they strongly agreed that all activities had taken place according to the work plan and deadlines for the delivery were respected. The communication with the partnership was as planned and the work load according to the estimation. As far as concerned the whole management aspect,

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

the partners noticed also the coordinator's experience and the leaderships skills were referred also, as the professional management helped in the function of the project.

The activities during the project were also evaluated from the participants and it was really interesting that they had undertaken all activities they should have according to their work plan and were satisfied with the quality of the products. The evaluation of the goals was concentrated in the quality of the activities and products of the partnership and their successful accomplishment. The learning outcomes of the project, according to the partners, were the knowledge that they get in the management of European programs but also they won significant knowledge in the field on special education and disability. Different perspectives and opinions regarding the project subject enhanced the matter of support and inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education.

As for the open-ended questions the participants noticed the strong and the weak points of the project in an attempt to evaluate the project in depth. According to the partners they have focused on the main concept of the program. The strength of the project is the idea itself, as the cooperation among universities and relevant institutions for supporting and enhancing the inclusion of students with disabilities, constitutes the core and the strength of the project. Moreover, it is noticed that the extensive experience of the EU partners in the area of disability played a very important role in the project, as they promoted best practices, innovative knowledge and a wider perspective in the field of services for students with disabilities. Last but not least, the coordinator's experience and the leaderships skills were referred also, as the professional management helped in the function of the project.

Concerning the weak points, the partners referred to the absence of any policy framework at higher education level which could facilitate the inclusion of students with disability at HEIs. They also noticed the lack on university staff involvement at the beginning of the project which created problems in the implementation of the project objectives. The adjustments were sometimes difficult to take place as it was necessary to organize more training sessions. Another weak point was the low level of ICT services which in fact couldn't facilitate the inclusion on students with disabilities.

The activities or actions that were described as more successful were the development of a guide concerning services for students with disabilities in higher education. This made clearer about the necessary adjustments that should take place and the new services which must be established. Also the training sessions that were organised during the project helped the partners in many disability topics, such as Braille and Sign language. Nevertheless, the training on ICT solutions in order to support students with disabilities played a significant role in the project

Except for the successful activities the partners, underlined the achievements which they realised through the project. The change of perspective about the support and inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education was one of the most significant achievements of the project. The partners also referred to the adaptation of possible solutions which help students with disability in various areas such as academic, everyday life, learning, and teaching i.e. increasing the duration of examinations taken in alternative formats. Of course is also very important the fact that ME universities have implemented such solutions to realize their own rules and regulations and they managed to convince the authorities that support students with disabilities.

They also mentioned the better understanding of the concept of inclusion highlighting the need for enhancing personal skills and characteristics of students with disability. The project had also a significant effect in the development of new links at a

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

local, national and institutional level. The partners notice that during the working visits they had the opportunity to meet academic staff from different universities and institutions in the field of disability. Some partners didn't know the whole working group so it gave them the opportunity to come close with various universities and institutions. Moreover, some partners had the chance to create links authorities in national and local level. The participants also referred to the continuity of the concept of the project, as the support and inclusion of students with disability in HE shouldn't stop after the end of the program, but should be the base and the foundation for the development of a new perspective on disability.

4. Evaluation of the impact of the project

The project had an impact not also in instructional level but also in personal level. The partners made an attempt to evaluate the impact of the program, starting with the expectations that they had. Increasing awareness about students with disabilities in higher education was the most common expectation among partners. Awareness should also expand in increasing and enhancing the opportunities and services in University level and establish a series of services which would constitute in the general perspective of supporting students with disability in higher education, with main goal their inclusion in educational level. Changing the perspective on disability, focusing, on equal opportunities was an expectation that have been noticed from all the participants. Nevertheless the extent of achieved expectations was really satisfactory as the problems and barriers were sometimes hard to overtake. Overall, in academic level the project achieved to transfer the need for new perspectives on disability and inclusion, by establishing services which can help students with disability. Staff members had the opportunity to take part in training activities and workshops and public audience came close to concepts and knowledge that were unknown. Especially during the pilot year, most of the partners had the opportunity to apply many ideas, concepts and activities that had been proposed and managed to accomplish some of the goals of the project.

As we mentioned previously the project had also impact on the professional development of each partner. The majority of them referred to the awareness on the field of disability. Despite the fact that all of the participants (university, institutions) were part of educational and academic authorities, the project helped them understand the need and the significance of the inclusion. Moreover they improved and enhance their knowledge and professional skills on disability and learn how to work on university regulations and procedures. They mentioned also the development and increasing on experience working in large partnerships but also their competence in the implementation of European projects. In institutional level the partners mentioned that the project improved their competence and experience in project controlled directly by the EACEA. They had the opportunity to develop a new framework about disability and inclusion and became aware of services that can be established. The most important impact was the training of staff members (academic and administrative) in inclusion and support of students with disabilities at higher education. This was the key for the establishment of a new perspective on students with disabilities. They also changed their own perspective on disability and in institutional level they became open and tolerant in new suggestions, ideas and practices.

The problems that the partners have encountered in implementing the project objectives were also an element of evaluation. They mentioned that problems and barriers were a lot, especially in the early stages of the project where the absence of individuals that would support students with disabilities was notified. Such persons should be the main recipients of the activities during the entire project. Moreover, the authorities at national and local level weren't always open in new suggestions and ideas, so the change of the whole perspective in educational was a serious problem. Of course also in society level there were problems also. Disability is still a sensitive subject and members of society are suspicious and negative to new ideas and practices. We should also refer to the small number of students with disability. Individuals with disability usually don't participate in higher education and are still abandoned and far from the participation in higher education. At last it really important to notice that the role of the parents sometimes was a barrier or an obstacle in the implementation of the project. Parents are sometimes hard to communicate as they are most of the times abandoned from the society itself. Organizations and groups that function as links between the parents and the society should facilitate the inclusion of students with disability in education in general.

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

The role of the partner and his contribution to the project activities came under evaluation. Participants mentioned that they had the opportunity somehow to the project activities, with various and different roles. They refer to their own knowledge, professional skills and best practices. Monitoring, quality control designing the training courses and literature review were some of the contributions to the project activities. Some of them also mentioned the passion that managed to transfer to other partners about the project and also to the members of the academic and administrative staff about students with disability and inclusion.

It is also important to mention that there was an increase of students with disabilities enrolled at HEIs.

Table 3

Increase Nr of SwD at HEIs in Montenegro

	University of Montenegro	University Mediterranean	University of Donja Gorica	Total
2012	3	4	1	8
2013	3	4	0	7
2014	6	8	3	17

5. Benchmarking against policy and standards

The benchmarking exercise was part of the research activities carried out in work package 1 of the project. Work package 1 consisted of three related sub-activities:

- Work activity 1.1 - Analysis and Report on EU practices and policies for the inclusion of students with disabilities in Higher Education
- Work activity 1.2 - Analysis and Report on national practices and policies for the inclusion of students with disabilities in Higher Education (in Montenegro)
- Work activity 1.3 - Integration of comparative analysis of EU and national practices and benchmarking of Higher Education Institutions in Montenegro against current policies and practices.

The first two sub-activities collected and analysed data on state of the art in EU policies and practices for the inclusion of disabled students in Higher Education in comparison with those in Montenegro. The results of these fed into work activity 1.3, which presented an integration of the analysis of practices and policies for the inclusion of disabled students in Higher Education in the EU and in six member states (UK, SI, IT, GR, PL), benchmarked against the current situation in universities in Montenegro. Thus work activity 1.3 focuses on the integration of the material collected and analysed in work activities 1.1 and 1.2, followed by a synthesis of the material to provide a consolidated view of the 'landscape' of policies and practices for the inclusion of students with disabilities in HEIs within the EU. This landscape identifies the standards and good practices that can then be used to develop and apply a benchmarking framework to enable the situation in Montenegro to be compared with the EU situation, and key areas for future development identified.

The overall approach proposed to benchmarking was taken from the BENVIC approach developed in collaboration with a number of organisations under the Socrates programme (Benchmarking for higher education campuses).^{1 2} The methodology is based primarily on 'Best Practice' benchmarking but reflects elements of two other approaches – process benchmarking and strategic benchmarking. Best Practice Benchmarking describes the comparison of performance data that has been obtained from studying similar processes or activities and identifying, adapting, and implementing the practices that produced the best performance results. Process benchmarking is where the initiating organisation focuses its observation and investigation of business processes with a goal of identifying and observing the best practices from one or more benchmark organisations. Strategic benchmarking involves observing how others compete.³

The benchmarking methodology encompassed the following methods and actions:

- Identify the subject or 'problem' area – i.e. organisational processes to be assessed
- Identify other sectors that have similar processes
- Identify organizations that are leaders in these areas
- Identify data sources for comparison
- Collect data (e.g. Survey organisations for measures and practices; visit the "best practice" organisations to identify leading edge practices)
- Identify gaps between actual and desired state

¹ <http://www.benvic.odl.org/>

² Cullen, J (2002) The BENVIC Benchmarking Indicators Manual, BENVIC Consortium, Brussels

³ The Benchmarking Book, Staphenurst, T (2009) Elsevier

Implementing the benchmarking review in practice entails the following steps:

- Step 1: development of benchmarking framework and indicators (derived from an analysis of the results of WA1.1 – review of EU policies and practices to support the inclusion of disabled students - and WA1.2 - review of Montenegrin policies and practices to support the inclusion of disabled students). This specified the organisational processes to be assessed and the criteria and indicators used to compare the Montenegrin HEIs against EU benchmarks
- Step 2: initial mapping of Montenegrin HEIs against EU benchmarks
- Step 3: Selection of EU HEI ‘leaders’ for benchmarking comparison
- Step 4: Benchmarking of Montenegrin HEIs against comparator HEI’s
- Step 5: Analysis and identification of areas for improvement

A set of indicators were developed to carry out the analysis of the situation in Montenegro set against the state of the art in the EU. The indicators were selected using the results of the review of policies and practices to support students with disabilities, carried out in work package 1 of the project and presented in deliverables 1.1 and 1.2. The benchmarking exercise entailed comparing the Montenegrin HEIs with EU HEIs in relation to two dimensions, and using two sets of benchmarking criteria.

The first dimension focused on benchmarking the Montenegrin higher education sector against overall EU policy standards and practices in the higher education sector. This covered four areas, and four sets of benchmarking criteria, as shown in Table 1: policy and legal standards; targeting; implementation of policy and outcomes and impacts. The second dimension focused on benchmarking the three Montenegrin universities participating in sinc@he against individual ‘comparator’ universities in the EU. This covered the three sets of benchmarking criteria (structural, practices and performance benchmarks). Table 3 shows the results of benchmarking the Montenegrin higher education sector against overall EU policy standards and practices in the higher education sector. Column 1 of the Table shows the four areas, and four sets of benchmarking criteria - policy and legal standards; targeting; implementation of policy and outcomes and impacts – covered in the exercise. In Column 2, the key EU standards and good practices are summarised for each area and criterion. Column 3 summarises the situation for Montenegro with regard to these areas and criteria. Column 4 (before) and Column 5 (after) provides an overall ‘benchmark score’ for Montenegrin HEIs set against the areas and criteria. This shows three levels:

- Level 1 (-) – signifies that Montenegrin HEI’s are at the moment below the ‘norm’ for the EU as a whole
- Level 2 (=) - signifies that Montenegrin HEI’s are at the moment broadly at the same level as the ‘norm’ for the EU as a whole
- Level 3 (+) - signifies that Montenegrin HEI’s are at the moment broadly above the ‘norm’ for the EU as a whole.

Finally, Column 6 identifies key gaps in each area and for each criterion and suggests possible strategies for improvement and Column 7 the improvements after the project.

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

Table 4
Summary of policy and standards benchmarking analysis-Before and after the project

Policy and legal standards	EU standards and good practices	Montenegro situation at the beginning of the project	Benchmark Score-Before	Benchmark Score-After	Gaps and areas for improvement at the beginning of the project	Improvements after the project -Results
Implementation of United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Ratified at EU level and in most member states	Ratified Convention and Protocol 2007. 'Strategy of integration of the persons with disabilities from period 2008-2016' adopted. Association of the Youth with Disabilities actively champions Convention implementation.	=	=	Increase awareness among public of needs of people with disabilities. Improve monitoring and identification of numbers involved and their needs. Increase systematic application of UNCRPD in social, cultural and economic life. Improve accessibility in built environment.	There was increase (a) awareness among public of needs of individuals with disabilities, (b) systematic application of UNCRPD in social, cultural and economic life. UDG is accessible and UNIM has made some adaptations with ramps. ICT is also available for students with disabilities.
Implementation of EU Disability Action Plan 2003-2010	Plan has 3 priorities: accessibility; active inclusion; employment. Monitoring through ANED and SPSI NSRs *show that disability is mainstreamed in markedly different ways and that significant work is still required.	Law of prohibition of discrimination of the persons with disabilities, 2011, provides framework for mainstreaming disability.	=	=	As above – more effort in awareness-raising is required. Another key area is in employment. Montenegro has high rates of unemployment – particularly among disabled young people. More effort could be concentrated in building more effective 'transition pathways' for young people between school, tertiary education and work.	Raising awareness has been achieved especially during the piloting year were different kind of workshops took place at high schools all over Montenegro. The aspect of transition to work life was not one of the objectives of the project.
EU Education and Training policies (ET2020) with regard to disability	ANED and SPSI NSRs show that education has either been underplayed or disregarded in NSRs	Strategic goals of Montenegro are the implementation of inclusive education at all educational levels – through Law on amendments on the vocational rehabilitation and employment of persons with disabilities, 2011	=	=	Although the legal and policy infrastructure supports 'inclusive learning', it is not systematically applied in practice. Areas where more effort could be focused are: i) better integration between the different education sectors on educational needs of young people with disabilities ii) resources provided to train more qualified special needs education professionals and to promote continuing professional development of education professionals iii) more coherent frameworks and guidelines for implementation of UN and EU policies in	Guidelines and regulations have been adapted and accepted from HEIs. Special equipment is available and SAO has been established. I.e. Students reported that there does not exist any problem or barrier in realization of requirements for the implementation that is tailored to their category of disability.

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

					higher education	
Targeting	EU standards and good practices	ME situation			Gaps and areas for improvement	Improvements after the project -Results
Targeting strategy adopted	No standards identified	No specific targeting	=	+	Methodologies and tools to accurately capture the actual population of young people with disabilities, and their profiles and needs	During the piloting year different kind of methodology has been used in order to identify and capture the needs of current and prospective SwD.
Implementation	EU standards and good practices	ME situation			Gaps and areas for improvement	Improvements after the project -Results
Support measures on rights	EU Fundamental Rights Agency. EU2020 Digital Agenda. EU Disability High Level Group issues regular reports on progress made on the implementation of the UN Convention	No specific measures identified	-	=	Develop systems and tools to incorporate the rights of students with disabilities in HEIs. Examples: France -Social criteria-based grants; University of Primorska – University Statutes.	According to the evaluation and monitoring process during the piloting year it was noted that Students with disabilities are not completely aware about their rights to (i) have examinations tailored to their category of disability, and (ii) use special equipment and teachings aids. More intensive presentations of established legally framework is needed.
Support measures on accessibility; built environment; accommodation	Most Member States have taken initiatives to improve the accessibility of public buildings and to adopt rules that are ‘disability-friendly’ in new construction. However, the level and quality of provision is uneven. Definition of ‘reasonable accommodation’ varies widely.	Only University of Donja Gorica - a new University – has purpose-built accommodation and accessibility-focused design. Some provision in other universities- Podgorica and Nikšić., with rooms specialized for students with motor disabilities. Faculties at the Mediterranean University are partially accessible	-	=	More extensive implementation of EU Disability Strategy and related standards on accessibility – e.g. the EU ‘design for All’ mandate; ISO standard 21542 on accessibility and Mandate 273 on accessibility. Apply relevant good practices from EU examples, e.g. ‘Mobility Training’ (University of Warsaw)	UDG is accessible and UNIM has made some adaptations with ramps. ICT is also available for students with disabilities. Building accessibility was not one of the objectives of the project but some adaptations were made towards this perspective.
Support measures on governance	No specific policy measures at EU level. Examples of individual HEIs developing structures to involve disabled students in decision-making.	No specific measures to raise awareness or include students with disabilities in decision-making. Universities in Montenegro have support from the AYDM and specialized institutions for education of students with	-	=	Set up new awareness-raising, collaboration and decision making structures both within HEIs and linking them with external stakeholders like AYDM. Examples: Disability Equality Scheme (UK; Disability officers (Greece, Spain); Studentenwerke (Germany); Disability and Well-Being Support Advisors (UK)	Administrative staff members at partner institutions are mostly informed about their assigned duties in working with SwDs. SAO has been established at AYDM so that a central support service will be available for all HEIs.

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

Support measures on ICTs	European Parliament resolution 2007 called for the continuing development of design standards in ICTs to support disabled people. Directive 2009/136/EC on universal service and user's rights relating to electronic communications networks and services. Standardisation mandate 376 on European accessibility requirements. But Riga Dashboard report notes that progress towards achieving the Riga targets is much too slow. ICT and assistive technology support varies widely across EU but there are some examples of innovation.	disabilities. No systematic provision of ICTs and assistive technologies. Some measures – e.g. digitisation of learning content – have been implemented; e-learning systems (LMS Moodle), and auditory support in electronic materials available for some courses	-	=	More systematic implementation of EU standards and directives on procurement and installation of ICTs. Introduce relevant good practices from EU. Examples: University of Macerata e-learning system (OLAT); University of Warsaw - trackball devices, Magic Wand Keyboard, 'HeadMouse' sensor (PL); Institute of Education, London - Disability Assistive Technology room; University College, London - Student Enabling IT Suite	Special equipment is available for students with disabilities. An agreement among HEIs and AYDM has been signed in order to clarify the use and other regulations concerning this equipment. Some measures e.g. digitization of learning content have been implemented, elearning system (LMS Moddle) and auditory support in the electronic materials are available for some courses,
Pre-entry support measures	Generally neglected at EU and member state level, but some examples of innovation and good practice.	Scholarships for students with disabilities at public and private university or scholarship-free education Scholarships from the local municipalities. Assistance and support from the Association of Youth with disabilities	-	=	Integration of existing initiatives into more coherent financial support package. Explore feasibility of adopting good practice examples from EU. Examples: Fund for learning support (Ireland); Disabled Students Allowance (UK); Grants for signing (Austria, Spain); Social criteria-based grants (France)	Through Rector's Charter and other agreements i.e. Agreement on net working for supporting cognitive, social and intrapersonal issues of students with disabilities some initiatives have been taken into consideration. Pre-entry support measures i.e. scholarships for SWD at UoM and UDG or scholarship free education has been achieved.
Post-qualification support measures	Generally neglected at EU and member state level, but some examples of innovation and good	Not recognised, through AYDM does some work in this field.	-	-	Develop post-qualification support infrastructure in HEI's. Example: University of Macerata - CETRIL: centre for internship and job orientation	Was not an objective of the project

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

	practice.					
Outcomes and Impacts	EU standards and good practices	ME situation			Gaps and areas for improvement	Improvements after the project -Results
Evaluation/research carried out on policy and practice impacts	Implementation of survey module on European Disability and Social Integration (EDSIM)	Not developed, but AYDM carries out monitoring and analysis of profiles and needs.	-	=	Build on existing AYDM research to develop an 'Observatory' to monitor impacts of initiatives and assess progress in relation to policy goals. Use EU funding instruments (e.g. Lifelong Learning programme; PROGRESS Programme) to secure funding.	SAO has been established at AYDM. AYDM resolution, detailed regulation of implementation of AYDM resolution are key documents for this improvement.
Actual outcomes and impacts identified	Benchmarking and various studies on ICT for ageing and/or disability launched: Measuring eAccessibility in Europe, SeniorWatch2, assistive technology industry, eAccessibility legislation. European Academic Network on Disability launched.	Not developed, but AYDM has been involved in monitoring and evaluation projects, and Montenegrin universities have participated in joint research projects.	-	=	As above	As above

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher education institutions in Montenegro

6. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX – LFM (revised) SINC@HE

EACEA after the intermediate report suggested revising the LFM and introducing quantitative indications instead of milestones.

<p>Wider Objective: <i>What is the overall broader objective, to which the project will contribute?</i></p> <p>To improve quality and relevance of inclusive education for students with disabilities in Montenegro To strengthen the open society values by combining best EU practices and policies</p>	<p>Indicators of progress: <i>What are the key indicators related to the wider objective?</i></p> <p>Increased number of students with disabilities enrolled in university by 2014: On 2012 8 SwD on 2014 17 SwD were studying at HEIs</p> <p>Increased number of students with disabilities accessing support services: (a) 9 SwD, 20 prospective SwD, 16 parents participated at Workshops, (b) also workshops at high schools were organized were 31 prospective Swd and 6 parents participated as well as over 2000 high school students without disability, (c) 22 SwD are registered at AYDM asking for support services.</p> <p>Increased number of citizens aware on the topic: In total over 300 participants were involved in dissemination activities and raising awareness activities though workshops. Those participants were students with and without disabilities, parents, high school students with and without disabilities, academic and non academic staff.</p>	<p>HOW INDICATORS WILL BE MEASURED: <i>What are the sources of information on these indicators?</i></p> <p>Universities databases and registers Registers at Student advisory office Reports of workshops and events</p>	
<p>Specific Project Objective/s: <i>What are the specific objectives, which the project shall achieve?</i></p> <p>To improve university regulatory frameworks, guidelines and recommendations to allow full support for students with disabilities in ME higher education institutions.</p>	<p>Indicators of progress: <i>What are the quantitative and qualitative indicators showing whether and to what extent the project's specific objectives are achieved?</i></p> <p>Improved university regulatory framework for supporting students with disability for each university</p>	<p>How indicators will be measured: <i>What are the sources of information that exist and can be collected? What are the methods required to get this information?</i></p> <p>Improved regulatory successfully applied by university staff</p>	<p>Assumptions & risks: <i>What are the factors and conditions not under the direct control of the project, which are necessary to achieve these objectives? What risks have to be considered?</i></p> <p>Low reaction by the addressed target group Slow reaction by managing offices at university Low interest by internal human resources to be enrolled in</p>

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher

education institutions in Montenegro

To improve institutional capacities through providing special equipment, support services and staff training for teaching students with disabilities.

To establish a Student Advisory Office for counselling, guidance, tutoring, relationships and psychological support.
To raise awareness and motivation on inclusive education and to increase the number of prospective students with disabilities.

Number of implemented support services: 6 different kind of support services were provided: legal and

psychological counseling, transportation, accessible library, personal assistance service, technical support

Capacity of special equipment for students with disabilities provided

One SAO is established at AYDM in order to support all SwD at all HEIs

252 teachers and other staff trained on specific support services for students with disabilities (92 participated during the basic training and 134 during the advanced training) More concretely on basic training 30 academic staff, 58 non academic staff and 4 students' participated. On advanced training 45 academic staff, 85 non academic staff and 4 students participated.

8 different documents were produced on supporting students with disabilities provided for downloading

27 non academic staff (administration, IT and service support) and 12 academic staff were reached by the recommendations for future actions in inclusion in HE

9 new students with disability were enrolled at HEIs in MNE (UDG, UNIM, UoM)

Universities databases and registers on enrolled students with disabilities: accessible on request at university offices

Registers at Student Advisory offices (forms for requesting support, satisfaction survey): available on request

HE administrative offices registers for agreements and contracts: accessible on request at university offices
Final conferences reports and dissemination materials (agendas, signed sheets of attendance etc.): copies available at coordinator premises

training activities
Low interest by policy makers
Good coordination and high commitment of the project partners

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher

education institutions in Montenegro

<p>Outputs (tangible) and Outcomes (intangible) Please provide the list of concrete DELIVERABLES - outputs/outcomes (grouped in Workpackages), leading to the specific objective/s.:</p> <p>1. [WP1] Background analysis for inclusion of students with disabilities in HE</p> <p>1.1 Analysis of EU practices and policies for inclusion in Higher Education</p> <p>1.2 Analysis and Report on national practices and policies for the inclusion of students with disabilities in Higher Education</p> <p>1.3 Report on Comparative Analysis of EU and national practices and policies for inclusion in Higher Education</p> <p>2. [WP2] Improvement of institutional frameworks for inclusion of students with disabilities</p> <p>2.1 Analysis of legislative framework and human resources at partner institutions</p> <p>2.2 Defining institutional structure to support inclusion of students with disabilities</p> <p>2.3 Development of university regulatory documents for the support of students with disabilities</p> <p>3. [WP3] Definition of support services for students with disabilities at HEIs</p> <p>3.1 Analysis of needs and identification of support services in partners' institutions</p> <p>3.2 Design of services: ICT support, peers' support, guidance and counseling</p> <p>3.3 Planning for the implementation of services at institutional level</p> <p>4. [WP4] Establishing support services and capacity building for university students with disabilities</p> <p>4.1 Development of ICT support services for student with disabilities</p> <p>4.2 Providing special equipment and teaching aids for students with disabilities</p> <p>4.3 Establishment of a Student advisory office</p> <p>4.4 Upgrade university websites for guidelines on studying with disability</p> <p>5. [WP5] Training of university staff for working with students with disabilities</p> <p>5.1 Analyzing training needs for each partner institution involved</p> <p>5.2 Basic training on inclusive practices and support services for students with disabilities</p> <p>5.3 Advanced training on inclusive practices and support services for students with disabilities</p>	<p>What are the indicators to measure whether and to what extent the project achieves the envisaged results and effects?</p> <p>3 Reports on analysis and benchmarking of policies for inclusion of people with disabilities in HE delivered at month 3</p> <p>1 Report on legislative framework and human resources at HEIs delivered at month 10</p> <p>Guidelines for prospective students with disabilities and university staff delivered at month 6</p> <p>University regulatory documents for students with disabilities support adopted by each university involved at month 12</p> <p>1 Report on needs and identification of services in universities for supporting students with disabilities published at month 6</p> <p>Guidelines for designing services for students with disabilities delivered at month 6</p> <p>Implementation plan for the development of support services for students with disabilities delivered at month 12</p> <p>Support services running from month 18</p> <p>Special equipment for students with disabilities available at month 18</p> <p>1 Student Advisory Office open and working from month 18</p> <p>18 students with disability requiring for special support at month 36</p> <p>Guidelines and materials concerning students with disabilities delivered at month 6</p> <p>1 Report on training needs analysis and training plan delivered at month 12</p> <p>2 Reports on Basic and Advanced training HE staff retrained at month 24 (226 total nr for Advanced (134) and basic (92) training per partner include also e training (26))</p> <p>Monitoring reports on regulatory documents implementation delivered at month 36</p> <p>1 Evaluation report on piloting of support services delivered at month 36</p> <p>4 peers' support workshops and workshops at 20 cities in Montenegro at 44 high schools held at month 36</p> <p>48 participants at peers' support workshops at month 36</p> <p>Short term impact report on training activities delivered at month 36</p> <p>3 Internal Evaluation and quality assurance and 3 External</p>	<p>How indicators will be measured: What are the sources of information on these indicators?</p> <p>Project website (download section): accessible through the internet</p> <p>Internal documents in universities (registers): accessible on request</p> <p>Universities websites (download section, guidelines and other materials available): accessible through the internet</p> <p>Student advisory website (download section, guidelines and other materials available): accessible through the internet</p> <p>Human resources registers at the university (participation to training of teachers and administrative staff): accessible on request</p> <p>Registers of activity at the students' offices (i.e. request for support modules): accessible on request</p> <p>Financial tracking at the universities' financial offices (invoices for special equipment purchase): accessible on request at universities offices</p> <p>HE administrative offices registers for agreements and contracts: accessible on request at universities offices</p>	<p>Assumptions & risks: What external factors and conditions must be realised to obtain the expected outcomes and results on schedule?</p> <p>Low reaction by the addressed target group</p> <p>Potential delays in adopting institutional frameworks at university level</p> <p>Low interest by internal human resources to be enrolled in training activities</p> <p>Good coordination and high commitment in the project consortium</p>
--	---	---	--

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher

education institutions in Montenegro

6. [WP6] Piloting and evaluation of defined support services in partner universities

6.1 Monitoring of university regulatory documents implementation

1 Partnership Agreements, 1 interim and 1 final reports delivered at month 36

6.2 Piloting and evaluation of defined support services in partner universities

25 Project meetings minutes

6.3 Piloting of peers' support workshops

6.4 Monitoring and evaluation of training effects at partner universities

7. [QPLN7] Quality control and monitoring

7.1 Internal quality monitoring and control

7.2 External quality monitoring and control

7.3 Inter-Tempus project coaching

8. [DISS8] Dissemination and raising awareness

8.1 Creation of the project website

8.2 Raising awareness and motivation among current and prospective students with disabilities

8.3 Media promotion of new university capacities for education of students with disabilities

8.4 Dissemination conference with stakeholders

9. [EXP9] Exploitation and sustainability

9.1 Agreement on future inter-university peers support

9.2 Agreement on networking for supporting cognitive, social and intrapersonal issues of SwD

9.3 Analysis of piloting results and definition of recommendation for policy makers

10. [MNGT10] Management of the Project

10.1 Overall project management and administration

10.2 Project coordination meetings

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher

education institutions in Montenegro

<p>Activities: What are the key activities to be carried out (grouped in Workpackages) and in what sequence in order to produce the expected results?</p>	<p>What inputs are required to implement these activities, e.g. staff time, equipment, mobilities, publications etc.?</p>	<p>Assumptions, risks and pre-conditions: What pre-conditions are required before the project starts? What conditions outside the project's direct control have to be present for the implementation of the planned activities?</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [WP1] Background analysis for inclusion of students with disabilities in HE <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Analysis of EU practices and policies for inclusion in Higher Education 1.2 Analysis and Report on national practices and policies for the inclusion of students with disabilities in Higher Education 1.3 Report on Comparative Analysis of EU and national practices and policies for inclusion in Higher Education 2. [WP2] Improvement of institutional frameworks for inclusion of students with disabilities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 Analysis of legislative framework and human resources at partner institutions 2.2 Defining institutional structure to support inclusion of students with disabilities 2.3 Development of university regulatory documents for the support of students with disabilities 3. [WP3] Definition of support services for students with disabilities at HEIs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 Analysis of needs and identification of support services in partners' institutions 3.2 Design of services: ICT support, peers' support, guidance and counseling 3.3 Planning for the implementation of services at institutional level 4. [WP4] Establishing support services and capacity building for university students with disabilities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Development of ICT support services for student with disabilities 4.2 Providing special equipment and teaching aids for students with disabilities 4.3 Establishment of a Student advisory office 4.4 Upgrade university websites for guidelines on studying with disability 5. [WP5] Training of university staff for working with students with disabilities <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1 Analyzing training needs for each partner institution involved 5.2 Basic training on inclusive practices and support services for students with disabilities 5.3 Advanced raining o on inclusive practices and support services for students with disabilities 6. [WP6] Piloting and evaluation at partner universities 	<p><u>Staff time:</u> -Cat1 - 244 days -Cat 2 - 1237 days -Cat 4 - 284 days</p> <p><u>Mobility:</u> 116 flows from Partners to EU; 70 flows from EU to Partners; 25 flows within MNE</p> <p><u>Equipment:</u> (University Mediterranean, University Donja Gorica) For each UNI: 1) <i>Equipment for the support of students with visual impairment</i> 2 Braille multifunctional device: Braille display 4 Braille multifunctional device: Braille Notebook 2 OCR Software 2 Scanner 2 Large prints, 2Magnifier 4 Alternate keyboard 2 Screen magnification software 2 Screen reader software</p> <p>2) <i>Equipment for the support of students with hearing impairment</i> 8 Portable word processor 6 FM System with multiple transmitters and receivers 12 Audio shoe, enables connecting existing hearing aid to FM transmitter or audio out 8 Classic inductive loop set</p> <p>3) <i>Equipment for the support of students with physical disability</i> 4 Track ball/track pad/joystick with on-screen keyboard 8 Keyboard accessories</p> <p>4) <i>Equipment for the implementation of project activities on universities</i> 4 laptop computers, 1 desktop computer, 2 multifunctional scanner/fax/copy/printer (1 x HP LaserJet Pro M1536 Multifunction Printer serie) 2 Color printer and toners, 4 Projector, 2 Scanner switch, web publishing software, 1 network printer, 2 digital cameras 2 desktop computer (with extended graphic support), web</p>	<p>Interest of student with disabilities to be enrolled into peer processes Interest by policy makers to the specific project target group High commitment by project partners Risk: low/slow reaction by management offices at the universities Timely advertising and media promotion to reach the majority of interested groups Accepted participation in special sessions at existing conferences relevant to disability Availability of university management structures for signing the agreements Availability of staff to support agreed issues Interest of policy makers for improving the regulations on studying with disability</p>

Support and Inclusion of students with disabilities at higher

education institutions in Montenegro

<p>6.1 Monitoring of university regulatory documents implementation</p>	<p>10. Use of hardware: 10 desktop computers, 4 lap top computer, 49 desktop computers, 2 multifunctional scanner/fax/copy/printer</p>
<p>6.2 Piloting and evaluation of defined support services in partner universities</p> <p>6.3 Piloting of peers' support workshops</p> <p>6.4 Monitoring and evaluation of training effects at partner universities</p> <p>7. [QPLN7] Quality control and monitoring</p> <p>7.1 Internal quality monitoring and control</p> <p>7.2 External quality monitoring and control</p> <p>7.3 Inter-Tempus project coaching</p> <p>8. [DISS8] Dissemination and raising awareness</p> <p>8.1 Creation of the project website</p> <p>8.2 Raising awareness and motivation among current and prospective students with disabilities</p> <p>8.3 Media promotion of new university capacities for education of students with disabilities</p> <p>8.4 Dissemination conference with stakeholders</p> <p>9. [EXP9] Exploitation and sustainability</p> <p>9.1 Agreement on future inter-university peers support</p> <p>9.2 Agreement on networking for supporting cognitive, social and intrapersonal issues of SwD</p> <p>9.3 Analysis of piloting results and definition of recommendation for policy makers</p> <p>10. [MNGT10] Management of the Project</p> <p>10.1 Overall project management and administration</p> <p>10.2 Project coordination meetings</p>	<p><i>Printing and Publishing:</i></p> <p>1.1 Analysis of EU practices and policies for inclusion in Higher Education</p> <p>1.2 Analysis and Report on national practices and policies for the inclusion of students with disabilities in Higher Education</p> <p>1.3 Report on Comparative Analysis of EU and national practices and policies for inclusion in Higher Education</p> <p>2.1 Analysis of legislative framework and human resources at partner institutions</p> <p>2.2 Defining institutional structure to support inclusion of students with disabilities</p> <p>3.1 Analysis of needs and identification of support services in partners' institutions</p> <p>3.2 Design of services: ICT support, peers' support, guidance and counseling</p> <p>3.3 Planning for the implementation of services at institutional level</p> <p>5.1 Analyzing training needs for each partner institution involved</p> <p>5.2 Basic training on inclusive practices and support services for students with disabilities</p> <p>5.3 Advanced raining o on inclusive practices and support services for students with disabilities</p> <p>6.1 Monitoring of university regulatory documents implementation</p> <p>6.2 Piloting and evaluation of defined support services in partner universities</p> <p>6.3 Piloting of peers' support workshops</p> <p>6.4 Monitoring and evaluation of training effects at partner universities</p> <p>7.1 Internal quality monitoring and control</p> <p>7.2 External quality monitoring and control (in EN and MNE)</p> <p>9.1 Agreement on future inter-university peers support (in EN and MNE)</p> <p>9.2 Agreement on networking for supporting cognitive,</p>

