

## GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Title</b>	<b>Pedagogical Integration and Support Center CAIP</b>
<b>Key words</b>	Education, equality, people with disabilities
<b>Objectives</b>	Support Development Increase Tolerance and social inclusion
<b>Phase of studies</b> ( <i>Choose all phases it applies</i> )	Access X Retain X Graduation X Transition to work-life
<b>Type of degree</b> ( <i>Choose all degrees it applies</i> )	Bachelor's X Graduate X Master's X
<b>Level</b> ( <i>Choose all levels it applies</i> )	International National Institutional X Faculty X Group X Individual X
<b>Name of the institution</b>	West University of Timisoara
<b>Location</b> ( <i>City and country</i> )	Timisoara, Romania
<b>Target group/s</b>	Students with disabilities
<b>Stakeholders involved</b>	The university senate, administrative staff.
<b>Description of the organisational process</b> <i>Actors, triggering evidence, campaigns, graph... (max. 300 words)</i>	Pedagogical Integration and Support Center has as mission the development of an inclusive ambiance, centered on performance where people with disabilities bring their contribution to creating a culture of tolerance, diversity and active participation by allowing and promoting a university environment based on the principles of equal opportunities in education, assisting students with special requirements, development and innovation in the field of special education and optimizing practices in integrating this students in an equal environment.

## A. FORMAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p><b>A1. ACCESS TO INFORMATION</b>  <i>Provide sources of information (URL, websites, literature, materials)</i></p>	<p><a href="https://www.uvt.ro/files/1b9aedf64a832f520eccacc6f626fe11d31deb86/">https://www.uvt.ro/files/1b9aedf64a832f520eccacc6f626fe11d31deb86/</a></p>
<p><b>A2. TIMEFRAME</b>  <i>Since when has it been in use? What is its maturity level (initial, intermediate, advanced)? Describe if there is evidence of its duration in the long run. (max. 70 words)</i></p>	<p>Initial stage. It is ongoing since 2013.</p>
<p><b>A3. NUMBER OF STUDENTS</b>  <i>How many students are involved? Is the number representative considering the target group?</i></p>	<p>20</p>
<p><b>A4. SCALABILITY</b> (“volume”)  <i>Describe how it has been or can potentially be scaled up and practiced in a wider scale. Or, has it been or can it potentially be scaled down (e.g., from larger to smaller institutions)? (max. 70 words)</i></p>	<p>This center can be adopted by a wider scale of universities which have the possibility to share their budget in this kind of activity. It is known that can not be asked from a smaller university or a poor one to grant this kind of center but every university should appreciate and help its special students and help them benefit the process of HE. Of course, this activity can be scaled down to smaller institutions like schools maybe, that can offer this kind of center.</p>
<p><b>A5. TRANSFERABILITY</b> (from one context to another)  <i>Describe how it has been or can potentially be transferred and applied to different (a) target groups, (b) institutions, and (c) societies. If possible, name also some practices that this initiative was developed from or has inspired to. (max. 70 words)</i></p>	<p>There is a wide range of transferability. This center can also be a part of an enterprise or a factory because people with disabilities also need a life, a financial and social status. This kind of center may be helpful to motivate people work and be included in the society.</p>

**A6. ASSESSMENT**

*Describe how it has been evaluated. How has it proved its relevance as the most effective way to achieve the objective? How it was successfully adopted? How it has had a positive impact on people? How the impact has been measured? Shortly describe how various forms of evaluations have been used in the assessment (A6.1 User evaluation, A6.2 Self-evaluation, A6.3 Peer evaluation, A6.4 External expert evaluation). Provide references, if possible. (max. 200 words)*

This centre brought West University of Timisoara closer to the students with disabilities and helped them to receive the special education they need, also integrating them, making the place more accessible and helping teachers to create new ways of evaluation and teaching depending on the type and degree of deficiency the students have. The positive impact on people helped the target group to be more confident. There are not any documents to show the evolution of the center, but by counting the students with disabilities in West University of Timisoara we can figure it out it was a success.

**A7. CONTACT**

*Who can be contacted so as to seek support and networks for implementing the practice (name, position, e-mail)?*

Mihai Predescu  
mfpredescu@gmail.com

**B. CONTENT EVALUATION CRITERIA**
**B1. SOCIAL JUSTICE PRINCIPLES (see Nelson & Creagh, 2013)**
**B1.1 Self-determination**

*Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)*

*(how students have participated to its (a) design, (b) enactment and (c) evaluation and how they can (d) make informed decisions about the participation)*

*Very weakly*

*Weakly*

*Well*

X

*Very well*

*It was developed within the department of special education and the connection with beneficiaries was a direct one. The initiative was developed a couple of years of collecting and reflection about HE.*

<p><b>B1.2 Rights</b> Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</p> <p><i>(how it is assured that all participants are treated with dignity and respect. How have their individual cultural, social and knowledge systems been recognised and valued?)</i></p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Well <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Very well X</p>
<p>All participants were treated with dignity and respect, trying to help them get over the critical situations.</p>				
<p><b>B1.3 Access</b> Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</p> <p><i>(how it is assured that there is an active and impartial access to the resources (e.g., curriculum, learning, academic, social, cultural, support, and financial resources))</i></p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Well <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Very well X</p>
<p>The centre provides support to students with visual impairment such as developing books in braille.</p>				
<p><b>B1.4 Equity</b> Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</p> <p><i>(how if it openly demystifies and decodes dominant university cultures, processes, expectations and language for differently prepared cohorts)</i></p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Well</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Very well <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>This center offers activities for students cu deficiencies and special needs: evaluation and diagnose of students, scholar consiliation, primarily, secondary and tertiary pshicological intervention, consultancy, research, profesional formation and supervision.</p>				
<p><b>B1.5 Participation</b> Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</p> <p><i>(how it has led to socially inclusive practices. How does it increase students' sense of belonging and connectedness?)</i></p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Well X</p>	<p>Very well <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>The sense of belonging is developed by creating a community of students that can share their ides and the problems that may arise in their student life</p>				

<p><b>B2. COLLABORATION</b> <i>Describe what kind of collaboration there is between various stakeholders. (max. 70 words)</i></p>	<p>There is a close collaboration between the Educational Science Departments and the Department of Special Education and managerial support from the University by providing a space to develop their activities.</p>
<p><b>B3. STUDENT SATISFACTION</b> <i>Describe the student perception of this initiative. Is there evidence of their satisfaction? (see also A6.1) (max. 200 words)</i></p>	<p>There is no evidence regarding students satisfaction, but it may be a good opportunity for students with SEN to interact with each other</p>
<p><b>B4. STUDENT WELLBEING</b> <i>How does it influence on students' (a) psychological, (b) social, (c) academic, and (d) physical wellbeing? What kind of evidence there is? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	<p>There is no evidence on students wellbeing, but there may be a positive impact on students wellbeing due to the fact that they interact with each other and can share opinions on their academic, social and psychological issues .</p>

## C. FINAL REFLECTIONS

(based on the previous description of you good practice)

<p><b>Success factors</b> <i>What are the factors required for the successful implementation? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information</li> <li>- A correct approach</li> <li>- A correct evaluation of students</li> <li>- Trained people (psychologists, doctors etc.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sustainability</b> <i>What is needed for the practice to sustain? What resources are required? How it contributes to environmental, economic or social sustainability? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	<p>The service is essentially based on proper resources of the university. The center needs money and people trained for working with this special students.</p> <p>The social and environmental sustainability is easy to observe because this center not only that helps students with disabilities to graduate and to be present at their classes but also helps their families and teachers. Due to this kind of centers students with disabilities have a better chance in HE.</p>

### Challenges

*What are the constraints identified? How easy it is to learn and implement? (max. 200 words)*

The constraints reflect on the financial side due to the fact that has to be invested in this kind of centers and the workers from there.

It is a benefit to have a center like this but not so easy, because it's needed professionalism and dedication, also money.

### Sources

Kunntu, K. 2005. The study ability model. The Finnish Student Health Service (FSHS). ([http://www.yths.fi/filebank/692-ENG\\_OPISKELUKYKYMALLI\\_pdf.pdf](http://www.yths.fi/filebank/692-ENG_OPISKELUKYKYMALLI_pdf.pdf))

Nelson, K & Creagh T. 2013. A Good Practice Guide: Safeguarding Student Learning Engagement. Queensland University of Technology. Brisbane, Australia. ([http://safeguardingstudentlearning.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/LTU\\_Good-practice-guide\\_eBook\\_20130320.pdf](http://safeguardingstudentlearning.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/LTU_Good-practice-guide_eBook_20130320.pdf))