GENERAL INFORMATION	
Title	**Student Services (Integration Programmes)**
Key words	Disability; special educational needs (SEN); accessibility
Objectives	Serve students with SEN Provide assistance from the university
Phase of studies *(Choose all phases it applies)*	Access Retain X Graduation X Transition to work-life X
Type of degree *(Choose all degrees it applies)*	Bachelor's X Graduate X Master's X
Level *(Choose all levels it applies)*	International National Institutional X Faculty X Group X Individual X
Name of the institution	Student Services. University of Barcelona
Location *(City and country)*	Barcelona (Spain)
Short description	During the 90s the option to replace military service with specific tasks was available; one of those tasks was to assist students with SEN at university. In the late 90s this was replaced by the option of free tuition for students without disabilities who would support those that did. Over the years universities became aware that these needs must be met by the institutions themselves, that this will not only involve support - there are other needs such as adapting to the curriculum reports - and that the services must be delivered by qualified people. Following that, the FEM VIA programme was created and made available to students in 2003. In 2006 people who did not have a disability but who did have a

	doctor's report or an individual plan with secondary adaptations began to be admitted into the programme. In the 2008-09 academic year the service was integrated into SAE.
Target group/s	Students with SEN who registered, that is, those students who have specified that status in their enrolment because they have a disability certificate, are exempt from tuition fees. In addition to students who come to the service with no recognised special needs (invisible disability).
Stakeholders involved	The scientific community. As it has already been pointed out, University affiliated centres (such as CETT) are not collaborators, neither are postgraduate programmes at the University. Only undergraduate, master's degrees and doctoral degrees collaborate.
Description of the organisational process *Actors, triggering evidence, campaigns, graph… (max. 300 words)*	Information, advice and awareness aimed at the entire university community (at macro and micro levels). Provide support products in order to offer students with disabilities additional tools for their learning process. Personal support to students who need it (peer support and sign language interpreters). Accessibility through removing architectural and communication barriers. Promoting employability in collaboration with other entities. There are two main programmes in the service: The first programme is called FEM VIA (it was established at the same time as the service itself was and has been maintained over the years). It is the service's flagship programme. It serves people who have a certified disability and require certain specialised care. The second programme is entitled AVANÇA; it serves people who have a need that is recognised by a medical report or an individualised plan adapted in secondary school, in most cases students diagnosed with specific learning difficulties.

A. FORMAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

A1. ACCESS TO INFORMATION *Provide sources of information (URL, websites, literature, materials)*	www.edu.edu/sae/integracio.html
A2. TIMEFRAME *Since when has it been in use? What is its maturity level (initial,*	Since 2003 the service has been working on access for students and their adaptation to the University. This is the main task. Later, they are accompanied during that cycle and

intermediate, advanced)? Describe if there is evidence of its duration in the long rung. (max. 70 words)	the transition to higher cycles. And in employment after training.
A3. NUMBER OF STUDENTS *How many students are involved? Is the number representative considering the target group?*	During the 2015-16 academic year the service served 731 students with disabilities. The office has also collaborated with more than 80 students who have invisible disabilities. By way of comparison with recorded data, and considering the disabilities registered, 384 students were served during the 2009-10 academic year. The number of people with special needs has doubled in five years. It should however be noted that since the 2014-15 academic year, this figure has stabilised.
A4. SCALABILITY ("volume") *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)*	This type of student care programme can develop from different organisational levels. However, the optimisation of the resources necessary to provide quality services needs a student body that is large enough to enable an active operation and continued service.
A5. TRANSFERABILITY (from one context to another) *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)*	It is a standard practice in different contexts and universities, so its transferability is ensured.
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)*	Qualitative assessments of users and participants in the awareness workshops held. Service coordinator reflection on the following question: *Universities must train people and create opportunities for everyone. People with disabilities do not have to experience educational limits; institutions must be truly inclusive. However, there are times students need to be guided because a disability can be a handicap in the profession they want to study and they need to be aware of their reality. This point requires greater strengthening with universities in order to study the feasibility.*
A7. CONTACT *Who can be contacted so as to seek support and networks for implementing the practice (name, position, e-mail)?*	JORDI MOLINA SEGURA (+34) 934 035415 sae.integracio@ub.edu

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* ☐
	Half the students who enroll at the University use the service (and they maintain that use). Although the service is available to all students at the beginning of their studies. The rest use it for specific purposes. Those who are not specifically invited but request use of the service are those with an invisible disability (dyslexia, ADHD among others). Thus we know all those who request the service, but we do not know all of those from this group who are enrolled.			

B1.2 Rights *Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)* *(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?)*	*Very weakly* ☐	*Weakly* ☐	*Well* ☐	*Very well* X
	The first premise of the service is to agree with the data with which we work. Students, as they are of legal age, have the autonomy to decide whether they want to participate in the programme or not. The student's autonomy and responsibility is respected and fostered.			

B1.3 Access *Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)* *(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))*	*Very weakly* ☐	*Weakly* ☐	*Well* X	*Very well* ☐
	We do well compared to our immediate environment. But if we compare ourselves with the rest of Northern Europe, the United States and Canada, we have fewer resources. We also have fewer resources (in regard to the number of students we serve) than other universities in the other autonomous communities. The problem we found is that there are activities that use up most of the service's resources (such as sign language interpreters) and that means that other actions or issues cannot be addressed.			

B1.4 Equity *Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)* *(how if it openly demystifies and decodes dominant university cultures, processes, expectations and language for differently prepared cohorts)*	Very weakly ☐	Weakly ☐	Well ☐	Very well ☐
	The main aim of this programme is to promote equal opportunities of students with disability and SEN in the university. Therefore, equity is one of the main principles of this good practice.			

B1.5 Participation *Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)* *(how it has led to socially inclusive practices. How does it increase students' sense of belonging and connectedness?)*	Very weakly ☐	Weakly ☐	Well ☐	Very well ☐
	As other similar programmes this one try to guarantee the inclusion and participation of students with disability and SEN.			

B2. COLLABORATION *Describe what kind of collaboration there is between various stakeholders. (max. 70 words)*	We collaborate with other universities in Catalonia through UNIDISCAT. We also collaborate with other universities in the rest of Spain through SAPDU. And particularly with the UNIVERSIA, PREVENT and ONCE Foundations, or the ONCE resource centre (ONCE CRE).
B3. STUDENT SATISFACTION *Describe the student perception of this initiative. Is there evidence of their satisfaction? (see also A6.1) (max. 200 words)*	Results from the qualitative assessments carried out by students at the end of each course show us that we can be satisfied with the work we do. The perception we have from the expressions received is positive.
B4. STUDENT WELLBEING *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)*	They particularly appreciate the fact that the service exists. The support that is available (whether they use the service or not) encourages them during their transition to university and their integration into it. In fact, at the beginning of the year (the first year) they used the service more than in the other years. Once they have integrated and know they have the support of the university itself they feel more secure and their need for the service decreases.

C. FINAL REFLECTIONS (based on the previous description of you good practice)

Success factors *What are the factors required for the successful implementation? (max. 200 words)*	The professionalisation of the service and its continuity and visibility in the university.

Sustainability *What is needed for the practice to sustain? What resources are required? How it contributes to environmental, economic or social sustainability? (max. 200 words)*	The service's incorporation into the university makes it sustainable. Given the number of students we serve, we believe that a greater human resources platform is required in order to contribute to the equity of the university, and a greater involvement of teaching policies (it lacks a regulatory framework). It would also be ideal to have more funding as there are actions and requests by users that cannot be carried out which are necessary. As mentioned, a large part of the funding is spent on interpreters who are very necessary, but there are other requests that we cannot currently respond to (such as accompaniment to the bathrooms).
Challenges *What are the constraints identified? How easy it is to learn and implement? (max. 200 words)*	Another big challenge is adaptation of the actual curricular content, that is analysing the feasibility of subjects depending on the person and what things are necessary for the group or individuals. Today, we can only provide suggestions for the information to reach all types of students or adaptation for tests, possible deadlines, etc. But it would be helpful to have specific knowledge of each subject in order to offer individualised training that meets the needs of each student. Studying the feasibility of the proposal and ensuring and guaranteeing minimum knowledge acquisition from the education provided.

Sources

Kunttu, K. 2005. The study ability model. The Finnish Student Health Service (FSHS). (http://www.yths.fi/filebank/692-ENG_OPISKELUKYKYMALLI_pdf.pdf)

Nelson, K & Creagh T. 2013. A Good Practice Guide: Safeguarding Student Learning Engagement. Queenslad University of Technology. Brisbane, Australia. (http://safeguardingstudentlearning.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/LTU_Good-practice-guide_eBook_20130320.pdf)