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INTELECTUAL OUTPUT 1

Guide of Standards of Inclusion for University Students with Disabilities

# Introduction

According to article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), States Parties must ensure that persons with disabilities are able to access tertiary education, vocational training, adult education and lifelong learning without discrimination and on an equal basis with others.[[1]](#footnote-1) To this end, the Convention sets forth the obligations of the States Parties to ensure that, among other things, the persons with disabilities receive the support required and reasonable accommodation is provided.

All European countries, as well as the European Union itself as a supranational organization, have ratified the Convention and its optional protocol. Since then, States Parties have been developing public policies to ensure the social inclusion of persons with disabilities, in particular in the areas of education and employment. However, there is a disparity between the different Member States of the European Union regarding the implementation of educational strategies and universal access that facilitate and promote the access and the participation of persons with disabilities in higher education.[[2]](#footnote-2) Some countries have been pioneers in achieving progress in this area, removing barriers for learning, and promoting the participation of all persons in educational and vocational activities. Others, however, have failed to provide the support and the reasonable accommodations required to ensure equal educational opportunities and remove the gaps of inequality associated to disabilities. Consequently, the inclusion indicators for university students with disabilities in the European Union continue to show inequality and discrimination, as the percentage of young persons with disabilities that have access to higher education is still low according to the results obtained by Díez et al. (2011) and Rodríguez y Álvarez (2016).[[3]](#footnote-3),[[4]](#footnote-4)

Europe 2020 Strategy[[5]](#footnote-5), the European Union’s agenda for growth and employment, demanded efforts to reduce the drop-out rate in the educational system to 10%. In the same line, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of the United Nations in their Sustainable Development Goals[[6]](#footnote-6) 10, 8, 4, and 11, protect the rights of persons with disabilities (over one billion people worldwide) to promote sustainable development. Goal 4, for example, establishes the need to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education to promote learning opportunities for all, and Goal 8 urges countries to promote inclusive and sustainable growth and full and productive employment for all.

Furthermore, in there General Comment Nº 4 “On the right to inclusive education”, the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities[[7]](#footnote-7) has described the European scenario as worrying, emphasizing that in various Member States, many young persons with disabilities do not have access to an inclusive and quality education. Consequently, students with disabilities are still marginally represented in mobility programmes, which are critical for quality education and for competing and meeting the professional requirements of today’s employment scenario.

A study conducted within the project co-funded by Erasmus+KA3, EPFIME, responded by 1134 students from 30 European countries, highlights the mobility challenges faced by university students with disabilities, and conversely, the advantages of such experiences, through the comments of the students: “As a result of the lack of information on disability, I decided not to study abroad. I was afraid I would not have the appropriate services.” “In the city where I lived during the exchange programme, I found a new perspective concerning blindness …I acquired better social and mobility skills.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

Another study promoted by ONCE Foundation on the international mobility of university students with disabilities in Spain showed the positive impact of participating in a mobility programme for university students with disabilities. These experiences help them improve their autonomy, their skills and professional expectations, and their employment opportunities.[[9]](#footnote-9)

For all these reasons, with the aim of promoting inclusion in universities and facilitating the international mobility of university students with disabilities in Europe, Erasmus+ European Network of Inclusive Universities (EUni4All-Network), a project coordinated by ONCE Foundation, is being conducted since November 2019. Other entities participating in this initiative are the University of Eastern Finland, the University of Trieste (Italy) the Lublin University of Technology (Poland), the University of Porto (Portugal), the European Disability Forum (EDF) and the Spanish University of Murcia, Autonomous University of Madrid, and University of Seville.

The objective of this project is to develop a new tool to encourage the inclusion of persons with disabilities in higher education; promote their inclusion in the university community supporting both faculty and administrative staff in order to respond to diversity; promote the international mobility among students with disabilities and raise awareness within the university community regarding accessibility and social inclusion of young persons with disabilities.

The ultimate goal of the project is to build a European network of universities working for inclusion to serve as a reference for students with disabilities. For this purpose, in this first phase, a guide of standards of inclusion has been drafted based on all the documents, reports, and recommendations of international organizations, universities and other educational institutions.

The purpose of this document is to serve as a guide that provides useful information to students with disabilities seeking international mobility options and to allow universities to think about their policies and actions concerning inclusion, adopt measures to improve, and share practices that inspire other universities.

The UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: "Inclusion and education: All means all" warns precisely of the need to intensify actions to guarantee inclusive educational systems, since inequality gaps are increasing in many regions of the world. Moving towards a more inclusive education is one of the main challenges of our time. “Inclusion in education is about ensuring that every learner feels valued and respected and can enjoy a clear sense of belonging. Yet many hurdles stand in the way of that ideal. Discrimination, stereotypes and alienation do exclude many.”[[10]](#footnote-10)

When speaking of inclusion, this project coincides with what is stated in the UNESCO report and in our definition we include all the students without exception. However, as our objectives indicate, we will focus on students with disabilities and their specific rights defended in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.[[11]](#footnote-11) This is one of the groups historically most excluded from the educational system and with difficulties in accessing higher education, according to the aforementioned studies. For this reason and according to the mission of the ONCE Foundation and EDF (European Disability Forum), fighting for the social inclusion of people with disabilities, we will focus on this group.

The expected outcomes of the EUni4All-Network are:

1. Creation of the Guide of Standards of Inclusion for Students with Disabilities.
2. Creation of a European Network of universities working for the inclusion of students with disabilities (European Network of inclusive universities).
3. Creation of workshops and teaching materials to promote teacher education for faculty in terms of inclusion.
4. Creation of a web platform identifying the European universities contained in the network, to facilitate useful information for university students with disabilities interested in participating in a mobility programme. These universities will be able to share their good practices and access the good practices of other countries and institutions.

One of the aims of this Guide of Standards of Inclusion for university Students with Disabilities (formerly called Report on Standards of Inclusion for European Universities) is to encourage European universities to advance in the process of reviewing their culture, policies, and practices within the framework of the right to inclusive education, thus contributing to improve the quality and excellence of universities. Please note that this guide is solely a self-assessment tool for universities, not a mechanism to control universities, nor does it entail any form of ranking or evaluation system.

The end beneficiaries of this guide and this project are the students with disabilities who, through a web platform, will be able to access quality information that will contribute to improve their decision making in terms of their mobility options and university studies.

The guide we are introducing has had ample participation of experts, universities and students. It consists of 38 indicators and measures, examples of evidence and standards for European universities to be able to rate themselves and learn about their strengths and areas for improvement concerning inclusion. We trust it will prove to be a useful tool for universities. It is expected that at least 56 European universities will respond the questionnaire proposed. Once the results of these universities are received, the project partners will proceed to analyse the information and prepare reports highlighting opportunities for improvement, which will be shared in the interactive web-based platform of the programme and will serve as a guide for students with disabilities. Additionally, these results will be useful for other universities to be able to assess their own standards and adopt measures to advance in their paths towards inclusion.

This publication also contains an account of the methodology and the phases of preparation of the Guide of Standards (literature review, discussion sessions, exchange among all project partners and consultation with experts); a description of the guide, (also called tool or questionnaire); the methodology used for the analysis of the results of the universities’ self-assessment; the guide of standards with rubrics, the criteria used for the distribution of countries by the partners and for selecting the universities that are invited to respond the questionnaire in each country. The questionnaire that universities will receive with the instructions and a glossary of the terms used are attached.

# Methodology and process of development of the Guide of Standards of Inclusion for university Students with Disabilities

This section discusses the process used for developing the Guide of Standards of Inclusion for University Students with Disabilities (originally called “Report on Standards of Inclusion for Universities.”).

The four phases of development of the guide, which are described and analysed below, involved a literature review, discussion and exchange sessions among project partners, and consultation with experts.

## First Phase

The objective of this phase was to make a first delimitation of dimensions and fundamental indicators of a university that is considered inclusive. These indicators will serve both European universities to evaluate themselves and students with disabilities who intend to carry out international mobility.

Two complementary strategies were used for this purpose: a review of academic literature on the topic, and a proposal of essential indicators based on the analysis performed by experts.

### A. Identification of indicators from academic literature review

The project initially presented was committed to relay in few sources, such as the article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the MobiAbility project. However, in order to provide a more rigorous guide, the partners in charge of the Intellectual output 1 decided to conduct a wider literature review to learn about the indicators used in other studies for assessing the inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education settings.

In order to be included in this review, studies had to meet the following criteria: had to deal with inclusion in higher education institutions and formulate indicators to assess it. Therefore, the articles reviewed that focused on primary or secondary education or did not involve the drafting of indicators were excluded.

A search was conducted in the following databases: *Education Source*, *ERIC*, *PsycINFO*, *PsycARTICLES*, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences, *SCOPUS* and *Dialnet*.

Additionally, the following journals were reviewed: Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, Higher Education, Studies in Higher Education, Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, International Journal of Inclusive Education and European Journal of special needs education.

Two criteria were used for the search: key words and publication date. The terms used in the search were: *higher education, disability, inclusion, indicators* and *university*. As for publication dates, the search was limited to publications made from 2010 onwards.

As a result of the search, 533 articles were identified. Table 1 shows data on the articles identified using the methods above.

1. Search of databases and journals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Databases and journals  | Number of results |
| *Education Source*, *ERIC*, *PsycINFO*, *PsycARTICLES*, Psychology and Behavioral Sciences; SCOPUS; Dialnet | 336 |
| Specialized journals (see list above)  | 197 |

After reading the title and abstract,24 articles were identified that met the above criteria. After reading the articles in full, seven were excluded because they contained specific indicators for elementary or secondary education. Other six were also excluded because they did not include indicators to assess inclusion in the institution, but rather assessed other issues, such as faculty and student beliefs on inclusion in their institutions.

The review then finally focused on eleven papers. All of them focused on university settings. Eight refer specifically to the inclusion of students with disabilities, while the rest deal with diversity outreach, including gender, background, economic status, language, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, etc.

1. Academic articles selected

| Article | Inclusion | Dimensions |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Buenestado-Fernandez, M., Alvarez-Castillo, J. L., Gonzalez-Gonzalez, H., & Espino-Diaz, L. (2019)[[12]](#footnote-12) | Inclusion of all persons | 1. Philosophy and policy of higher education institutions in relation to diversity outreach
2. Institutionalisation strategies aimed at the university community
3. Specific institutionalisation strategies of Teaching and Research staff
4. Specific institutionalisation strategies of administrative managers in the institution
 |
| Kutscher, E. L., & Tuckwiller, E. D. (2019)[[13]](#footnote-13) | Inclusion of persons with disabilities | 1. Engagement with faculty members
2. Social engagement
3. Awareness of available services
4. Use of available services
5. Quality of accommodations
 |
| García-Cano Torrico, M., Alós Cívico, F., Jiménez Luque, N., & Polonio de Dios, G. (2018)[[14]](#footnote-14) | Inclusion of persons with disabilities | 1. Accessibility
2. University community
3. Teacher education and practice
4. Training and internships
5. Curriculum adaptations
 |
| Márquez C, Sandoval M, Sánchez S, Simón C, Moriñas A, Morgado B, García J, Díaz V. & Elizalde B (2020)[[15]](#footnote-15) | Inclusion of all persons | 1. Culture and values
2. Transition and access
3. Accessible settings and tools
4. Student-centred learning
5. Engagement and wellbeing
6. Mobility and employability
 |
| Pérez, M. Á., Casanova, E., Hernández, M., Illán, N., Manzano, A., Martínez, M.A., Ferrándiz, C., Molina, J., Guerrero C. & Macanás, G. (2018) (2018)[[16]](#footnote-16) | Inclusion of persons with disabilities | 1. Resources, measures and actions to support Erasmus+ students with disabilities
2. Management of supportive resources
3. Student evaluation of programmes
 |
| Mesa, M. S., & García, A. I. (2015)[[17]](#footnote-17) | Inclusion of all persons | 1. Creating inclusive cultures
2. Drafting inclusive policies
3. Developing inclusive practice
 |
| Ferreira, C., Vieira, M. J., & Vidal, J (2014)[[18]](#footnote-18) | Inclusion of persons with disabilities | 1. Institutional framework
2. Access
3. Engagement
4. Information and guidance
5. Accommodations
6. Accessibility
7. Resources
 |
| Grigal, M., Hart, D., & Weir, C., (2011)[[19]](#footnote-19) | Inclusion of persons with intellectual disabilities | 1. Academic access
2. Career development
3. Campus membership
4. Self-determination
 |
| Díez Villoria, E., Alonso, A., Verdugo Alonso, M. Á., Campo Blanco, M., Sancho, I., Sánchez, S., Calvo, I. y Moral, E. (2011)[[20]](#footnote-20) | Inclusion of persons with disabilities | 1. Accessibility of documents and materials
2. Accessibility of facilities, tools and equipment
3. Web accessibility
4. Internships and activities
5. Reasonable accommodations
6. 6. Service characteristics
 |
| Shaw, S. F., & Dukes III, L. L. (2006)[[21]](#footnote-21) | Inclusion of persons with disabilities | 1. Collaboration
2. Dissemination of information
 |
| The Quality Assurance Agency UK. (2010)[[22]](#footnote-22) | Inclusion of persons with disabilities | 1. General principles
2. Physical setting
3. Information for applicants, students and staff
4. Student recruitment and admission
5. Learning and teaching
6. Tests and evaluations
7. Personal development
8. Access to general facilities and support
9. Additional specialized support
10. Confidentiality
11. Complaints
12. Monitoring and evaluation
 |

After reviewing these documents, 395 indicators were identified to assess the institutionalisation of inclusion at the university. In order to determine the importance and weight of these indicators, we selected those appearing in more than one article. After merging the indicators that assessed the same items, the initial list was cut down to 235.

In line with the main objective of this project, namely to serve as guideline for students with disabilities to foster their mobility, and after the literature review and discussion conducted by members, a decision was made to group the indicators found in the eleven papers under three major dimensions, which relate to the three stages students go through in their university experience: Access, University Life and Graduation.

The indicators under each dimension were then grouped into subdimensions:

* Access: admission process, induction, management of supportive resources, and culture and policies.
* University life: learning and education, physical accessibility, technology and information accessibility, participation, internships, research and international mobility; and,
* Graduation: employment.

### B. Identification of indicators from expert opinions

In order to agree upon and outline the indicators, a session was conducted with all project members, experts from ONCE Foundation, the European Disability Forum (EDF), the University of Eastern Finland, the University of Porto (Portugal), the University of Trieste (Italy), the Lublin University of Technology (Poland), and the Spanish Universities, University of Murcia, Autonomous University of Madrid, and University of Seville.

This session, that took place during the first international meeting of this project, was organised in *four discussion groups*, each comprised of three or four members from different organizations. One group member was responsible for coordinating the group work, consisting in agreeing upon the essential elements for the creation of indicators for the subdimension assigned. For each subdimension, group proposals were shared and discussed with the whole group, and essential indicators were agreed upon by all members.

Table 3 shows the outcomes of this discussion.

1. Outcomes of groups discussion on essential items of each subcategory

| Dimension | Subdimension | Essential items |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Access | Admission process | Accessible admission tests |
| Admission test success rate |
| Transition from secondary to higher education |
| Information about rights and support organizations |
| Induction  | Welcoming events for students with disabilities |
| Reception of new students |
| Support networks in the city area |
| Accessible student residences |
| Management of supportive resources | Support strategies for students with disabilities |
| Office offering services to students with disabilities |
| Support methodology |
| Culture and policies  | Specific university policies modified in accordance with CRPD ratification |
| The university defines inclusion in its Mission Statement in accordance with the CRPD  |
| Percentage of students with disabilities |
| Inclusion policies for faculty members and administrative staff |
| Training program on inclusion for teaching staff  |
| Quota reserved for students with disabilities |
| Tuition waivers for students with disabilities |

| Dimension | Subdimension | Essential items |
| --- | --- | --- |
| University life  | Learning and education  | There are data available on students with disabilities |
| Use of alternative evaluation methods |
| Encouragement of cooperative learning |
| Encouragement of motivation |
| Clear teaching guidelines including all relevant information |
| Training of teaching staff in Universal Design for Learning |
| Accessible materials |
| Support to teaching staff for lesson design |
| Protocols for identifying support needs |
| Alternatives for students unable to attend classes |
| Support to students in learning strategies and social skills  |
| Locations and schedules designed for all persons |
| Peer mentoring |
| Physical accessibility  | All buildings and facilities are physically accessible |
| All buildings and facilities are cognitively accessible |
| Maps and signage are designed for all persons |
| Accessible transportation |
| Accessible student residences |
| Accessibility assessment  |
| Digital accessibility | Accessibility of teaching environments |
| Accessibility of websites |
| Training of all staff in digital accessibility |
| Accessible computer workstations |
| Participation | Leisure and cultural activities for all students |
| Participation of students with disabilities in student associations |
| Participation of students with disabilities in university governance bodies |
| Accessible sports |
| Feeling of belonging to the university  |
| All activities are designed to ensure the participation of all persons |
| Data on representation of students with disabilities in different areas |
| Internships | Support services |
| Support to hosting companies or institutions |
| Agreements with companies or institutions |
| Research  | Training for research team leaders  |
| Promotion of research on disability topics |
| International mobility | Clear information and support measures |
| Disability training for staff  |
| Accessible student residences  |
| Graduation  | Employment | Information and guidance for graduate students |
| Percentage of students with disabilities in postgraduate courses |
| Information on accessible jobs  |
| Agreements with companies or institutions that employ graduate students with disabilities |
| Dropout rate of students with disabilities  |
| Information on employment rights  |
| Internships for students with disabilities |

Then, the members responsible for this first intellectual outcome of the project drafted the indicators on the basis of inputs from the above discussion. Each university worked on the indicators for one dimension, which were then discussed with the whole group. It was agreed that indicators were to be written with the following format: indicator name, description, and areas or aspects for its evaluation (Table 4).

1. Example of indicator

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Description | Areas for evaluation |
| Digital accessibility | Websites, digital platforms and mobile apps are accessible. Conformance with Double A Universal Accessibility system must be considered. Also, registration forms for enrolment and access to university services are accessible. | 1. Websites are accessible (including information on curricula and courses)
2. Website downloads are accessible (including registration forms)
3. Digital platforms are accessible (including e-administration)
4. Mobile apps are accessible
 |

Once the indicators were drafted, in order to reduce their number, overlapping indicators that assessed the same or related items were detected and merged. As a result, 37 indicators were obtained. The members then decided to group the indicators addressing cross-cutting items included in more than one dimension under a new, more general dimension called Key Institutional Policies. This dimension includes the following subdimensions: Accessibility, Normative and Operational Framework, and Training and Awareness. The indicators were organized as follows:

1. Organization of indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Dimension  | Subdimension  |
| 1. Key institutional policies
 | 1.1. Accessibility |
| 1.2. Normative and Operational Framework  |
| 1.3. Training and awareness |
| 1. Acces
 |  |
| 1. University life
 | 3.1. Learning and education  |
| 3.2. Participation |
| 3.3. Internships |
| 3.4. Research |
| 3.5. International mobility |
| 1. Graduation
 |  |

Each indicator was structured as follows: title or name, description, and areas that comprise it. These areas were defined with the aim of identifying the components of the indicator to be assessed.

After that, the decision was made to create a rubric for each indicator, which involved discussing with the group the definition of benchmarks for each indicator.

 It was also decided to request evidence for each indicator. The definitions of all these items are provided in the section below.

Table 6 shows an example of the elements of an indicator.

1. Example of indicator with rubric and standard

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 1. Accessible buildings and spaces |
| Buildings and spaces are physically and sensory accessible |
|  | MEASURE\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Score of 2(60-80% compliance in all measurable areas) | 1. Below standard (less than 60% are accessible)
2. Meets standard (60-80% are accessible)
3. Above standard (over 80% are accessible. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Academic buildings (colleges, schools, classrooms, laboratories, etc.)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Teaching and research resource facilities (libraries, computer workstations and labs)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Service buildings (dining areas, sports facilities) (Not applicable)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Administrative buildings (offices)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Campus (other than buildings)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Students residences
 | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 60% are accessible; 2. 60-80% are accessible; 3. Over 80%

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of the different areas
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing accessibility
* Information about accessible residences

Mandatory evidence:* Accessibility report from the department or person responsible for university infrastructure
* If the report is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report. If you don´t have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to show the level of accessibility in your universities
 |
| Remarks:  |

## Second Phase

The next phase consisted in sending the document containing the 37 indicators to be assessed by all the European project members. The assessment consisted in scoring each indicator for clarity and relevance, using a three-point Likert scale (much-little-none), and in terms of its suitability for the subdimension under which it was included. For “little” or “none” answers, respondents were requested to provide an alternative proposal. Also, the indicator standard was evaluated through the question: Do you consider the standard proposed suitable? If the answer was no, we requested the respondent to provide an appropriate standard (see Table 7). Finally, a question was included at the end of the document on whether the respondent considered that the guide was missing any essential indicator. If so, experts were required to say which one (see Table 8).

All contributions were gathered and organized for further discussion. Based on this input, changes and adjustments were made to the document.

1. Evaluation of indicator name, definition and measures

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Much | Little | None |
| Relevance (importance and usefulness of indicator for the purposes of the guide) |  |  |  |
| Clarity (of indicator wording and of proposed measure)  |  |  |  |
| Suitability for the dimension in which it is included |  |  |  |
| Remarks:If the response is “little” or “none”, please indicate an alternative proposal |
| Standard evaluation:Do you consider the standard proposed is suitable? YES/NOIf NO, please indicate a standard you consider suitable: |

1. Final evaluation of the tool

|  |
| --- |
| General remarks:Please state if you consider the guide is missing any essential indicator: Yes/NoIf YES, please indicate which one: |

## Third phase

The last stage of the drafting of the final document involved consultation with external national and international experts. The group of experts consulted was formed by faculty staff from various universities, disability experts, former mobility students with disabilities, a student association focusing on mobility of students with disabilities, and networks dedicated to disability or mobility issues.

 These experts were requested to provide the same assessment as project members in relation to relevance, clarity and suitability of the indicators for the respective subdimension, as well as the suitability of the standard proposed. Again, all feedback was collected, discussed and used as input to make the final changes and adjustments to the document.

Finally, the document was organized around 38 indicators, divided into four major dimensions and eight subdimensions, as shown in Table 9.

1. Final document structure

| DIMENSION | SUBDIMENSION | INDICATOR |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES
 | 1.1. Accessibility | 1. Accessible buildings and facilities
 |
| 1. Cognitively accessible buildings and spaces
 |
| 1. Accessible transportation
 |
| 1. Digital accessibility
 |
| 1. Support resources for students with disabilities
 |
| 1.2. Normative and operational framework | 1. Specific regulations for students with disabilities
 |
| 1. Inclusion plan for students with disabilities
 |
| 1. Students Services protocol
 |
| 1. Coordination between services and resources
 |
| 1. Disability office, unit or services
 |
| 1. Tuition and fee waivers
 |
| 1.3. Training and awareness | 1. Community awareness
 |
| 1. Teaching staff training and innovation
 |
| 1. Training and orientation to administrative, technical, and service staff
 |
| 1. ACCESS
 |  | 1. Transition and induction programmes
 |
| 1. Accessible admission tests
 |
| 1. Reserved quota
 |
| 1. Information on students with disabilities
 |
| 1. UNIVERSITY LIFE
 | 3.1. Learning and education | 1. Accessible content and materials
 |
| 1. Inclusive methodologies
 |
| 1. Inclusive assessment systems
 |
| 1. Counselling services
 |
| 1. Orientation plan and personalized tutoring
 |
| 1. Peer support systems
 |
| 3.2. Participation | 1. Participation in cultural and university extension activities
 |
| 1. Participation of students with disabilities in university governance bodies and student associations
 |
| 1. Physical activity and sports
 |
| 1. Protocols for the prevention of harassment in the university community
 |
| 3.3. Internships | 1. External internships
 |
| 3.4. Research | 1. Research and PhD program
 |
| 1. Teaching and research staff with disabilities
 |
| 3.5. International mobility  | 1. Participation in mobility programmes
 |
| 1. Mobility grants and support resources
 |
| 1. Inclusion of international students in mobility programmes
 |
| 1. Events for international students in mobility programmes
 |
| 1. GRADUATION
 |  | 1. Career orientation and information services
 |
| 1. Specific programmes to promote employment for students with disabilities.
 |
| 1. Graduate follow-up
 |

# Description of the guide of standards

## General Structure

The Guide is organized around four dimensions: Key Institutional Policies, Access, University Life, and Graduation.

Dimensionsare the general areas of assessment, which in the case of *Key Institutional Policies and University Life*, have been broken into subdimensions. These are further defined through 38 indicators**.** Table 10 shows this general organization.

1. Dimensions, subdimensions and indicators of the *Guide*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Dimensions | Subdimensions | Indicators |
| 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES
 | 1.1. Accessibility | 1-5 |
| 1.2. Normative and Operational Framework  | 6-11 |
| 1.3. Training and awareness | 13-14 |
| 1. ACCESS
 |  | 15-19 |
| 1. UNIVERSITY LIFE
 | 3.1. Learning and Education | 20-24 |
| 3.2. Participation | 25-28 |
| 3.3. Internships | 29 |
| 3.4. Research | 30- 31 |
| 3.5. International Mobility  | 32-35 |
| 1. GRADUATION
 |  | 36-38 |

Each indicatoris structured as follows:

* A *definition* that outlines what the indicator is intended to assess. With the aim of explaining key concepts included in the indicators, we have drafted a glossaryof terms. The terms included in the glossary are underlined in the text (in the online version glossary definitions may be accessed directly).
* Some indicators identify several related *settings,* which should be assessed separately.
* A *measure* that indicates the degree of achievement or development of the indicator in the institution. The measure format may vary for each indicator.
* If the indicator or any of its settings are not applicable to a particular institution, a “Not Applicable” option is available. In this case, the respondent is required to provide an explanation in the *Remarks* section.
* The institution is requested to provide *evidence*, such as documents, links, etc., to justify the assessment given. The *Guide* contains examples of possible forms of evidence that may be offered by the university. In some cases, certain mandatory documents or links are required, such as where to find information, contact data, or the specific services covered by the university. The criteria for determining these *mandatory evidence* is that they represent information of special relevance for students with disabilities.
* A section for *remarks* to write any relevant comments.

An example of an indicator is presented below:

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 22. Counselling serviceThe university has a counselling service for all students, including students with disabilities, to support their learning process (e.g., study techniques, social skills, etc.) |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. There is no counselling service
 | 1. There is only a service for students with disabilities
 | 1. There is a service for all students, which is also available for students with disabilities
 |   | * 1. Below standard (there is no counselling service)
	2. Meets the standard (there is only a service for students with disabilities)3
	3. Above standard (there is a service for all students, which is also available for students with disabilities. Good practice)
 |
| The university has a counselling service for all students, including students for disabilities, to support their learning process  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* + Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities regarding the support received
* Mandatory evidence:
* Link to the learning and education counselling service site or contact
 |
| Remarks:  |

## Final university assessment: tool output

How will the degree of compliance with each indicator be assessed?

In line with the objectives of the Guide of building a “Network of universities working for inclusion” and contributing to the improvement of higher education institutions, it is necessary to define the general criteria to be met by universities.

For this purpose, each indicator is linked to:

* A standardthat defines the minimum expected compliance of the indicator by the university.
* A rubricused for the assessment of the university for each indicator, and which results from the relation of the measure score and the standard.

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 1. Accessible buildings and spaces |
| Buildings and spaces are physically and sensory accessible |
|  | MEASURE\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Score of 2(60-80% compliance in all measurable areas) | 1. Below standard (less than 60% are accessible)
2. Meets standard (60-80% are accessible)
3. Above standard (over 80% are accessible. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Academic buildings (colleges, schools, classrooms, laboratories, etc.)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Teaching and research resource facilities (libraries, computer workstations and labs)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Service buildings (dining areas, sports facilities) (Not applicable)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Administrative buildings (offices)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Campus (other than buildings)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Students residences
 | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 60% are accessible; 2. 60-80% are accessible; 3. Over 80%

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of the different areas
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing accessibility

Mandatory evidence:* Accessibility report from the department or person responsible for university infrastructure Report from the university’s accessibility department or responsible entity. If the report is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report. If you don´t have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to show the level of accessibility in your universities
 |
| Remarks:  |

What will be the final tool output?

The final output for the university is mainly qualitative. Specifically:

* A detailed report structured around the tool dimensions, subdimensions and indicators, with a *general assessment* of each indicator, resulting from the application of the rubric to the measures reported by the institution for that indicator. The assessment will have three possible values: below standard; meets standard or above standard /good practice.
* A *final report* or *conclusions* with more specific details on strengths and areas for improvement, including any relevant recommendations.

# Standards of inclusion for University students with disabilities

This document presents the *Guide of Standards for the Inclusion of University Students with Disabilities* devised to provide students with disabilities with a useful tool and quality information on European universities to improve decision-making concerning their studies and possible mobility.

Once the Intellectual Output 1 is finished, the 9 partners of this project will be in charge of 3 or 4 countries of the European Union, and will invite universities of these countries to answer the questionnaire presented below, but in a digital format. Once the partners receive the results of these universities, they will proceed to analyse the information and write the reports. The results of these reports will be included interactively on the program's web-platform and will serve as a guide for students with disabilities.

Below you will find the guide, which is organized around the following dimensions and subdimensions.

Each indicator has:

* A *measure* that may vary for each indicator: dichotomous YES/NO questions or Likert Scale.
* A *standard* that defines the minimum expected compliance with the indicator
* A *rubric* that helps with the assessment of the university’s compliance with the indicator and which results from the relation between the measure score and the standard.
* A section for *remarks*
* A request for *evidence,* namely documents or links to be provided by the university to justify the assessment given. The Guide contains examples of possible forms of evidence that may be offered by the university. In some cases, certain mandatory documents or links are required, such as where to find information, contact data, or the specific services covered by the university. The criteria for determining this *mandatory evidence* is that they represent information of special relevance for students with disabilities.

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 1. Accessible buildings and spaces |
| Buildings and spaces are physically and sensory accessible |
|  | MEASURE\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Score of 2(60-80% compliance in most measurable areas) | 1. Below standard (less than 60% in most areas)
2. Meets standard (60-80% in most areas)
3. Above standard (over 80% are accessible in most areas. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Academic buildings (colleges, schools, classrooms, laboratories, etc.)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Teaching and research resource facilities (libraries, computer workstations and labs)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Service buildings (dining areas, sports facilities) (Not applicable)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Administrative buildings (offices)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Campus (other than buildings)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Students residences
 | N/A |  |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 60 % are accessible; 2. 60-80% are accessible; 3. Over 80%

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of the different areas
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing accessibility
* Information about accessible residences

Mandatory evidence:* Accessibility report from the department or person responsible for university infrastructure
* If the report is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report. If you don´t have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to show the level of accessibility in your universities
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 2. Cognitively accessible buildings and spacesEasy-to-read formats are used in all campus facilities. Signage, signs and maps are designed for all persons (plain language, infographics, and icons).  |
|  | MEASURE\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Score of 2(25-50% compliance in most measurable areas) | 1. Below standard (less than 25% are accessible)
2. Meets the standard (25-50% are accessible)
3. Above standard (over 50% are accessible. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Academic buildings (colleges, schools, classrooms, laboratories, etc.)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Teaching and research resource facilities (libraries)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Service buildings (dining areas, sports facilities)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Administrative buildings (offices)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Campus (other than buildings)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Students residences
 | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 25% are accessible. 2. 25-50%. 3. Over 50% are accessible

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of the different areas
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing accessibility
* The university's risk and emergency management plan provides for the needs of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Accessibility report from the department or person responsible for university infrastructure Report from the university’s accessibility department or responsible entity. If the report is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report. If you don´t have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to show the level of accessibility in your universities
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 3. Accessible transportationTransportation to access the university campus is accessible. |
|  | MEASURE\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | A- 2B- 2C- 3 | 1. Below standard (50% or less in the three items)
2. Meets the standard (50 % in A and B, and over 50 % in C)
3. Above standard (over 50 % in the three items. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Public transportation that provides access to campus is accessible
 |  |  |  |
| 1. The university offers adapted transportation services to all students who need them (if not available by other means)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. The University meets the mobility needs of students with disabilities
 |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 50%; 2. 50%; 3: Over 50%

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Department or service report on transport accessibility
* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of different transportation services
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Chart of services of the unit or service responsible for the transport system

Mandatory evidence:* Report from the service responsible for organising mobility of students with disabilities. If you don´t have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to make sure that transportation is accessible for them.

If the report, document or link is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report that you think could help students. |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 4. Digital accessibilityWebsites, digital learning platforms and mobile apps are accessible. Conformance with Double A universal accessibility standards must be considered. Registration forms for enrolment and access to certain university services are accessible. |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
|  | 1. Non-conformance or level A accessibility
 | 1. Level AA accessibility
 | 1. Level AAA accessibility
 | A- 2B- 3C- 2D- 1E-Yes | 1. Below standard (A=1, B=1 or 2, C=1 and D=1)
2. Meets the standard: (A=2, B=3, C=2, D=1)
3. Above standard (A=3, B=3, C= 3, D= 2 or 3, E-Yes. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Websites are accessible (including information on curricula and courses)
 |  |  |   |
| 1. Website downloads are accessible (including registration forms)
 |  |  |   |
| 1. Digital platforms are accessible (including e-administration, and Course Management Systems such as Moodle)
 |  |  |   |
| 1. Mobile apps, such as videoconferencing systems, are accessible
 |  |  |   |
| 1. The university has a system to control the accessibility of all digital content
 | Yes | No |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* The university's own report regarding the accessibility of virtual spaces in accordance with the provisions of:

https://eurancla/ legal / content / PT / TXT /?uri=CELEX:32016L2102* Link to registration forms
* Link to information on the curricula and courses offered
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing virtual accessibility
* Availability of scientific dissemination publications in easy-to-read formats
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1 Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 5. Supportive resources for students with disabilitiesThe university has supportive resources to promote the autonomy and self-determination of students with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | 1 | 2 | 3 | A, B and C= YESA, B and C= 2 | 1. Below standard ("No" in any of the items)
2. Meets the standard ("Yes" in the three items and 2 in the three items)
3. Above standard ("Yes" in the three items and - in two or three items. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university offers a service of personal assistants
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The university offers a sign language interpreter service for deaf students
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The university offers assistive devices (i.e. PCs, computer mice, magnifiers, software, and other tools) to improve learning accessibility for students with disabilities who require them
 |  |  |  |  |  |

\*If “Yes”, please indicate percentage of demand met by the service: 1. Meets less than 50%; 2. Meets about 50%; 3. Meets over 50% of the demand

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Annual report of the support office or the service responsible for providing supportive resources to students with disabilities
* Survey of students with disabilities on the support received

Mandatory evidence:* Chart of services of the unit, service or office serving students with disabilities or the accessibility office
* Contact of the unit, service or office.

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 6. The university has specific regulations or guidelines to ensure that the needs of students with disabilities are catered for |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
|  | 1. The university has no specific regulations, no general reference to people with disabilities is made in any of its regulations, and has no budget to develop inclusive actions
 | 1. The university has some internal regulations that make general reference to students with disabilities and has no budget available for measures
 | 1. The university has regulations to guarantee the rights of students with disabilities and a budget to execute the measures provided for therein
 | 2 | 1. Below standard (the university has no regulations or budget).
2. Meets the standard (the university makes general references and does not have a specific budget)
3. Above standard (the university has specific regulations and a budget. Good practice)
 |
| The university has specific regulations for students with disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Link to university regulations (rules, statutes, etc.)
* Report of the service unit on the implementation of regulations
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 7. Plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities The university has a comprehensive inclusion plan for students with disabilities with specific actions in all areas of university life |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. The university does not have a plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities
 | 1. The university has a non-comprehensive inclusion plan without a specific budget, and/or a diversity plan that includes students with disabilities, among other groups
 | 1. The university has a comprehensive inclusion plan in place that involves all departments, schools, colleges, and all the university community, and has a specific budget to develop it
 | 2 | 1. Below standard A= 1, B= NO)
2. Meets standard (A=2, B= NO)
3. Above standard (A= 3, B= YES. Good practice)
 |
| A) Plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities |  |
| B) There is a monitoring system for the inclusion plan | YES | NO |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Report of the office that serves students with disabilities on the implementation of the plan
* Existence of an advisory body responsible for the strategic plan

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the university’s strategic plan for students with disabilities
* Contact person or link relevant for students with disabilities
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2 Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 8. Student service protocolThe university has a service and support protocol to respond to the needs of students with disabilities (interviews with technicians, provision of resources, monitoring, information to teaching staff, specialised support in administrative offices, etc.) |
| Student service protocol | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. The university has no student service protocol
 | 1. The university has a protocol to respond to the support needs and the accommodations required by the student
 | 1. The university has a protocol to provide individualised and flexible care, activated at the request of the student in order to accommodate support if required
 | 2 | 1. Below standard (the university has no protocol)
2. Meets the standard (the university has a standardised protocol)
3. Above standard (the university has a protocol to provide individualised and flexible care. Good practice)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Documentation showing the process carried out to meet the needs of the students
* Annual report from the relevant office/service on the demands and responses to support needs
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities regarding the process

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the student service and support protocol or documents

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2 Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 9. Coordination between services and resourcesThe university has a system for coordination between the different university services in order to offer comprehensive support to respond to the needs of students with disabilities, including coordination with colleges and schools. |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1. Below standard (no coordination system)
2. Meets the standard (coordination with university departments)
3. Above standard (coordination with university departments and with all the university services. Good practice).
 |
|  | There is no coordination system  | The university has a system for coordination between the disability office and the different university departments in order to offer support to respond to the needs of students with disabilities. | The university has a coordination system covering all levels: the different university departments and services, and the colleges and schools to offer comprehensive support to respond to the needs of students with disabilities. |
| Coordination between services and centres |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Strategic inclusion plans
* Protocols for coordination between services
* Report from the service responsible for coordination between services and departments on the actions carried out
* Link to or information about the unit or service that coordinates the different services and departments
* Existence of an advisory body responsible for coordination
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 10. Disability office, unit or servicesThe university has an office, unit or service (or a point of contact for information for students with disabilities) to provide care and support to students with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | 1. The university has a unit, office, service or point of contact staffed by administrative personnel only
 | 1. The university has a unit, office or point of contact, staffed by administrative and technical personnel who are specialised and qualified in the inclusion of people with disabilities
 | MEASURE 1- YESMEASURE 2-1 | 1. Below standard (there is no service in place)
2. Meets the standard (the service is staffed by administrative personnel only)
3. Above standard (the university has a unit or service staffed by administrative and technical personnel who are specialised and qualified in the inclusion of people with disabilities. Good practice)
 |
| The university has an office, unit or services to provide care and support to students with disabilities |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is “Yes”, answer Measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* Office website or contact
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework  |
| INDICATOR: 11. Tuition and fee waiversThe university offers students with disabilities financial assistance for tuition and other fees in accordance with internal or country regulations |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | 1. The university offers reductions in fees and costs to students with disabilities | 2. The university offers fee reductions and tuition waivers to students with disabilities | YES1 | 1. Below standard (the university does not offer waivers or reductions)
2. Meets the standard (the university offers reductions)
3. 3. Above standard (the university offers waivers. Good practice)
 |
| Financial assistance for fees and other costs |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is YES, answer Measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* University or government regulations related to positive actions regarding fees and prices for students with disabilities
* Summary in English of the positive actions or free education regulations
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES  |  |
| SUB-DIMENSION: 1.3. Training and awareness  |  |
| INDICATOR: 12. Community awarenessThe university conducts awareness-raising activities regarding the inclusion of persons with disabilities and universal design aimed at the entire university community |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | 1. The university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at only one of the following groups: a) students, b) administrative, technical or service staff, c) teaching staff
 | 1. The university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at only two of the following groups: a) students, b) administrative, technical or service staff, c) teaching staff
 | 1. The university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at the whole university community
 | * YES
* 2
 | 1. Below standard (the university does not conduct awareness-raising activities or these are aimed at only one of the groups)
2. Meets the standard (the university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at two of the groups)
3. 3. Above standard (the university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at the whole university community. Good practice)
 |
| The university conducts awareness-raising activities regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design aimed at the whole university community |  |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is YES, answer measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* Report, programmes or links to websites on annual awareness-raising activities aimed at the university community. Calendars, newsletters, etc.

If the information is in another language, please add a sum up in English |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.3. Training and awareness  |
| INDICATOR: 13. Teaching staff training and innovationThe university offers continuing professional development, teaching innovation programmes and teacher networks, regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YES in two items | 1. The university implements one or none of these actions
2. The university implements at least two of these actions.
3. The university mandatorily implements actions b, c and d (professional development programs, innovation programs and networks. Good practice)
 |
| 1. From time to time, the university offers workshops or courses to the teaching staff on the inclusion of persons with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |  |  |
| 1. The university provides continuing professional development programmes on the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |
| 1. The university provides teaching innovation programmes regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has teacher networks regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Information on teaching innovation programmes
* Information on teacher networks regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
* Information on courses or other training actions on universal design for learning
* Training programs on inclusive methodologies (pedagogical and e-learning)
* Teaching innovation projects related to the Tutoring Action Plan
* Training and resources for the teaching staff of the Tutoring Action Plan to support students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Link or document with information about training and/or innovation programmes

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES  |  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.3. Training and awareness  |  |
| INDICATOR: 14. Training and guidance for administrative, technical and service personnelThe university offers training and guidance for administrative, technical and service personnel on catering for diversity and special needs in the university activities |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | 1. The university does not offer any guidance or training to administrative, technical or service personnel
 | 1. The university offers guidance or training to administrative, technical or service personnel
 | 1. The university offers guidance and training for administrative, technical, or service personnel
 | YES- 2 | 1. Below standard (the university does not offer any guidance or training)
2. Meets the standard (the university offers guidance or training)
3. Above standard (the university offers guidance and training for administrative, technical, or service personnel. Good practice)
 |
| The university offers guidance and training for administrative, technical, and service personnel on catering for diversity and special needs in the university activities |  |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is YES, answer Measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:Orientation and e-learning tools available for teachers or other staff membersMandatory evidence:* Documentation or link to information on specific courses administered annually for administrative and service personnel

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |
| INDICATOR: 15. Transition and induction programmesThe university runs transition programmes from secondary to university education and has an induction plan for all new students that is accessible for students with disabilities.  |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YES to A or B | 1. The university does not run any programme or induction plan
2. The university runs transition programmes or induction plans involving one action
3. The university runs transition programmes or induction plans involving different actions; and at least one of the plans includes more than one action. Good practice
 |
| 1. The university runs transition programmes from secondary to university education (summer academic programmes and meetings, open days, orientation on higher education, peer mentoring programs) aimed at students with disabilities or general programmes that include students with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has an induction plan (welcome week, orientation days, etc.) that includes students with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Assessment of transition programs and induction plans by students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Link to information on induction and transition programmes. Description of activities

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |
| INDICATOR: 16. Accessible admission testsThe university admission test, as well as the admission tests to all other university study programs, have been designed in an accessible format, and the university provides reasonable accommodations and resources as required by persons with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | A-YESB-NO | 1. Below standard (the university makes no accommodations to admission tests for undergraduate or postgraduate studies)
2. Meets the standard (the university only makes accommodations to admission tests for undergraduate studies).
3. Above standard (the university makes accommodations to admission tests for all study levels to suit the needs of people with disabilities. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university admission tests for undergraduate studies are adapted to suit the needs of people with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university admission tests for postgraduate studies are adapted to suit the needs of people with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Report from the relevant service on the accommodations made
* Number of students who require accommodations in university admission tests
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the effectiveness and adequacy of the accommodations

Mandatory evidence:* Attach or provide link to existing university regulations on this issue
* Provide a contact of an English-speaking person relevant in this issu
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |  |
| INDICATOR 17. Reserved quota The university has a reserved quota for new students with disabilities  |
|   | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YESNO | 1. Below standard (there is no quota)
2. Meets the standard (there is a quota and is not filled)
3. 3. Above standard (there is a quota and Is filled. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university maintains a reserved quota for new students with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The quota is filled
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Percentage and number of reserved places. Percentage and number of students gaining entry through the quota

Mandatory evidence:* Report on the percentage and number of reserved places or information on how the university guarantees that students with disabilities have a place
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |
| INDICATOR: 18. Information on students with disabilities enrolledThe university includes the variable “disability” in its system of information on students enrolled at all levels of university studies |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | If YES, indicate percentage of students with disabilities enrolled: | YES in A | 1. Below standard (the university does NOT have a general information system of students with disabilities enrolled)
2. Meets the standard (the university has a general information system of students with disabilities enrolled)
3. Above standard (the university has an information system on the students with disabilities enrolled by educational level i.e. undergraduate, master’s and doctorate programmes. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university has an information system on students with disabilities enrolled at all levels of university studies
 |  |  |  |
| 1. The university has an information system on the students with disabilities enrolled by educational level i.e. undergraduate, master’s and doctorate programmes
 |  |  | If YES, indicate percentage by educational level: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Report on the number of students with disabilities enrolled

Mandatory evidence:* Information about the number or percentage of students with disabilities enrolled
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 19. Accessible content and materialsThe content, resources and materials used for teaching and learning are accessible |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | Yes to A | 1. Below standard (there are no accessibility guidelines, platforms or monitoring systems)
2. Meets the standard (there are guidelines, but no environment or monitoring system)
3. Above standard (there are guidelines, environments and monitoring systems. Good practice)
 |
| 1. There are guidelines for the development of accessible content and materials
 |  |  |
| 1. Learning environments and platforms allow for the use of different teaching and learning formats (written, audio, braille, easy read, etc.)
 |  |  |
| 1. Existence of a control or monitoring system of the accessibility of teaching documents, materials and resources
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Information from the platform showing the different options available to provide course materials in different formats (written, audio, visual)
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the accessibility of materials and content
* Control system of the accessibility of materials, teaching resources
* Data on number of teachers who value the materials positively

Mandatory evidence:* Guidelines for the development of accessible content and materials (link, document or report)

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 20. Inclusive methodologiesThe university encourages teaching staff to use systems, tools and methodologies that facilitate the participation and learning of all students, in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Design framework |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
|  | YES | NO | A: NOB: Yes andC: Yes | 1. Below standard (NO to two or three items)
2. 2.Meets the standard (NO to A, YES to B and C)
3. 3. Above standard (YES to all items. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Methodologies: The university promotes the use of methodologies that encourage participation and learning of all students (cooperative learning, peer tutoring...)
 |  |  |
| 1. Guidance is provided for teachers to make reasonable accommodations to meet the specific needs of the students
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has tools to ensure the participation of all students (online questionnaires, surveys, forums, etc.) and teaching staff are trained to use them
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Training plans on inclusive methodologies (training courses, MOOCs, etc.)
* Specify how the use of active methodologies is encouraged in teaching performance evaluations
* Guidelines or other resources for teaching staff to make accommodations to suit the needs of students with disabilities and to use inclusive methodologies in their teaching practices
* Snapshot of teaching toolkit compliant with universal design standards available for teachers
* Evaluation survey of students with disabilities that enquires on whether the university uses systems, tools and methodologies that promote participation and learning of all students, and their effectiveness
* System used by the university to verify that teaching practices conform to Universal Design principles

Mandatory evidence:* Document or link to chart of services that provide guidelines to teachers for making reasonable accommodations to suit specific student characteristics

If the information is in another language, please add a summary in English |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 21. Inclusive assessment systemsThe university offers diverse assessment methods (formats, techniques, times, etc.) that ensure equal opportunities and evaluation criteria for students with disabilities. Teaching guides contain specific information on evaluation systems to meet individual student needs |
| 1. The university requires that all courses and programmes provide diverse assessment methods
 | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. None
 | 1. Recommended
 | 1. Required
 | 2 | 1. Below standard (score of 1 in A and "NO" in B)
2. Meets the standard ("Recommended" in A, and "YES" in B)
3. Above standard ("Required" in A and "YES" in B. Good practice)
 |
| 1. Teaching guides describe and encourage the use of inclusive assessment methods (different formats, techniques, times, etc.)
 | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YES | 1. Below standard (1 in A and "NO" in B)
2. Meets the standard ("Recommended" in A, and "YES" in B)
3. Above standard ("Required" in A and "YES" in B. Good practice)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Teaching guide samples
* Evaluation or assessment templates
* University standards
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the use of assessment systems compliant with Universal Design
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 22. Counselling serviceThe University has a counselling service for all students, including students with disabilities, to support their learning process (e.g., study techniques, social skills, etc.) |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. There is no counselling service
 | 1. There is only a service for students with disabilities
 | 1. There is a service for all students, which is also available for students with disabilities
 | 2 | 1. Below standard (there is no counselling service)
2. Meets the standard (there is only a service for students with disabilities)
3. Above standard (there is a service for all students, which is also available for students with disabilities. Good practice)
 |
| The University has a counselling service for all students, including students with disabilities to support their learning process |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities regarding the support received.

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the learning and education counselling service site or contact
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 23. Orientation plan and personalised tutoringThe university has a Tutoring Action Plan (implemented by teachers) that offers personalized support to all students, including students with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. There is no Tutoring Action Plan
 | 1. There is a Tutoring Action Plan only for students with disabilities
 | 1. There is a Tutoring Action Plan for all students, including students with disabilities
 | 2 | 1. Below standard (there is no tutoring action plan)
2. Meets the standard (there is a tutoring action plan only for students with disabilities)
3. Above standard (there is a tutoring action plan for all students, including students with disabilities. Good practice)
 |
| The university has a tutoring action plan (support plan implemented by teachers) to support students with disabilities during their academic process |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Regulations concerning the Tutoring Action Plan
* Example of the information, guidance, etc. provided to teaching staff in the framework of the Tutoring Action Plan for tutoring sessions with students with disabilities
* Personalized study plan
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the Tutoring Action Plan
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1 Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 24. Peer support systemsThe university runs peer support programmes for students aimed at facilitating learning and promoting the well-being of all students, including students with disabilities. These programmes include training, evaluation, monitoring and formal recognition (mentors, peer support, volunteers)  |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. There are NO volunteer or mentoring programmes
 | 1. There are volunteer but not mentoring programmes
 | 1. There are mentoring programmes (although not fully implemented or standardised)
 | 1. There are mentoring programmes in place, with training, evaluation, monitoring and recognition
 | 3 | * 1. Below standard (there are NO volunteer or mentoring programmes, or there are volunteer but not mentoring programmes)
	2. Meets the standard (there are mentoring programmes (although not fully implemented or standardised)
	3. Above standard, (there are mentoring programmes in place, with training, evaluation, monitoring and recognition. Good practice)
 |
| The university runs peer support programmes for students aimed at facilitating learning and promoting the well-being of all students, including students with disabilities. These programmes include training, monitoring and formal recognition (mentors, peer support, volunteers) |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Existing support programmes; mentoring plan; volunteer program. Link to information and contact

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2. Participation |
| INDICATOR: 25. Participation in cultural and university extension activitiesThe university offers cultural and university extension activities (such as drama, dance or art exhibitions) that are accessible for all students, thus guaranteeing the participation of all students regardless of their abilities |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. Less than 75% of activities are accessible
 | 1. Around 75% of activities are accessible
 | 1. More than 75% of activities are accessible
 | 2 | 1. Below standard (less than 75% of activities are accessible)
2. Meets the standard (around 75% of activities are accessible)
3. 3. Above standard (more than 75% of activities are accessible. Good practice)
 |
| The university offers cultural and university extension activities (such as drama, dance or art exhibitions) that are accessible for all students, thus guaranteeing the participation of all students regardless of their abilities |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the scheduled activities
* Reports of the university cultural programming (or similar) service indicating the accessibility of the scheduled activities

Mandatory evidence:* Program of cultural and university extension activities accessible to all students. Newsletters, calendars, etc. Link to information on activities
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2. Participation |
| INDICATOR: 26. Participation of students with disabilities in university bodies and student associationsThe university encourages students, including students with disabilities, to participate in the different governing bodies, university representation entities and student associations. There are protocols and actions to encourage the participation of students with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
|  | YES | NO | A=YESB=NO | 1. Below standard ("No" in both items)
2. Meets the standard ("Yes" in A and "No" in B)
3. Above standard ("Yes" in both items. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university encourages students, including students with disabilities, to participate in the different governing bodies, university representation entities and student associations
 |  |  |
| 1. There are protocols and actions to encourage the participation of students with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Documentation showing how students with disabilities are encouraged and motivated
* Guidelines aimed at encouraging the participation of students with disabilities
* Document describing the actions implemented
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2. Participation |
| INDICATOR: 27. Physical activity and sportsThe university implements specific measures and other inclusion policies to promote physical activity and sports practice for students with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | A= YESYES in B or C | 1. Below standard ("NO" in A, B, C)
2. Meets the standard ("YES" in A and "YES" in one of the other two (B or C))
3. Above standard ("Yes" in A, B and C. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university has programmes to encourage the participation of students with disabilities in general and/or adapted sporting activities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has professional or technical sporting staff who are trained in adapted physical activities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has resources to develop adapted physical activities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Identify available programmes, resources and staff, including measures that encourage and ensure the development of adapted physical activities
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Indicate specific adaptive equipment measures, and other inclusion policies to promote physical activity and sports practice by students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Link or document to information of the sports service on physical activities and adapted or inclusive sports practice

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2. Participation |
| INDICATOR: 28. Protocols for the prevention of harassment in the university communityThere are protocols for the prevention of harassment in the university community, with a special focus on people with disabilities. Intervention, mediation, and follow-up systems are in place |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. NO protocols
 | 1. YES, there are protocols with a special focus on people with disabilities, but there is no evaluation or follow-up
 | 1. YES, there are protocols with a special focus on people with disabilities, and there is evaluation and follow-up
 | 2 | * 1. Below standard (NO protocol)
	2. Meets the standard (YES, there are protocols with a special focus on people with disabilities, but there is no evaluation or follow-up)
	3. Above standard (YES, there are protocols with a special focus on people with disabilities, and there is evaluation and follow-up. Good practice)
 |
| There are systems in place for intervening, mediating and follow-up, and harassment protocols for the entire university community, with a special focus on people with disabilities |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Example of evidence:* Harassment Protocol
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.3. Internships |
| INDICATOR: 29. External internshipsThe university offers external internships that are accessible to all students. There are support and advisory systems for students with disabilities to participate in internships outside the university. The university has support and advisory systems for hosting organisations in relation to students with disabilities. |
|   | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1. There are no support or advisory systems for students with disabilities or hosting organizations
 | 1. There are support and advisory systems for students with disabilities, but not for hosting organisations
 | 1. There are support and advisory systems for students and hosting organizations
 | 2 | 1. Below standard (there are no support or advisory systems for students or hosting organisations)
2. Meets the standard (there are support and advisory systems for students, but not for hosting organisations)
3. 3. Above standard (there are support and advisory systems for students and hosting organisations. Good practice)
 |
| The university offers external internships that are accessible to all students. There are support and advisory systems for students with disabilities to participate in internships outside the university. There are support and advisory systems for hosting organisations in relation to students with disabilities |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Example of evidence:* List of accessible businesses or centres for internships
* People or services that provide support and advice on internships to students with disabilities
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on accommodations offered
* Satisfaction survey of hosting organisations on accommodations offered

Mandatory evidence:* Documents or examples of university guidelines to hosting organizations. Link or contact to the service or resource

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.4. Research  |
| INDICATOR: 30. Research and PhD programThe university offers scholarships and grants for university students with disabilities applying for doctorate and/or research programmes. The university has teams or groups engaged in research in the field of inclusion, accessibility and the rights of persons with disabilities. The university conducts knowledge transfer projects on inclusion and the wellbeing of persons with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YES to A | 1. Below standard (the university does not have a quota for students with disabilities applying for PhD and/or research programmes and does not conduct research or knowledge transfer projects on inclusion and the rights of persons with disabilities)
2. Meets the standard, (the university has a quota for students with disabilities applying for PhD and/or research programmes)
3. Above standard (the offer of scholarships and grants includes a quota for students with disabilities applying to doctorate and/or research programmes and has research teams and/or knowledge transfer programmes on inclusion and the rights of persons with disabilities. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university offers scholarships and grants for university students with disabilities applying for doctorate and/or research programmes
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has groups or teams engaged in research in the field of inclusion, accessibility and/or rights of persons with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university conducts knowledge transfer projects on inclusion and the rights of persons with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Number of grants
* Number of students engaged in these programs

Mandatory evidence:* University internal regulations: reserved quotas for persons with disabilities for scholarships/grants. Links or documents of university calls
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.4. Research  |
| INDICATOR: 31. Teaching and research staff with disabilitiesThe university has reserved quotas for the access of persons with disabilities to teaching and/or researcher positions. The university offers support measures for teaching and research staff with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YES to A | 1. Below standard (The university does not have a reserved quota for persons with disabilities to access teaching or research positions, or protocols or measures to support teaching and research staff with disabilities)
2. Meets the standard (the university has a reserved quota for people with disabilities to access teaching or research positions)
3. Above standard (the university has a reserved quota for persons with disabilities to access teaching or research positions, and support protocols and measures are in place for teaching and research staff with disabilities)
 |
| 1. The university has reserved quotas for people with disabilities to access teaching or research positions
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has a support system for the university's teaching and research staff
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* + University employment offers with reserved quota of teaching and research positions for persons with disabilities. Employment offer documents or link
	+ Support protocol or measures for teaching and research staff with disabilities

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5. International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 32. Participation in mobility programmesThe university offers activities and takes steps to guarantee and encourage the participation of students with disabilities in international mobility programmes.The university runs information and orientation services for students with disabilities about mobility programmes and the opportunities open to them |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | If YES, indicate the percentage of students with disabilities participating in international mobility programmes compared with the percentage of students without disabilities | The percentage of students with disabilities taking part in mobility programmes in relation to the percentage of students without disabilities in those programmes is 30% | 1. Below standard (the percentage of students with disabilities taking part in mobility programmes in relation to the percentage of students without disabilities in those programmes is less than 30%)
2. Meets the standard (the percentage of students with disabilities taking part in mobility programmes in relation to the percentage of students without disabilities in those programmes is 30%)
3. Above standard (the percentage of students with disabilities taking part in mobility programmes in relation to the percentage of students without disabilities in those programmes is over 30%). Good practice
 |
| * The university offers activities and takes steps to guarantee and encourage the participation of students with disabilities in international mobility programmes
 |  |  |
| * The university runs information and orientation services for students with disabilities about mobility programmes and the opportunities open to them
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Number of students participating in mobility programs
* Forums
* Awareness actions led by student associations
* Supports offered by the university to students participating in mobility programs in other countries

Mandatory evidence:* List and description of the programs and/or actions developed. Link to information or document on mobility options for students with disabilities

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5. International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 33. Mobility grants and support resourcesThe university offers complementary grants to support the international mobility of students with disability and provides them with the support services they need to take part in mobility programs |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | 1. The current grant offer covers less than 30% of the demand from students with disabilities
 | 1. The current grant offer covers between 30% and 60% of the demand from students with disabilities
 | 1. The current grant offer covers more than 60% of the demand from students with disabilities
 | Measure 1- YESMeasure 2- 2 | 1. Below standard (less than 30% of the demand is covered)
2. Meets the standard (30% to 60% of the demand is covered)
3. Above standard (more than 60% of the demand is covered. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university offers mobility grants
 |  |  |

\*If the answer is YES, answer Measure 2 as appropriate

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2If the answer is YES, indicate YES or NO in the following items (multiple options may be selected): | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | Support on administrative matters | Support staff | Information on accessibility of services and tools | MEASURE 1- YESMEASURE 2- YES in two of the three items | 1. Below standard: "NO" in all 3 items or "YES" in only one item
2. Meets the standard: "YES" in two items
3. Above standard: "Yes" in the three items. (Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university provides students with the necessary support tools and services to participate in mobility programmes (YES/NO)
 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Number of grants and description of resources. Link to grant information
* Support actions to find accommodation

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5. International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 34. Inclusion of international students in mobility programmesThe university welcomes students with disabilities from other international universities and offers support services,including reasonable accommodations. |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
|  | YES | NO | If YES, indicate the percentage of students with disabilities from other European universities in mobility programs that arrive compared to the percentage of students without disabilities from other European universities in those programs: | Measure 1- YESMeasure 2= 30% | 1. Below standard (the percentage of students with disabilities from other European universities taking part in mobility programmes compared to the percentage of students without disabilities from other European universities in those programmes is less than 30%)
2. Meets the standard (the percentage of students with disabilities from other universities taking part in mobility programmes compared to the percentage of students without disabilities from other European universities in those programmes is 30%)
3. Above standard (the percentage of students with disabilities from other European universities taking part in mobility programmes compared to the percentage of students without disabilities from other European universities in those programmes is more than 30%). Good practice
 |
| The university welcomes students with disabilities from other European universities and offers support services, including reasonable accommodations |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence**:*** List of students with disabilities from other countries
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities and number of students who evaluate their experience positively.

Mandatory evidence:* Student associations that offer information and support to mobility students. If any, add link or contact information
* Procedure for the induction of new students (Protocol)
* Chart of specific support services provided to students with disabilities, including adjustments and reasonable accommodations. (contact details and/or link of relevant office, unit or service)

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5. International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 35. Events for international students in mobility programsThe university and the student associations organize accessible events and take into consideration the needs of international students with disabilities for the development of university extension, cultural and leisure activities.  |
|  | MEASURE 1 | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| The university and the international student associations organise accessible events and take into consideration the needs of students with disabilities for developing cultural and leisure activities. | 1. Less than 40% of activities are accessible
 | 1. 40-60% of activities are accessible
 | 1. Over 60% of activities are accessible
 | 2. 40-60% of activities are accessible | 1. Below standard (Less than 40% of university extension, cultural and leisure activities organised are accessible)
2. Meets the standard (40-60% of university extension, cultural and leisure activities organised are accessible)
3. Above standard (Over 60% of university extension, cultural and leisure activities organised are accessible) Good practice
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Description of training and support actions provided by the university to student association

Mandatory evidence:* Link to information on events and actions conducted and/or associations of Erasmus students that support this mobility process (newsletters, calendars about past events, etc.)
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 4. GRADUATION |
| INDICATOR: 36. Career orientation and information servicesThe university has, and offers to students with disabilities, information, orientation and advisory services on training and career opportunities. The university provides students with the necessary support and experience to find and keep a job |
|  | MEASURE 1 | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YES in two of the three items | 1. Below standard: "NO" in all 3 items or "YES" in only one item
2. Meets the standard: "Yes" in two items
3. Above standard: "Yes" in the three items. (Good practice)
 |
| 1. Information and advisory services on training and career opportunities, including students with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. Support and experience required to find and keep a job
 |  |  |
| 1. Job tutors and mentors to help the transition of university students with disabilities to employment
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Agreements with companies or organizations that receive students with disabilities
* Satisfaction surveys of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the service, unit or website where job information is offered
* Employment programs accessible to students with disabilities link or documentation

Please add a summary in English, if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 4. GRADUATION |
| INDICATOR: 37. Specific programs to promote employment for students with disabilitiesThe university arranges and offers specific services and programs to improve employability and employment support for people with disabilities and informs them of their employment rights.The university partners with companies and institutions to encourage training and employment offers for persons with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 If the answer is YES, indicate YES or NO in the following items (multiple options may be selected) | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
|  | YES | NO | Preferential internships for people with disabilities | Prior information about employment rights | Specific job offers for people with disabilities | Pre-employment training for people with disabilities | Accommodations for jobs with partner companies | MEASURE 1- YESMEASURE 2- YES IN THREE ITEMS | 1. Below standard: (Measure 1 "No" or Measure 1 "Yes" and Measure 2 "Yes” in only 1 or 2 items)
2. Meets the standard (Measure 1 "Yes"
3. Measure 2 "Yes" in 3 items) Above standard (Measure 1 "Yes" and Measure 2 "Yes" in 4 or 5 items (Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university arranges and offers specific services and programs to improve employability and provide employment support for people with disabilities and informs them of their employment rights.
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The university partners with companies and institutions to encourage training and employment offers for people with disabilities
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Agreements with companies that receive students with disabilities
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities about the existing employment programs and the support received from the university
* Number of students participating in internships with hosting companies

Mandatory evidence:* Link or documents to the list of employment programs and services and list of companies participating in the program

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 4. GRADUATION |
| INDICATOR: 38. Graduate follow-upThe university has a follow-up system of graduates with disabilities and measures their employment rate in compliance with the National Data Protection Law  |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2If “YES”, indicate the number of graduates with disabilities and their employment rate | STANDARD | RUBRIC |
| YES | NO | YESNO | 1. Below standard (there is no system to monitor and measure the employment rate)
2. Meets the standard (a monitoring system is in place, but the employment rate is not measured)
3. Above standard (a system is in place to monitor graduates with disabilities and to measure their employment rate. Good practice)
 |
| 1. The university has a system to monitor the employment of graduates with disabilities
 |  |  |  |
| 1. There is a measure of the employment rate of students with disabilities
 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Information on the monitoring system for graduates with disabilities, if any
* Official university data on graduates with disabilities and their employment level. If any, please provide link
 |
| Remarks:  |

# Procedure for the selection of universities

In this document we describe the criteria for the distribution of countries of the European Union (EU) among the partners and for the selection of the universities in each country that will be invited to answer the questionnaire.

## Distribution of countries between partners

To distribute the countries of the EU among partners we classified them in large, medium and small according to their population (See table 11).

1. Population by country[[23]](#footnote-23)

| UE countries | Population by January 1º 2020 - total |
| --- | --- |
| Germany | 83166711 |
| France | 67098824 |
| United Kingdom[[24]](#footnote-24) | 66796807 |
| Italy | 60244639 |
| Spain  | 47329981 |
| Poland  | 37958138 |
| Romania | 19317984 |
| Netherlands | 17407585 |
| Belgium  | 11549888 |
| Greece | 10709739 |
| Czechia | 10693939 |
| Sweden | 10327589 |
| Portugal | 10295909 |
| Hungary | 9769526 |
| Austria | 8901064 |
| Bulgaria | 6951482 |
| Denmark | 5822763 |
| Finland | 5525292 |
| Slovakia | 5457873 |
| Ireland  | 4963839 |
| Croatia | 4058165 |
| Lithuania | 2794090 |
| Slovenia | 2095861 |
| Latvia | 1907675 |
| Estonia | 1328976 |
| Cyprus | 888005 |
| Luxembourg | 626108 |
| Malta | 514564 |

Each partner was assigned a country from each of these categories. The final distribution is displayed in table 12.

1. Distribution of countries of the EU between partners

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PARTNER | EU COUNTRY 1 | EU COUNTRY 2  | EU COUNTRY 3 | EU COUNTRY 4  |
| University of de Seville | Germany | Greece  | Ireland  |  |
| Autonomous University of Madrid | France | Czech Republic | Croatia |  |
| University of Porto  | United Kingdom  | Portugal  | Lithuania |  |
| University of Trieste | Italy  | Sweden | Slovenia |  |
| University of Murcia  | Spain  | Hungary | Latvia  |  |
| Lublin University of Technology | Poland  | Austria | Estonia |  |
| Fundación Once  | Romania | Denmark | Cyprus |  |
| University of Eastern Finland | Netherlands | Finland | Luxembourg |  |
| European Disability Forum | Belgium | Slovakia | Malta  | Bulgaria |

## Selection of Universities in each country

For the selection of universities to be assessed we wanted to prioritize those with an inclusive culture that receive a high number of mobility students. Also, we wanted to include both universities and polytechnics and reach for institutions from different regions of each country, ensuring that specific characteristics of different areas are covered.

For this selection we used the information provided by the EU Commission about all the European Universities receiving students with disabilities.

With this data as a basis we use two other sources of information as filters for the selection. In the first place we used a ranking of the European universities that receive more students with disabilities. Secondly, a list with the top 40 EU institutions that receive the most mobility students. Both sources of data were provided by the SEPIE (Spanish Service for the Internationalization of Education) and correspond to 2017.

In addition to these criteria, each partner could suggest universities with experience in inclusion, based on experts from the different countries.

# APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire

### Instructions for completing this questionnaire

* We recommend that this questionnaire is completed by the existing strategic planning offices or similar in the universities. In any case, it must be a person appointed by the university with institutional representation at the rector's level. It could be answered by more than one person.
* Each indicator has a *definition* that outlines what the indicator is intended to assess. With the aim of explaining key concepts included in the indicators, we have drafted a glossaryof terms (See appendix 2). The terms included in the glossary are underlined in the text (in the online version glossary definitions may be accessed directly).
* Some indicators identify several related *settings,* which should be assessed separately.
* All the indicators have a *measure* that indicates the degree of achievement or development of the indicator in the institution. The measure format may vary for each indicator.
* If the indicator or any of its settings are not applicable to a particular institution, a “Not Applicable” option is available. In this case, the respondent is required to provide an explanation in the *Remarks* section.
* The institution is requested to provide *evidence*, such as documents, links, etc., to justify the assessment given. The *Guide* contains examples of possible forms of evidence that may be offered by the university. In some cases, certain mandatory documents or links are required, such as where to find information, contact data, or the specific services covered by the university. The criteria for determining these mandatory evidences is that they represent information of special relevance for students with disabilities.
* There is a section for remarks, at the end of each indicator (after the evidence request) to write any relevant comments in each one of the indicators.
* We understand that each university and the normative of each country are different. If you feel that the procedures of your universities (or your country) are no reflected in some of the indicators descriptions or the evidences requested please explain in the remarks box and add the evidence that you consider necessary. For example, in indicator 11 it could be that you don´t have tuition waivers because studying in your country is free of charge. In this case your answer should be “YES” (you offer tuition and free waivers) and the situation should be explained in the “remarks” box.
* If you have any doubts when responding the questionnaire, please always think of the information that is going to be useful for students.

### Dimensions

#### 1st dimension: Key institutional policies

This dimension is cross-cutting to the other two dimensions and encompasses physical, technological, accessibility to information and communication and sensory accessibility in Higher Education Communities.

#### 2nd dimension: Access

This dimension encompasses all aspects related to access to Higher Education as a student.

#### 3rd dimension: Higher Education and college life

This dimension encompasses de life of the student in Higher Education community, including research and international mobility.

#### 4th dimension: Graduate

This dimension encompasses access to information about career development plan and employment.

##### Interfaz de usuario gráfica, Texto, Aplicación  Descripción generada automáticamenteExample of an indicator in the digital Guide

By clicking on the words in blue you can access the meaning of the term

By clicking in the question mark you can access the description of the indicator











|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 1. Accessible buildings and spaces[[25]](#footnote-25)Buildings and spaces are physically and sensory accessible |
|  | MASURES |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. Academic buildings (colleges, schools, classrooms, laboratories, etc.)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Teaching and research resource facilities (libraries, computer workstations and laboratories)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Service buildings (dining areas, sports facilities)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Administrative buildings (offices)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Campus (other than buildings)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Students residences
 | N/A |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 60 % are accessible; 2. 60-80% are accessible; 3. Over 80%

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of the different areas
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing accessibility
* Information about accessible residences

Mandatory evidence:* Accessibility report from the department or person responsible for university infrastructure

If the report is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report. If you don´t have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to show the level of accessibility in your universities |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 2. Cognitively accessible buildings and spaces[[26]](#footnote-26)Easy-to-read formats are used in all campus facilities. Signage, signs and maps are designed for all persons (plain language, infographics, and icons).  |
|  | MEASURE |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. Academic buildings (colleges, schools, classrooms, laboratories, etc.)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Teaching and research resource facilities (libraries)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Service buildings (dining areas, sports facilities)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Administrative buildings (offices)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Campus (other than buildings)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Students residences
 | N/A |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 25% are accessible. 2. 25-50%. 3. Over 50% are accessible

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of the different areas
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing accessibility
* The university's risk and emergency management plan provides for the needs of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Accessibility report from the department or person responsible for university infrastructure Report from the university’s accessibility department or responsible entity

If the report is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report. If you don't have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to show the level of accessibility in your universities |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 3. Accessible transportation[[27]](#footnote-27) Transportation to access the university campus is accessible. |
|  | MEASURE\* |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. Public transportation that provides access to campus is accessible
 |  |  |  |
| 1. The university offers adapted transportation services to all students who need them (if not available by other means)
 |  |  |  |
| 1. The University meets the mobility needs of students with disabilities
 |  |  |  |

\* 1. Less than 50%; 2. 50%; 3: over 50%

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Department or service report on transport accessibility.
* Graphic documentation showing accessibility of different transportation services
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Chart of services of the unit or service responsible for the transport system

Mandatory evidence:* Report from the service responsible for organising mobility of students with disabilities. If you don´t have a report you can show any document or link that will be useful for students to make sure that transportation is accessible for them

If the report, document or link is not in English please add a sum up in English with the main information of the report that you think could help students |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 4. Digital accessibility[[28]](#footnote-28)Websites, digital learning platforms and mobile apps are accessible. Conformance with Double A universal accessibility standards must be considered. Registration forms for enrolment and access to certain university services are accessible. |
|  | MEASURE |
|  | 1. Non-conformance, or level A accessibility
 | 1. Level AA accessibility
 | 1. Level AAA accessibility
 |
| 1. Websites are accessible (including information on curricula and courses)
 |  |  |   |
| 1. Website downloads are accessible (including registration forms)
 |  |  |   |
| 1. Digital platforms are accessible (including e-administration, and Course Management Systems such as Moodle)
 |  |  |   |
| 1. Mobile apps, such as videoconferencing systems, are accessible
 |  |  |   |
| 1. The University has a system to control the accessibility of all digital content
 | Yes | No |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* The university's own report regarding the accessibility of virtual spaces in accordance with the provisions of: https://eur ancla / legal / content / PT / TXT /?uri=CELEX:32016L2102
* Link to registration forms
* Link to information on the curricula and courses offered
* Survey of students with disabilities assessing virtual accessibility
* Availability of scientific dissemination publications in easy-to-read formats
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.1. Accessibility |
| INDICATOR: 5. Supportive resources for students with disabilities[[29]](#footnote-29)The university has supportive resources to promote the autonomy and self-determination of students with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* |
| YES | NO | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. The university offers a service of personal assistants
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The university offers a sign language interpreter service for deaf students
 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The university offers assistive devices

(i.e. PCs, computer mice, magnifiers, software, and other tools) to improve learning accessibility for students with disabilities who require them |  |  |  |  |  |

\*If “Yes”, please indicate percentage of demand met by the service. 1. Meets less than 50%. 2. Meets about 50%; 3. Meets over 50% of the demand

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Annual report of the support office or the service responsible for providing supportive resources to students with disabilities
* Survey of students with disabilities on the support received

Mandatory evidence:* Chart of services of the unit, service or office serving students with disabilities or the accessibility office.
* Contact of the unit, service or office.

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 6. The university has specific regulations or guidelines to ensure that the needs of students with disabilities are catered for[[30]](#footnote-30) |
|   | MEASURE |
| 1. The university has no specific regulations, no general reference to people with disabilities is made in any of its regulations, and has no budget to develop inclusive actions
 | 1. The university has some internal regulations that make general reference to students with disabilities and has no budget available for measures
 | 1. The university has regulations to guarantee the rights of students with disabilities and a budget to execute the measures provided for therein
 |
| The university has specific regulations for students with disabilities |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Link to university regulations (rules, statutes, etc.)
* Report of the service unit on the implementation of regulations
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 7. Plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities[[31]](#footnote-31)The university has a comprehensive inclusion plan for students with disabilities with specific actions in all areas of university life |
|  | MEASURE 1 |
|  | 1. The university does not have a plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities
 | 1. The university has a non-comprehensive inclusion plan without a specific budget, and/or a diversity plan that includes students with disabilities, among other groups
 | 1. The university has a comprehensive inclusion plan in place that involves all departments, schools, colleges, and all the university community, and has a specific budget to develop it. This plan follows the European regulation EN 17161: 2019. Design for all
 |
| 1. Plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities
 |  |  |  |
|  | MEASURE 2 |
| 1. There is a monitoring system for the inclusion plan
 | YES | NO |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Report of the office that serves students with disabilities on the implementation of the plan
* Existence of an advisory body responsible for the strategic plan

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the university’s strategic plan for students with disabilities
* Contact person or link relevant for students with disabilities
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 8. Student service protocol[[32]](#footnote-32)The university has a service and support protocol to respond to the needs of students with disabilities (interviews with technicians, provision of resources, monitoring, information to teaching staff, specialised support in administrative offices, etc.) |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. The university has no student service protocol
 | 1. The university has a protocol to respond to the support needs and the accommodations required by the student
 | 1. The university has a protocol to provide individualised and flexible care, activated at the request of the student in order to accommodate support if required
 |
| Student service protocol  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Documentation showing the process carried out to meet the needs of the students
* Annual report from the relevant office/service on the demands and responses to support needs
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities regarding the process

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the student service and support protocol or documents

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 9. Coordination between services and resources[[33]](#footnote-33)The university has a system for coordination between the different university services in order to offer comprehensive support to respond to the needs of students with disabilities, including coordination with colleges and schools |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  | There is no coordination system  | The university has a system for coordination between thedisability office and the different university departments in order to offer support to respond to the needs of students with disabilities | The university has a coordination system covering all levels: the different university departments and services, and the colleges and schools to offer comprehensive support to respond to the needs of students with disabilities |
| Coordination between services and centres |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Strategic inclusion plans
* Protocols for coordination between services
* Report from the service responsible for coordination between services and departments on the actions carried out
* Link to or information about the unit or service that coordinates the different services and departments
* Existence of an advisory body responsible for coordination
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework |
| INDICATOR: 10. Disability office, unit or services[[34]](#footnote-34)The university has an office, unit or service (or a point of contact for information for students with disabilities) to provide care and support to students with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* |
| YES | NO | 1. The university has a unit, office, service or point of contact staffed by administrative personnel only
 | 1. The university has a unit, office or point of contact, staffed by administrative and technical personnel who are specialised and qualified in the inclusion of people with disabilities
 |
| The university has an office, unit or services to provide care and support to students with disabilities |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is “Yes”, answer Measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* Office website or contact
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.2. Normative and operational framework  |
| INDICATOR: 11. Tuition and fee waivers[[35]](#footnote-35)The university offers students with disabilities financial assistance for tuition and other fees in accordance with internal or country regulations |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* |
| YES | NO | 1. The university offers reductions in fees and costs to students with disabilities
 | 1. The university offers fee reductions and tuition waivers to students with disabilities
 |
| Financial assistance for fees and other costs |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is YES, answer Measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* University or government regulations related to positive actions regarding fees and prices for students with disabilities
* Summary in English of the positive actions or free education regulations
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.3. Training and awareness  |
| INDICATOR: 12. Community awareness[[36]](#footnote-36)The university conducts awareness-raising activities regarding the inclusion of persons with disabilities and universal design aimed at the entire university community.  |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* |
| YES | NO | 1. The university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at only one of the following groups: a) students, b) administrative technical or service staff, c) teaching staff
 | 1. The university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at only two of the following groups: a) students, b) administrative technical or service staff, c) teaching staff
 | 1. The university conducts awareness-raising activities aimed at the whole university community
 |
| The university conducts awareness-raising activities regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design aimed at the whole university community |  |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is YES, answer measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* Report, programmes or links to websites on annual awareness-raising activities aimed at the university community. Calendars, newsletters, etc.

If the information is in another language, please add a sum up in English  |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.3. Training and awareness  |
| INDICATOR: 13. Teaching staff training and innovation[[37]](#footnote-37)The university offers continuing professional development, teaching innovation programmes and teacher networks, regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning.  |
|  | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. From time to time, the university offers workshops or courses to the teaching staff on the inclusion of persons with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |  |  |
| 1. The university provides continuing professional development programmes on the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |
| 1. The university provides teaching innovation programmes regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has teacher networks regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Information on teaching innovation programmes
* Information on teacher networks regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities and universal design for learning
* Information on courses or other training actions on universal design for learning
* Training programs on inclusive methodologies (pedagogical and e-learning)
* Teaching innovation projects related to the Tutoring Action Plan
* Training and resources for the teaching staff of the Tutoring Action Plan to support students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Link or document with information about training and/or innovation programmes

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 1. KEY INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 1.3. Training and awareness  |
| INDICATOR: 14. Training and guidance for administrative, technical and service personnel[[38]](#footnote-38) The university offers training and guidance for administrative, technical and service personnel on catering for diversity and special needs in the university activities. |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2\* |
| YES | NO | 1. The university does not offer any guidance or training to administrative, technical or service personnel
 | 1. The university offers guidance or training to administrative, technical or service personnel
 | 1. The university offers guidance and training for administrative, technical, or service personnel
 |
| The university offers guidance and training for administrative, technical, and service personnel on catering for diversity and special needs in the university activities |  |  |  |  |  |

\*If the answer is YES, answer Measure 2

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Orientation and e-learning tools available for teachers or other staff members

Mandatory evidence:* Documentation or link to information on specific courses administered annually for administrative and service personnel

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |
| INDICATOR: 15. Transition and induction programmes[[39]](#footnote-39)The university runs transition programmes from secondary to university education and has an induction plan for all new students that is accessible for students with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. The university runs transition programmes from secondary to university education (summer academic programmes and meetings, open days, orientation on higher education, peer mentoring programs) aimed at students with disabilities or general programmes that include students with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has an induction plan (welcome week, orientation days, etc.) that includes students with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Assessment of transition programs and induction plans by students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Link to information on induction and transition programmes. Description of activities

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |
| INDICATOR: 16. Accessible admission tests[[40]](#footnote-40)The university admission test, as well as the admission tests to all other university study programs, have been designed in an accessible format, and the university provides reasonable accommodations and resources as required by persons with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. The university admission tests for undergraduate studies are adapted to suit the needs of people with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university admission tests for postgraduate studies are adapted to suit the needs of people with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Report from the relevant service on the accommodations made
* Number of students who require accommodations in university admission tests
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the effectiveness and adequacy of the accommodations.

Mandatory evidence:* Attach or provide link to existing university regulations on this issue
* Provide a contact of an English speaking person relevant in this issue
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |
| INDICATOR: 17. Reserved quota[[41]](#footnote-41)The university has a reserved quota for new students with disabilities  |
|  | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. The university maintains a reserved quota for new students with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The quota is filled
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Percentage and number of reserved places. Percentage and number of students gaining entry through the quota

Mandatory evidence:* Report on the percentage and number of reserved places or information on how the university guarantees that students with disabilities have a place
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 2. ACCESS |
| INDICATOR: 18. Information on students with disabilities enrolled[[42]](#footnote-42)The university includes the variable “disability” in its system of information on students enrolled at all levels of university studies |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 If YES, indicate percentage of students with disabilities enrolled: |
| YES | NO |  |
| The university has an information system on students with disabilities enrolled at all levels of university studies |  |  |  |
| If YES, indicate percentage by educational level: |
| The university has an information system on the students with disabilities enrolled by educational level i.e. undergraduate, master’s and doctorate programmes |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Report on the number of students with disabilities enrolled

Mandatory evidence:* Information about the number or percentage of students with disabilities enrolled
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 19. Accessible content and materials[[43]](#footnote-43)The content, resources and materials used for teaching and learning are accessible |
|  | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. There are guidelines for the development of accessible content and materials
 |  |  |
| 1. Learning environments and platforms allow for the use of different teaching and learning formats (written, audio, braille, easy read, etc.)
 |  |  |
| 1. Existence of a control or monitoring system of the accessibility of teaching documents, materials and resources
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Information from the platform showing the different options available to provide course materials in different formats (written, audio, visual)
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the accessibility of materials and content
* Control system of the accessibility of materials, teaching resources
* Data on number of teachers who value the materials positively

Mandatory evidence:* Guidelines for the development of accessible content and materials (link, document or report)

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION:3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 20. Inclusive methodologies[[44]](#footnote-44)The university encourages teaching staff to use systems, tools and methodologies that facilitate the participation and learning of all students, in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Design framework.  |
|  | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. Methodologies: The university promotes the use of methodologies that encourage participation and learning of all students (cooperative learning, peer tutoring...)
 |  |  |
| 1. Guidance is provided for teachers to make reasonable accommodations to meet the specific needs of the students
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has tools to ensure the participation of all students (online questionnaires, surveys, forums, etc.) and teaching staff are trained to use them
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Training plans on inclusive methodologies (training courses, MOOCs, etc.)
* Specify how the use of active methodologies is encouraged in teaching performance evaluations
* Guidelines or other resources for teaching staff to make accommodations to suit the needs of students with disabilities and to use inclusive methodologies in their teaching practices
* Snapshot of teaching toolkit compliant with universal design standards available for teachers
* Evaluation survey of students with disabilities that enquires on whether the university uses systems, tools and methodologies that promote participation and learning of all students, and their effectiveness
* System used by the university to verify that teaching practices conform to Universal Design principles

Mandatory evidence:* Document or link to chart of services that provide guidelines to teachers for making reasonable accommodations to suit specific student characteristics

If the information is in another language, please add a summary in English |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 21. Inclusive assessment systems[[45]](#footnote-45)The university offers diverse assessment methods (formats, techniques, times, etc.) that ensure equal opportunities and evaluation criteria for students with disabilities. Teaching guides contain specific information on evaluation systems to meet individual student needs |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. The university requires that all courses and programmes provide diverse assessment methods
 | 1. None
 | 1. Recommended
 | 1. Required
 |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. Teaching guides describe and encourage the use of inclusive assessment methods (different formats, techniques, times, etc.)
 | YES | NO |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Teaching guide samples
* Evaluation or assessment templates
* University standards
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the use of assessment systems compliant with Universal Design
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 22. Counselling service[[46]](#footnote-46)The university has a counselling service for all students, including students with disabilities, to support their learning process (e.g., study techniques, social skills, etc) |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. There is no counselling service
 | 1. There is only a service for students with disabilities
 | 1. There is a service for all students, which is also available for students with disabilities
 |
| The university has a counselling service for all students, including students with disabilities to support their learning process |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities regarding the support received

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the learning and education counselling service site or contact
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 23. Orientation plan and personalised tutoring[[47]](#footnote-47)The university has a Tutoring Action Plan (implemented by teachers) that offers personalized support to all students, including students with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. There is no Tutoring Action Plan
 | 1. There is a Tutoring Action Plan only for students with disabilities
 | 1. There is a Tutoring Action Plan for all students, including students with disabilities
 |
| The university has a tutoring action plan (support plan implemented by teachers) to support students with disabilities during their academic process |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Regulations concerning the Tutoring Action Plan
* Example of the information, guidance, etc. provided to teaching staff in the framework of the Tutoring Action Plan for tutoring sessions with students with disabilities
* Personalized study plan
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the Tutoring Action Plan
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.1. Learning and Education |
| INDICATOR: 24. Peer support systems[[48]](#footnote-48)The university runs peer support programmes for students aimed at facilitating learning and promoting the well-being of all students, including students with disabilities. These programmes include training, evaluation, monitoring and formal recognition (mentors, peer support, volunteers)  |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. There are NO volunteer or mentoring programmes
 | 1. There are volunteer but not mentoring programmes
 | 1. There are mentoring programmes (although not fully implemented or standardised)
 | 1. There are mentoring programmes in place, with training, evaluation, monitoring and recognition
 |
| The university runs peer support programmes for students aimed at facilitating learning and promoting the well-being of all students, including students with disabilities. These programmes include training, monitoring and formal recognition (mentors, peer support, volunteers) |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Existing support programmes; mentoring plan; volunteer program. Link to information and contact

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2. Participation |
| INDICATOR: 25. Participation in cultural and university extension activities[[49]](#footnote-49)The university offers cultural and university extension activities (such as drama, dance or art exhibitions) that are accessible for all students, thus guaranteeing the participation of all students regardless of their abilities. |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. Less than 75% of activities are accessible
 | 1. Around 75% of activities are accessible
 | 1. More than 75% of activities are accessible
 |
| The university offers cultural and university extension activities (such as drama, dance or art exhibitions) that are accessible for all students, thus guaranteeing the participation of all students regardless of their abilities. |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on the scheduled activities
* Reports of the university cultural programming (or similar) service indicating the accessibility of the scheduled activities

Mandatory evidence:* Program of cultural and university extension activities accessible to all students. Newsletters, calendars, etc. Link to information on activities
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2 Participation |
| INDICATOR: 26. Participation of students with disabilities in university bodies and student associations[[50]](#footnote-50)The university encourages students, including students with disabilities, to participate in the different governing bodies, university representation entities and student associations. There are protocols and actions to encourage the participation of students with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE |
|  | YES | NO |
| 1. The university encourages students, including students with disabilities, to participate in the different governing bodies, university representation entities and student associations
 |  |  |
| 1. There are protocols and actions to encourage the participation of students with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Documentation showing how students with disabilities are encouraged and motivated
* Guidelines aimed at encouraging the participation of students with disabilities
* Document describing the actions implemented
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2. Participation |
| INDICATOR: 27. Physical activity and sports[[51]](#footnote-51)The university implements specific measures and other inclusion policies to promote physical activity and sports practice for students with disabilities |
|   | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. The university has programmes to encourage the participation of students with disabilities in general and/or adapted sporting activities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has professional or technical sporting staff who are trained in adapted physical activities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has resources to develop adapted physical activities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Identify available programmes, resources and staff, including measures that encourage and ensure the development of adapted physical activities
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Indicate specific adaptive equipment measures, and other inclusion policies to promote physical activity and sports practice by students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence*:** Link or document to information of the sports service on physical activities and adapted or inclusive sports practice

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.2. Participation |
| INDICATOR: 28. Protocols for the prevention of harassment in the university community[[52]](#footnote-52)There are protocols for the prevention of harassment in the university community, with a special focus on people with disabilities. Intervention, mediation, and follow-up systems are in place |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. NO protocols
 | 1. YES, there are protocols with a special focus on people with disabilities, but there is no evaluation or follow-up
 | 1. YES, there are protocols with a special focus on people with disabilities, and there is evaluation and follow-up
 |
| There are systems in place for intervening, mediating and follow-up, and harassment protocols for the entire university community, with a special focus on people with disabilities |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Example of evidence:* Harassment Protocol
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE  |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.3. Internships |
| INDICATOR: 29. External internships[[53]](#footnote-53)The university offers external internships that are accessible to all students. There are support and advisory systems for students with disabilities to participate in internships outside the university. The university has support and advisory systems for hosting organisations in relation to students with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE |
| 1. There are no support or advisory systems for students with disabilities or hosting organizations
 | 1. There are support and advisory systems for students with disabilities, but not for hosting organisations
 | 1. There are support and advisory systems for students and hosting organizations
 |
| The university offers external internships that are accessible to all students. There are support and advisory systems for students with disabilities to participate in internships outside the university. There are support and advisory systems for hosting organisations in relation to students with disabilities |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Example of evidence:* List of accessible businesses or centres for internships
* People or services that provide support and advice on internships to students with disabilities
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities on accommodations offered
* Satisfaction survey of hosting organisations on accommodations offered

Mandatory evidence:* Documents or examples of university guidelines to hosting organizations. Link or contact to the service or resource

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.4. Research  |
| INDICATOR: 30. Research and PhD program[[54]](#footnote-54)The university offers scholarships and grants for university students with disabilities applying for doctorate and/or research programmes**.** The university has teams or groups engaged in research in the field of inclusion, accessibility and the rights of persons with disabilities. The university conducts knowledge transfer projects on inclusion and the wellbeing of persons with disabilities. |
|  | MEASURE  |
| YES | NO |
| 1. The university offers scholarships and grants for university students with disabilities applying for doctorate and/or research programmes
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has groups or teams engaged in research in the field of inclusion, accessibility and/or rights of persons with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. The university conducts knowledge transfer projects on inclusion and the rights of persons with disabilities
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Number of grants
* Number of students engaged in these programs

Mandatory evidence:* University internal regulations: reserved quotas for persons with disabilities for scholarships/grants. Links or documents of university calls
 |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.4. Research  |
| INDICATOR: 31. Teaching and research staff with disabilities[[55]](#footnote-55)The university has reserved quotas for the access of persons with disabilities to teaching and/or researcher positions. The university offers support measures for teaching and research staff with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE |
| YES | NO |
| 1. The university has reserved quotas for people with disabilities to access teaching or research positions
 |  |  |
| 1. The university has a support system for the university's teaching and research staff
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Mandatory evidence:* University employment offers with reserved quota of teaching and research positions for persons with disabilities. Employment offer documents or link
* Support protocol or measures for teaching and research staff with disabilities

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3.UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5. International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 32. Participation in mobility programmes[[56]](#footnote-56)The university offers activities and takes steps to guarantee and encourage the participation of students with disabilities in international mobility programmes.The university runs information and orientation services for students with disabilities about mobility programmes and the opportunities open to them |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 |
| YES | NO | If YES, indicate the percentage of students with disabilities participating in international mobility programmes compared with the percentage of students without disabilities |
| The university offers activities and takes steps to guarantee and encourage the participation of students with disabilities in international mobility programmes |  |  |  |
| The university runs information and orientation services for students with disabilities about mobility programmes and the opportunities open to them |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Number of students participating in mobility programs
* Forums
* Awareness actions led by student associations
* Supports offered by the university to students participating in mobility programs in other countries

Mandatory evidence:* List and description of the programs and/or actions developed. Link to information or document on mobility options for students with disabilities

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5 International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 33. Mobility grants and support resources[[57]](#footnote-57)The university offers complementary grants to support the international mobility of students with disability and provides them with the support services they need to take part in mobility programs |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 |
| YES | NO | 1. The current grant offer covers less than 30% of the demand from students with disabilities
 | 1. The current grant offer covers between 30% and 60% of the demand from students with disabilities
 | 1. The current grant offer covers more than 60% of the demand from students with disabilities
 |
| 1. The university offers mobility grants
 |  |  |  |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 |
|  | YES | NO | Support on administrative matters | Support staff  | Information on accessibility of services and tools |
| 1. The university provides students with the necessary support tools and services to participate in mobility programmes
 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* *Number of grants and description of resources. Link to grant information*
* Support actions to find accommodation

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5. International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 34. Inclusion of international students in mobility programmes[[58]](#footnote-58)The university welcomes students with disabilities from other international universities and offers support services,including reasonable accommodations. |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 |
|  | YES | NO | If YES, indicate the percentage of students with disabilities from other European universities in mobility programs that arrive compared to the percentage of students without disabilities from other European universities in those programs |
| The university welcomes students with disabilities from other European universities and offers support services, including reasonable accommodations |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* List of students with disabilities from other countries
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities and number of students who evaluate their experience positively

Mandatory evidence:* Student associations that offer information and support to mobility students. If any, add link or contact information
* Procedure for the induction of new students. (Protocol)
* Chart of specific support services provided to students with disabilities, including adjustments and reasonable accommodations. (contact details and/or link of relevant office, unit or service)

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 3. UNIVERSITY LIFE |
| SUBDIMENSION: 3.5. International mobility  |
| INDICATOR: 35. Events for international students in mobility programs[[59]](#footnote-59)The university and the student associations organize accessible events and take into consideration the needs of international students with disabilities for the development of university extension, cultural and leisure activities |
|  | MEAUSURE 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. Less than 40% of activities are accessible | 2. 40-60% of activities are accessible | 2. Over 60% of activities are accessible |
| The university and the international student associations organise accessible events and take into consideration the needs of students with disabilities for developing cultural and leisure activities |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities
* Description of training and support actions provided by the university to student associations

Mandatory evidence:* Link to information on events and actions conducted and/or associations of Erasmus students that support this mobility process (newsletters, calendars about past events, etc.)
 |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 4. GRADUATION |
| INDICATOR: 36. Career orientation and information services[[60]](#footnote-60)The university has, and offers to students with disabilities, information, orientation and advisory services on training and career opportunities. The university provides students with the necessary support and experience to find and keep a job |
|  | MEASURE 1 |
|  | YES | NO |
| 1. Information and advisory services on training and career opportunities, including students with disabilities
 |  |  |
| 1. Support and experience required to find and keep a job
 |  |  |
| 1. Job tutors and mentors to help the transition of university students with disabilities to employment
 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Agreements with companies or organizations that receive students with disabilities
* Satisfaction surveys of students with disabilities

Mandatory evidence:* Link to the service, unit or website where job information is offered
* Employment programs accessible to students with disabilities link or documentation.

Please add a summary in English, if the information is in another language |
| Remarks:  |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 4. GRADUATION |
| INDICATOR: 37. Specific programs to promote employment for students with disabilities[[61]](#footnote-61)The university arranges and offers specific services and programs to improve employability and employment support for people with disabilities and informs them of their employment rights.The university partners with companies and institutions to encourage training and employment offers for persons with disabilities |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2If the answer is YES, indicate YES or NO in the following items (multiple options may be selected): |
|  | YES | NO | Preferential internships for people with disabilities | Prior information about employment rights | Specific job offers for people with disabilities | Pre-employment training for people with disabilities | Accommodations for jobs with partner companies |
| 1. The university arranges and offers specific services and programs to improve employability and provide employment support for people with disabilities and informs them of their employment rights
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The university partners with companies and institutions to encourage training and employment offers for people with disabilities
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Agreements with companies that receive students with disabilities
* Satisfaction survey of students with disabilities about the existing employment programs and the support received from the university
* Number of students participating in internships with hosting companies

Mandatory evidence:* Link or documents to the list of employment programs and services and list of companies participating in the program

Please add a summary in English if the information is in another language |
| Remarks: |

|  |
| --- |
| DIMENSION: 4. GRADUATION |
| INDICATOR: 38. Graduate follow-up[[62]](#footnote-62)The university has a follow-up system of graduates with disabilities and measures their employment rate in compliance with the National Data Protection Law  |
|  | MEASURE 1 | MEASURE 2 |
|  | YES | NO | If “YES”, indicate the number of graduates with disabilities and their employment rate |
| 1. The university has a system to monitor graduates with disabilities and measure their employment rate
 |  |  |  |
| 1. There is a measure of the employment rate of students with disabilities
 |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Examples of evidence:* Information on the monitoring system for graduates with disabilities, if any
* Official university data on graduates with disabilities and their employment level. If any, please provide link
 |
| Remarks:  |

APPENDIX 2: Glossary

The following intends to explain concepts included in the standards, and thus guarantee that each indicator is well understood and adequately answered by the institutions that choose to use this tool.

### General Concepts

First, we define the broad general concepts that are the framework of this document.

#### Disability

Disability is an evolving concept and results from the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers that hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.

The CRPD does not provide a definition of disability however, in article 2 it describes that persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments, which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.[[63]](#footnote-63)

#### Inclusion

In terms of education, inclusion is a process that ensures full participation and access to quality learning opportunities for all children, young people and adults, respecting and valuing diversity, and eliminating all forms of discrimination in and through education. The term inclusion represents a commitment to making preschools, schools, and other education settings, places in which everyone is valued and belongs, and diversity is seen as enriching.

Inclusive education is the result of the social model of disability articulated from a human rights perspective. It involves:

* + Reasonable accommodations made to meet the different educational needs of different children
	+ All persons have equal access
	+ Accessibility
	+ Person-centred[[64]](#footnote-64),[[65]](#footnote-65)

#### Universal design

The design of products, environments, programmes and services to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design. “Universal design” shall not exclude assistive devices for particular groups of persons with disabilities where this is needed.[[66]](#footnote-66)

#### Universal design for learning (UDL)

UDL is a set of principles, providing teachers and other staff with a structure to create adaptable learning environments and develop instruction to meet the diverse needs of all learners. It recognizes that each student learns in a unique manner and involves developing flexible ways to learn: creating an engaging classroom environment; maintaining high expectations for all students, while allowing multiple ways to meet expectations; empowering teachers to think differently about their own teaching; and focusing on educational outcomes for all, including those with disabilities. Curricula must be conceived, designed and applied to meet and adjust to the requirements of every student, and providing appropriate educational responses. Standardised assessments must be replaced by flexible and multiple forms of assessments and recognition of individual progress towards broad goals that provide alternative routes for learning.[[67]](#footnote-67)

#### Accessibility

It is a precondition for persons with disabilities to live independently and participate fully and equally in society, including the Higher Education community.

Accessibility must be addressed in all its dimensions, encompassing:

* + - physical environment;
		- transportation;
		- information and communication, including information and communication technologies;
		- learning materials, e.g., Braille and audiobooks; Sign language resources; etc.;
		- other facilities and services open or provided to the whole community.

*\*Changes to the accessibility of physical environments, curriculum adaptations or teacher training, will make it possible to monitor the progress of the transformation.*[[68]](#footnote-68)

#### Support

To guarantee the development of the full potential of people with disabilities in education, the system must offer resources and support to make their inclusion and their learning progress effective. Supports include products and technical aids, personal assistants, scholarships and financial resources, counsellors, curricular adaptations, etc.

* The need for assistance and support can fluctuate, depending on environmental factors, the stage of life, the underlying health conditions, and the level of individual functioning.
	+ Learning support: Assistive products; Individual learning plans; Individual support, personal assistants.
* Curricula must be conceived, designed and implemented in such a way as to meet and adjust to the requirements of every student, and provide appropriate educational responses. Standardized assessments must be replaced with flexible and multiple forms of assessments and the recognition of individual progress towards broad goals that provide alternative routes for learning.[[69]](#footnote-69)
	+ Accessible admission tests: they must respond to individual needs. The Higher Education Institution must take measures such as an adaptation of the time available to the student, the organization of tests from home, or the possibility of having audio materials, among others.
* With appropriate teaching methodologies, support and accommodations; all curricula can be adapted to meet the needs of all students, including those with disabilities. Inclusive student assessment systems can be strengthened through a system of individualized supports.[[70]](#footnote-70)
* Peer support refers to support from a person who has knowledge from their own experiences. According to UNESCO, Schools should have peer support groups to allow children, adolescents and adults with disabilities to share their ideas and concerns with one another.[[71]](#footnote-71)
	+ “Peer supported schemes within higher education institutions draw on elements of instruction, coaching and mentoring. In contrast to coaching or instructing, peer support does not require the supporting 'peer' to have more years of experience, just experience in the area of activity which the developing peer needs.”[[72]](#footnote-72)
	+ “Peer Supported Development Scheme (PSDS). It provides a cross-institutional framework to enable constructive dialogue to develop teaching and learning in order to further the student experience and enable staff to continue their professional development.”[[73]](#footnote-73)

According to the Committee on the Rights of Disability, States parties must recognize that individual support and reasonable accommodation are priority matters and should be free of charge at all compulsory levels of education

### Indicators vocabulary

A glossary of the terms that appear in the different indicators is presented below, in the order in which they are mentioned in the document:

#### Physical accessibility (Indicator 1)

Aims at providing a barrier-free environment for the independence, convenience and safety of all people with disabilities. Including but not limited to wheelchair users and people with limited walking abilities or reduced mobility.

The barriers may be found in signage, pathways inside the campus, curb ramps, pedestrian crossings, parking, etc.

Physical accessibility of vertical and horizontal access in both new and existing constructions encompass ramps, elevators, platform lifts, stairs, railings and handrails, entrances, vestibules, doors, corridors and restrooms.

For old existing buildings, at least one entrance per facility should be accessible to a wheelchair user. For new buildings, the accessible entrance(s) should be the main entrance(s) intended for use by the public.

All teaching, administrative and common areas should be accessible to a wheelchair user and people with reduced mobility.

Suitable arrangements should be made for stepped lecture halls or auditoriums.

At least one accessible unisex restroom should be provided in each building other than student dormitories and residential accommodations.

All recreational facilities should be usable by persons with disabilities, to the extent possible.

All library facilities and equipment should be accessible.

Sports halls should be as accessible as possible to a wheelchair user and people with reduced mobility.

At least one shower room, one restroom and one changing room per facility should be accessible to a wheelchair user or people with reduced mobility.

Spectators' seating areas should be provided for wheelchair users and some seats should be reserved for people with reduced mobility.

All public areas inside Campus such as banks, shops, waiting areas, customs areas, inquiry offices, etc. should be accessible to a wheelchair user, and people with reduced mobility wherever possible.[[74]](#footnote-74)

#### Sensory accessibility (Ind. 1)

Different types of sensory impairments affect one or more senses, sight, hearing, smell, touch, taste or spatial awareness.

Sensory disabilities could involve autism spectrum disorder (ASD); blindness and low vision; hearing loss and deafness and sensory processing disorder. Sensory accessibility includes but is not limited to high contrast, dyslexic fonts and larger text, texts in braille, tactile marks, textural changes in the footpath, floors and signs, colours and contrasts, audio induction loop, subtitling or captioning, light signals, sign language interpreters.[[75]](#footnote-75)

#### Cognitive accessibility (Ind. 2)

 Accessible information, especially for persons with learning disabilities. It could be manifested in different formats, such as easy to read and plain language. Easy read is information, which is written using simple words supported by images. Easy to read formats aims to be easier to understand than standard documents, mainly for people with a learning disability. It can be useful for other people too, for example, people with low literacy levels and / or English (language of the country providing the assessment) as a second language, people who have had a stroke or people with dementia. The images used to create easy read documents vary, for example, photographs, drawings or symbols. Different people are used to different styles of easy read, in different sectors and use of different easy read providers.

Easy read will help some people to read information independently and can help people to remember information from the conversation. The images should support people to understand the text.

Simple text is the basis for easy read. Not everyone with a learning disability wants easy to read. For example, some autistic people might find images distracting.[[76]](#footnote-76)

#### Digital accessibility (Ind. 4)

Digital accessibility should be understood as principles and techniques to be observed when designing, constructing, maintaining, and updating websites, mobile applications and virtual contents so that they can be used by people with disabilities.

The four principles of accessibility are: perceivability, meaning that information and user interface components must be presentable to users in ways they can perceive; operability, meaning that user interface components and navigation must be operable; understandability, meaning that information and the operation of the user interface must be understandable; and robustness, meaning that content must be robust enough to be interpreted reliably by a wide variety of user agents, including assistive technologies.[[77]](#footnote-77)

Digital accessibility implies, for example, that people with disabilities can navigate the network with their support instruments (voice reading, subtitling, sign language, color contrast, and easy reading).

#### Support resources (Ind. 5 and 33)

Resources available to students with disabilities. These can be support staff, such as personal assistants or interpreters, support products such as magnifying glasses, software, assistive technologies, or other tools or services. Any support measures provided must be compliant with the goal of inclusion. Accordingly, they must be designed to strengthen opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in the classroom and in out-of-school activities alongside their peers.[[78]](#footnote-78)

#### Regulations (Ind. 6)

Guidelines to guarantee attention to the needs of students with disabilities, whether they are the university own regulations, national, European or international. They could include directives, laws, decrees, regulations, plans, instructions, etc.

#### Comprehensive Inclusion Plan (Indicator 7)

Document containing measures and actions aimed at guaranteeing the rights of people with disabilities in all the university community. They are usually approved by the governing body of the university or another government body. Universities must have a specific plan for students with disabilities, which organizes, directs, and gives coherence to the supports and all forms of assistance that the university must make available to these students to ensure their educational inclusion.[[79]](#footnote-79)

#### Student service protocol (Indicator 8)

Procedure which details the way in which services are provided to students with disabilities in order to unify criteria for action. It combines flexibility and attention to the particularity of each student, with a certain systematization in the guidelines and criteria adopted. This process could involve some of the following steps or activities: initial contact, information gathering, interviews, needs assessment, development and specification of action guidelines, intervention, curricular and evaluation adaptations, follow-up, etc.[[80]](#footnote-80)

#### System for coordination (Ind. 9)

The university has established processes and systematized mechanisms for the coordination between the different schools, faculties, and services to facilitate the university life of students with disabilities according to their characteristics.

#### Teaching innovation programmes (Ind. 13)

Programs developed by universities that promote and accompany the use of innovative practices in the classroom. We understand by innovative practices the use of multi-faceted and lively teaching methods and diversified and rich content to stimulate students’ inner interest in learning, thus, developing positive student attitudes toward proactive learning and enhancing students’ learning ability.[[81]](#footnote-81)

#### Teacher networks (Ind. 13)

Approaches to teacher professional development have shifted from a top-down focus on individual improvement to bottom-up approach involving collaboration and group inquiry. In this context, teacher networks emerge as a web of relationships through which information, resources and support is exchanged. These networks are constituted as communities of active collaboration, in which practices, resources, materials, experiences and training are exchanged.[[82]](#footnote-82)

Inclusive education requires a support and resource system for teachers in educational institutions at all levels. This might include partnerships within the university or with other universities, promoting collaborative practice including team teaching, study groups, joint student assessment processes, peer support and exchange visits.[[83]](#footnote-83)

#### Admission test (Ind. 16)

Entrance examinations measure knowledge and aptitudes in certain subjects, relevant for the program, and may be considered with other factors in the admission process.[[84]](#footnote-84) These tests must be accessible for students with disabilities offering diverse assessment methods and formats.

#### Reasonable accommodation[[85]](#footnote-85) (Ind. 20 and 34)

Necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, including their right to education.

Elements:

* Is of immediate realization
* Applies in individual cases
* Applies upon request of a person with disability
* Implies an objective reasonableness test

Accessibility is related to groups, whereas reasonable accommodation is related to individuals. This means that the duty to provide accessibility is an ex-ante duty.

The duty to provide reasonable accommodation is an ex nunc duty, which means that it is enforceable from the moment an individual with an impairment needs it in a given situation. A person with a rare impairment might ask for accommodation that falls outside the scope of any accessibility standard*.*[[86]](#footnote-86)

Reasonable accommodations in the educational field may involve methodological and curricular adaptations, support and changes in the evaluation systems, among others.

#### Teaching guides (Ind. 21)

Guide for each course in which practical aspects, competencies and learning results, objectives, contents, references, methodology, evaluation systems and an indicative timetable are specified. These guides must be available and accessible for all students.

#### Counselling service (Ind. 22)

Service aimed at students that provides both information and support in the learning process through study techniques, adaptation of materials, training in social skills, etc. In the case of students with disabilities, this service must offer adequate information on support resources.

#### Tutoring action plan (Ind. 23)

Institutions should ensure that the resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate for each program offered. In addition to their teachers, students have a range of resources to help them in their learning. Among these resources is the human support in the form of tutors.[[87]](#footnote-87)

The Tutoring Action Plan is the institutional document that makes explicit the organization of the orientation and tutorials of a center, a faculty or a degree. More specifically, the Tutorial Action Plan must include actions aimed at adapting students to the institution; guiding the development of transversal and specific competences; making possible the autonomy, individual initiative and self-knowledge of each student; improving academic performance, integration and climate; informing and guiding about professional opportunities and promoting the transition to active life.[[88]](#footnote-88)

In Spain and other countries students have the right to receive personalized guidance and tutoring in the first year and during studies, to facilitate adaptation to the university environment and academic performance, as well as in the final phase in order to facilitate employment, professional development and the continuity of education.[[89]](#footnote-89)

#### University extension activities (Ind. 25)

These are extracurricular activities that allow the university to connect with society. They imply a transfer of knowledge and the development of cultural, sports and leisure activities.

University extension activities are part of an educational, cultural and scientific process that articulates, extends, develops and feeds Education and Research and enables the articulation of the ever-evolving relationship between the university and society.[[90]](#footnote-90) In order to ensure inclusion, these activities must be accessible to people with disabilities.

#### Guidelines for the participation of students with disabilities in university bodies (Ind 26)

Set of guidelines, often organized in a guide to foster participation of students with disabilities in students’ associations, and/or other managing bodies of the Higher Education Institution. In some universities there are guides to promote diversity and the inclusion of people with disabilities in different university bodies.

#### Inclusive physical activities (Ind. 27)

Are those that allow people with disabilities to carry out physical activities an equal basis with others, in the same context and, under the same rules.

#### Adapted physical activities (Ind. 27)

Are those that allow people with disabilities to carry out physical activities by making adaptations in material, spaces and regulations.

The difference is that the former allows people with disabilities to practice in inclusive settings, while the latter are designed only for people with disabilities.

Some examples of adapted activities would be wheelchair basketball and wheelchair rugby. However, there are modalities of basketball or inclusive rugby whose teams are made up of people with and without disabilities.

#### Support staff (Ind. 33)

According to article 24 of the CRPD[[91]](#footnote-91), States must provide the necessary support to guarantee the education of persons with disabilities in the regular system. This obligation includes making support staff available for people with disabilities who need it, such as integrative teachers, pedagogical peers, support teachers, therapeutic companions, support aides, non-teaching personal companions, personal assistants, sign language interpreters, among others.
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59. Description of the indicator: In a similar way to the indicator 34, this one notes if the university extension, cultural and leisure activities leaded by student associations are accessible and if they keep in mind the mobility students with disability in their program. It is mandatory to provide the link to information on events and support actions provided by the university to student associations that supports this mobility process. Also, the satisfaction surveys would serve as evidences. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
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