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Annex 1. Term of Reference

UNICEF Moldova

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Institutional Consultancy

Joint evaluation of implementation of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education 2011–2020, including application of child-friendly school's standards

Duration: April – December 2019

Location: Chisinau and selected districts

1. Background and rationale

In September 2015, the UN member states, including the Republic of Moldova, approved the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which is to be implemented over the next fifteen years to reduce all forms of poverty, combat inequalities and tackle climate change, leaving no one behind. The agenda places a special emphasis on education, which is an important mean of ensuring long-term sustainable development, particularly through the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 ‘Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’.

The National Development Strategy ‘Moldova 2030’ was the next step for integrating SDG priorities and targets into national strategic planning documents. It is aligned with 2030 Agenda and the EU Association Agreement, and it was approved by the Government in November 2018. The vision of the new strategy proposes an approach centred on humans, life level and quality of life, according to which the education system is a crucial element in the country's social and economic development, but also in the development of each and every citizen.

Concomitantly with the development of the National Development Strategy “Moldova 2030”, the mid-term review of the 2014-2020 Strategy ‘Education-2020’ has been conducted to find out how strategic directions, specific objectives and actions are anchored to the national development priorities and whether a proper mechanism was put in place to implement the Strategy ‘Education-2020’. Furthermore, an Education Sector Analysis is currently being carried out to provide up-to-date detailed evidence to complement the findings of the mid-term review of the Strategy ‘Education-2020’ for the development of the educational sector.

By ratifying a series of international acts in the field of human rights, the Republic of Moldova has undertaken basic commitments in terms of Inclusive Education. In the last decades, especially in the period 2005-2011, a normative framework was elaborated that regulates the specific aspects of the inclusion of children with disabilities and of children with special educational needs (SEN) in the education system. In 2011, the Government approved the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education in the Republic of Moldova for 2011-2020 (hereinafter ‘the Programme’). Subsequently, a Minimum Inclusive Education Package that includes resource centres and support teachers at school level was created, followed by adjustment of the per-pupil funding formula to provide two per cent of the total budget to cover the minimum inclusive education package. Psycho-pedagogical assistance services (PAS) in all the districts of the country and the Republican Centre for Psycho-pedagogical Assistance (RCPA) were created to support inclusion of children with disabilities in regular schools.

This did set the basis for promotion of inclusive education and the situation has improved slowly but steadily in the recent years. In 2017 there were 9,840 children with disabilities and children
with special education needs in regular schools, showing a fourfold increase since 2012. At the same time, the number of children in special schools decreased by two thirds, reaching 749.¹

Inclusion of children with severe disabilities in regular schools is still difficult due to many reasons, including the attitude of parents, teachers and other professionals and pupils toward having children with disabilities in regular classes. While parents are concerned about the teachers' capacity to manage time effectively during classes when there are children with disabilities in the respective classes, the teachers are concerned about not knowing how to address the needs of children with disabilities in regular classes. There is still limited instruction and knowledge on how to assess the performance of children with disabilities.

In 2018 UNICEF Moldova conducted a national representative study on Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in the Education System. The study revealed that the education system faces general problems such as shortage and fluctuation of staff, aging of the teaching staff, inadequate salary level and endowment of institutions, that negatively affects the implementation of inclusive education. Inclusion of children with mental disabilities in regular schools is still accepted on a limited basis by professionals, communities, parents etc. Even if the inclusive education reform is still ongoing, there is a need to have an evaluation of the Programme, as agreed with the Government of Moldova.

The knowledge generated by the evaluation will be used by the Government to address existing gaps and adjust reforms if needed so. The evaluation of the Programme will feed into the next education policy framework and will further contribute to the implementation of “Moldova 2030” Strategy.

The evaluation is part of the Costed Evaluation Plan², approved by UNICEF Executive Board, Second Regular Session, 12-15 September 2017 and Biannual Work Plan for 2018-2019 signed by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research and UNICEF (Outcome 1, Output 3, Activity 3.5).

2. Purpose, scope and objectives

The purpose of the assignment is to provide technical assistance and to support the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research (MECR) to conduct an independent evaluation of the implementation of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education 2011-2020.

The objective of the Evaluation is to have a proper measurement of the results achieved, determine the bottlenecks and barriers and identify best ways for further promotion of the child rights to education in the context of broad education sector reform and implementation of the inclusive education beyond the Programme, that will end in 2020. The Evaluation will address the rights of the most vulnerable children through gender and equity lens.

Given the context, the evaluation is planned to have both formative and summative purposes and will cover the period of 2011-2018.

The object of this Evaluation will be the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education 2011-2020 which aims to achieve the following four general objectives:

a) promoting inclusive education as an educational priority to avoid exclusion and/or marginalization of children, young people and adults;

b) developing regulatory, teaching and methodological framework to promote and ensure implementation of inclusive education;

---

c) creating a friendly, accessible educational environment, capable of meeting the
expectations and special needs of beneficiaries:

d) to form an inclusive culture and society.

More particularly, the evaluation will assess the results and achievements in implementing the
Programme, focused on continuous change and adaptation of the education system to respond to
the diversity of children and to the needs resulting from such diversity, to provide quality education
to everyone in integrated contexts and joint learning environments.

The implementation of the Inclusive Education Programme implies three phases:

2011 – 2012: drafting the legal framework for inclusive education development;
2013 – 2016: piloting inclusive education models;
2017 – 2020: large scale implementation of the Program.

The Evaluation will cover all these three phases. Because the Programme is reaching the middle of
the last phase and is coming to its end soon, the proposed evaluation will therefore have the
characteristics of both a summative and a formative evaluation.

The Programme will be evaluated through the lens of the “Education for All” paradigm and
application of child-friendly school standards, aiming to ensure adequate conditions and meet
educational needs of every child.

Objectives of the evaluation:

- Assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and to the extent possible,
  impact of the implementation of the Programme in terms of pedagogical, psychological,
  social and economic aspects, both on individual and society levels;
- Identify and document lessons learnt and good practices in relation to implementation,
  management, and monitoring of planned actions to achieve the results, as well as
  coordination among all involved actors;
- Assess whether application of child-friendly school standards contributed to the
  inclusiveness of children in needs and suggest what adjustments may need to be made going
  forward to respond to emerging challenges faced by children and their families to enjoy
  access to quality education;
- Provide recommendations to guide and inform the Ministry of Education, Culture and
  Research on further adjustment of the education system to make it more inclusive, based
  on the lessons learnt, good practices and reported latest trends for development of inclusive
  education and regional and global levels.

The geographical scope will include mostly nationwide implementation of the Programme. A sample
of sub-national level interventions should be considered to assess piloting and capacity building
related efforts.

The primary intended audience of this evaluation is the Government of the Republic of Moldova ·
Ministry of Education, Culture and Research, other relevant line ministries and state bodies · and
UNICEF Moldova. Other relevant audiences include local public authorities, education
institutions, CSOs active in the area of education and child protection, partner UN agencies,
development partners, independent bodies and key donors.
3. Limitations

During the planning of the Evaluation several limitations were identified which will need to be managed.

There is no sufficient monitoring and reporting mechanism in place to track the progress on implementation of the reform. Monitoring and evaluation baselines, targets etc. were not comprehensively established in advance of implementation and there could be limited data to measure outcomes, even though the Programme contains a description of evaluation and reporting procedures and indicators.

Data availability and disaggregation is another main issue of concern to track the progress and assess the situation of the most disadvantaged boys and girls.

A theory of change (ToC) needs to be retrospectively reconstructed to explain how the implementation of the Programme contributed to results chain of results that lead to the intended impacts.

Collaboration across the sectors and different stakeholders could create limitations, in particularly assessing financial coverage.

4. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

a) Considering the limitations outlined above, to the extent possible, the evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the interventions according to the following general questions3 tailored to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria4

Relevance - To what extent are the objectives of the Programme still valid and up to date to the national and international contexts? Are the objectives of the Programme consistent with the overall goal? Are implemented activities and outputs consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

Effectiveness - To what extent were the objectives (general and specific), activities and expected results at output and outcome levels achieved / are likely to be achieved? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Efficiency - Were activities and interventions cost-efficient? Were they implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? Were objectives (general and specific), activities and expected results at output and outcome levels achieved on time? Are the resources (money, human resources, facilities/ capital assets) sufficiently efficient? How well the implementation of activities has been managed? What management and monitoring tools have been used and what tools could have been used?

Sustainability – Were the achieved results and targets sustainable? Is sustainability ensured through implementation of the Programme? What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of results at output and outcome levels?

Impact criteria should be considered, and the following question answered: To what extent the implementation of the Programme had and can further impact on the access, quality and relevance of inclusive education services for the rights holders? What has happened because of the implementation of the Programme and what is the real difference made to the rights holders? How many children have been benefitting from the Programme?

b) Issues related to Gender Equality, Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming and Results-Based Management will be addressed across the evaluation questions or, if required,

---

3 Detailed evaluation questions tailored to the criteria will be developed as a part of application process and during the planning stage.

developed as specific points as per United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Guidance on Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation.\(^5\)

**c)** In addition, the following criteria and evaluation questions will be considered:

- **Coverage**: Was representativeness of coverage ensured by the activities and interventions? Have vulnerable children and their families been reached, including children left behind by migrant parents, poor and marginalised children?

- **Coordination**: What was the role of the MECR, Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection, Ministry of Finances, as well as other ministries, LPAs, CSOs, community and other key actors in the design, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the Programme? What was the role and comparative advantage of UNICEF?

- **Coherence**: What were the areas and ways of cooperation with other UN agencies and development partners regarding implementation of the Programme? Was there coherence across interventions supported by different agencies?

Evaluation questions will be further refined considering human and child rights, equity and gender equality. Additional questions will be incorporated by the Evaluation Team – if required - during the inception phase.

### 5. Methodology

The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Evaluation Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).\(^6\) The assignment will follow internationally agreed evaluation criteria as outlined above. An Evaluation Matrix will be developed to clearly define the methods and instruments to be used to answer evaluation questions. The methodology includes desk review (key documents are presented in Annex A), primary and secondary data collection and analysis.

Primary data will be collected through focus-group discussions and in-depth interviews with right-holders (parents/caregivers and students), relevant stakeholders (MECR, Directorates for Education, Youth and Sport, Psycho-pedagogical Assistance Services, NGOs etc.) and professionals (staff of the at Psycho-pedagogical Assistance Services, teachers, health professionals etc.) at national and local levels. The field work should take place both in the districts who benefitted from the overall nationally provided services and support and those that got additional support for implementation of inclusive education from various NGOs and partners in a total of at least 6 districts.

The methodology and selection will be proposed by applicants to ensure proper coverage of the respondents (duty bearers and rights holders) considering the following: sex, age, urban/rural areas, vulnerability etc.

Secondary data analysis will emerge from examination of all available data sources, such as policy and regulatory frameworks, reports on monitoring of the implemented pilots and the activity of services for support of inclusive education, and other relevant documents, administrative statistics, relevant studies and reports and take into consideration the international treaties the Republic of Moldova is part of.

The evaluation will be done in a participative manner, with close involvement of the MECR, Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection, Ministry of Finances, representatives of local public authorities, including district departments of education, civil society, professionals, teachers, and relevant developmental partners.

---


To ensure impartiality, lack of biases and data validation, the methodology will include a mix of quantitative, qualitative and other methods, including triangulation of information.

**Stakeholders' participation:** Stakeholders will be mainly involved in the evaluation process through (i) facilitation of data collection and provision of information for the analysis, and (ii) review and validation of the report. The Evaluation team will work in close consultation with the MECR, other line relevant ministries and departments and the evaluation report will be consulted with the Local Education Group (LEG) established by MECR to support the work on the Education Sector Analysis and Development Plan.

6. Ethical issues

The methodology of Evaluation must comply with UNICEF Procedure for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis. The proposed evaluation methodology and report should include a section identifying anticipated or actual ethical issues and methods to address or mitigate these issues, for example: collecting data directly from stakeholders/beneficiaries, protecting anonymity and confidentiality of individual information sources, etc.

The Contractor will be responsible for considering ethical issues concerning the participation of the rights holders (parents/caregivers, adolescents, etc.). During the field work interviews of students are envisaged. Thus, the Contractor will ensure that the process is in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines. The Contractor should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty while interacting with stakeholders and rights holders. Furthermore, the Contractor should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual information. All participants should be informed about the context and purpose of the evaluation, as well as about the confidentiality of the information shared. The Contractor can use documents and information provided only for the tasks related to these terms of reference. Data collection tools will be submitted to the external Ethical review body.

**Confidentiality:** the evaluation team should be sensitive to beliefs and act with integrity and respect to all stakeholder and ensure confidentiality of information regarding individual children/caregivers/women. The evaluation team should not share the findings of the report on individual children/caregivers or individual institutions with media.

6. Delivery and delivery dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deliverables*</th>
<th>Tentative deadlines**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

7 [https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF](https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF)

1. **Preparatory stage:**
- development of detailed work plan;
- desk review of available sources: administrative statistics, national studies, evaluations and reports, and records from relevant ministries and agencies;
- development of methodology and evaluation matrix with tailored evaluation questions and assessment tools;

| **•** Inception report containing the detailed work plan, draft methodology, evaluation matrix, and List of consulted documents for desk review |
| Expected completion: Within 4 weeks from the contract commencement |

(Translation: the Inception report will be sent for independent external review as outlined in chapter 7. Quality Assurance)

| **•** Final validated methodology, evaluation matrix and data collection instruments; |

2. **Implementation stage:**
- data collection and analysis;
- report writing, review and validation of evaluation results;
- validation workshop with key stakeholders

| **•** First draft evaluation report  
**•** Second draft evaluation report, incorporating all feedback and comments;  
**•** Slide presentation / summary of key findings and related recommendations;  
**•** Validation meeting documentation (agenda, list of participants, notes indicating the received comments/suggestions etc.) |
| Expected completion: Within 14 weeks from contract commencement |

(Translation: the Second Draft will be sent for independent external review as outlined in chapter 7. Quality Assurance)

3. **Finalization stage:**
- finalisation of the report, including  
  - translation and editing;  
  - Documentation of evaluation process

| **•** Final Evaluation report (both English and Romanian versions), including a summary;  
**•** All relevant materials related to documentation of the evaluation process. |
| Expected completion: Within 20 weeks from contract commencement |

*All deliverables will be presented in both Romanian and English (to be submitted to the national stakeholders for comments and to the external independent review to ensure the quality of the outcomes).

** Exact deadlines will be mutually agreed upon contract signature.

**Evaluation report:** The evaluation report should be clear and include the following elements: an executive summary of maximum 10 pages, a profile of the evaluated Programme, description of methodology and data collection tools, the main findings, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations, attachments (ToR, reconstructed Theory of Changes, evaluation matrix and data collection tools, list of persons interviewed etc.). The findings and conclusions of the evaluation will answer the evaluation questions. The lessons learned and the recommendations will provide the
link between the results of the evaluation and future inclusive education policies and programme adjustments and development.

The UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluation/ Child Rights Monitoring Specialist in coordination with the Education Specialist will be accountable for reviewing/approving the evaluation methodology and final evaluation outcomes.

7. Quality Assurance

The quality of all evaluation reports (Inception Report and Draft Report) will be assessed by a company external to UNICEF and will be facilitated by UNICEF Moldova. The Contractor will be responsible for ensuring that recommendations for quality improvement of the report(s) are fully addressed.

The Draft Report will be considered as a Final one only after passing through the external quality assessment, addressing all comments and having final positive rating as “Satisfactory” or “Highly Satisfactory”.

The Final Evaluation report will be also submitted to the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS) for final quality assessment with feedback provided to the UNICEF Moldova office on the quality of the evaluation (could be shared with contractors upon request).

8. Reporting requirements

All activities and deliverables undertaken by the Evaluation Team shall be discussed and planned in consultation with UNICEF and MECR, as key intended users. The Contractor is expected to deliver each component of the work plan electronically (in Word format) in the languages specified above. At each stage, the deliverable shall be sent to the UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluation/ Child Rights Monitoring Specialist and the Education Specialist by email.

9. Performance indicators for evaluation of results

The performance of work will be evaluated based on the following indicators:

- Completion of tasks specified in ToR;
- Compliance with the established deadlines for submission of deliverables;
- Quality of work (clarity, completeness, accuracy);
- Demonstration of high standards of work with UNICEF and with counterparts.

10. Qualifications and experience

The competencies required from the Contractor are the following:

**Institution:**

- National or international think-tank or research/consultancy institution with minimum of five (5) years of proven experience in evaluations of education policy implementation (examples should be provided), specialization in inclusive education is a strong asset;
- Demonstrated experience of work with Governmental institutions. Previous experience in working with the Government of the Republic of Moldova, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research is a strong asset;
- Previous work with UNICEF /other UN agencies and international organizations is an asset.

**Evaluation Team leader:**

- Advanced University Degree in Education, Social Sciences or related field;
- Minimum of 7 years of professional experience in conducting evaluations
- Proven experience in quantitative and qualitative research in education or another social field or human rights area;
• Proven knowledge of Child and Human Rights Based Approach and Result-based Management;
• Familiarity with international frameworks related to inclusive education;
• Strong analytical and report writing skills;
• Excellent mastery of English and/or Romanian, both oral and written;
• Demonstrated knowledge of the education system in Moldova is a strong asset;
• Demonstrated experience of work with the Government of the Republic of Moldova in undertaking research, evaluations, reviews in the social field is a strong asset.

The Evaluation team shall include at least one expert in inclusive education, with focus on policy development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

11. Content of technical proposal
The Technical Proposal should include but should not be limited to the following:

• Corporate Profile highlighting the institution and Evaluation team qualifications and experience matching the assignment requirements, including details of specific experience with similar assignments and evaluations conducted in the past five years, as follows:
  a) Evidence in the form of contracts and/or references.
  b) Up to three similar assignments (evaluations, assessments etc.) containing the following information:
    - Name of Client
    - Title
    - Year and duration
    - Scope
    - Outcome – include reports, web-links, etc.
    - Reference /Contact person details

• Proposed approach and methodology (up to 1,500 words/ 3 pages single spaced), including:
  - Proposed methodology, including Evaluation Matrix
  - Work plan showing the detailed sequence and timeline for each activity and days necessary for each proposed Evaluation team member
  - Travel plan
  - Quality assurance mechanism and risk mitigation measures put in place
  - Ethical considerations and how the contractor will address them

• Details of the proposed Evaluation Team for the assignment including the following information:
  - Title/Designation of each team member on the project
  - Educational qualifications and professional experiences
  - Experience in working on similar evaluations and assignments.

12. Financial Proposal
The financial proposal shall specify the total budget estimated in USD, as well as a detailed breakdown of budget items as per the Technical proposal, linked to deliverables. Payments shall be based upon outputs, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the ToR.

The financial proposal should also include all other applicable costs, such as: translation, meeting costs, transportation (local and international), daily subsistence costs (if applicable). If not provided by ToR, UNICEF will not reimburse costs not directly related to the assignment outcome, such as translation/interpretation services, local travels, passport/visa costs, hardware, software, stationery, logistic and meeting costs.
13. Evaluation criteria for selection

Interested institutions will submit both a Technical Proposal and a Financial Proposal. The total amount of points to be allocated for the technical component is 70 points. The proposals will be evaluated against the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Criteria</th>
<th>Technical Sub-criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Response</td>
<td>- Completeness of response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overall concord between RFPS requirements and proposal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company and Key Personnel</td>
<td>Institutional experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Range and depth of experience with similar assessments or evaluations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Company background, qualification and experience in the relevant area, as outlined in the Requirements section</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Evaluation team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Team leader: relevant experience and qualifications, as outlined in the Requirements section</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Team members: relevant experience of similar scope and complexity, professional expertise and knowledge</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Methodology and Approach</td>
<td>Quality of proposed design and methodology and extent of alignment with requirements</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality of proposed implementation/management plan, monitoring and quality assurance process</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ethical considerations and recognition of direct/peripheral risks/ problems and methods to prevent and manage these</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Max.</td>
<td>(minimum score for technical qualification: 50 points)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total amount of points to be allocated for the price component is 30 points. The maximum number of points (30) will be allotted to the lowest price proposal of a technically qualified offer. Points for other offers will be calculated as Points (x) = (lowest offer / offer x) * 30.

Contract will be awarded to the bidder who obtains the highest cumulative score (technical + price points).

14. Payment schedule

The payment will be linked to the submission of the following deliverables, upon satisfactory completion and acceptance by UNICEF:
Deliverable
(delivered according to the timeline agreed upon with UNICEF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Proportion of payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report (maximum 25 pages), including methodology, work plan and timeline, methodological approach, data collection tools and instruments, annotated outline of final report etc.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Draft Report (addressing all comments of external quality review and having final positive rating as “Satisfactory” or “Highly Satisfactory”)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation Report (maximum 90 pages) fully complies with UNICEF standards, including Executive Summary (maximum 10 pages) of key findings and prioritised recommendations (to be further used for development of Evaluation management response) and all relevant materials related to documentation of the evaluation process</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Definition of supervision arrangements

The Evaluation Team will work under direct supervision of the UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluation/Child Rights Monitoring Specialist with technical support of the UNICEF Education Specialist. UNICEF will regularly communicate with the contractor and provide feedback on performance and other necessary support to achieve objectives of the Evaluation, as well as remain aware of any upcoming issues related to contractor’s performance and quality of work. Payments will be rendered upon successful completion of each task, as per the schedule outlined above.

16. Description of official travel involved

The consultancy will require both international (if an international institution is selected) and local travels. A travel plan will be included in the submission package. Travel costs shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel, and costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). All travel arrangements and expenses are covered by the selected company and included in the financial offer (lump sum and per-line breakdown).

17. Support provided by UNICEF

To achieve the above-mentioned objectives, UNICEF will facilitate the contact with the MECR and other relevant stakeholders and will provide timely feedback to all deliverables to be presented by the contracted organization. UNICEF will provide relevant data, documents and available researches, contacts and lists of relevant technical people to work with.

Annex A Data Sources

The most relevant national normative acts in the domain of inclusive education are:

- The Education Code⁹, which explicitly regulates the inclusive education and establishes that education for children with SEN is an integral part of the system. The Code contains a chapter on education for children and pupils with special educational needs and inclusive education.
- Strategy Education 2020¹⁰ which aims to promote and ensure inclusive education at the educational system level, according to the specific Objective 1.6 of the Strategy.
- Program for the development of inclusive education in Republic of Moldova for 2011-2020¹¹, creates the normative-strategic framework of the processes for ensuring the adequate

⁹ http://lex.justice.md/md/355156/
¹⁰ http://lex.justice.md/viewdoc.php?action=view&view=doc&id=355494&lang=1
¹¹ http://lex.justice.md/viewdoc.php?action=view&view=doc&id=339933&lang=1
conditions for capitalizing the potential of all children. The program stipulates the objectives of inclusive education, sets its specific functions, the specific criteria to be met by the general education institution for achieving the objectives and functions promoted for inclusion.

- **Action Plan for the years 2015-2017 for the implementation of the Inclusive Education Development Program in the Republic of Moldova for 2011-2020** – targets the actions, responsible institutions, costs and the sources of their coverage for the implementation of the program.

- The action plan for the years 2018–2020 is currently being developed for the implementation of the Inclusive Development Program in the Republic of Moldova for 2011-2020

- The **Law on social inclusion of persons with disabilities** regulates the rights of people with disabilities to their social inclusion, ensuring the possibility of their participation in all areas of life without discrimination, at the same level as other members of society, based on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Publicly available data and official statistics collected and analysed by the National Bureau of Statistics and MECR.

Relevant UNICEF supported studies, surveys (will be submitted to the contractor upon contract signature).

---

14 [http://lex.justice.md/md/344149/](http://lex.justice.md/md/344149/)
15 [http://www.statistica.md/](http://www.statistica.md/)
Annex 2. Logic model/ToC of the Programme – narrative form

The Theory of Change for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education 2011-2020 in the Republic of Moldova can be reconstructed, mainly based on programmatic documents of the program, namely: Government Decision (GD) no. 523/2011 for the approval of the programme, the Action plan for years 2011-2014, GD no. 858/2015 on the Action Plan for years 2015-2017, the Action Plan for years 2018-2020. The program included a considerable number of specific objectives, starting from an exhaustive analysis of the problems and needs of the pre-university education system in the Republic of Moldova, also defining an ambitious number of impact elements it aims at. However, the concrete ways of achieving objectives and reaching outcomes and impacts have only been clarified at the level of Action Plans. On the other hand, none of the mentioned policy documents (the programme or action plans) describes a theory of change by which the proposed objectives are individually linked to activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impact. Also, the risks, assumptions and factors that can support or can represent bottlenecks in implementing the programme are not explicitly formulated by programming documents.

The programme starts from a very comprehensive, even exhaustive analysis of the situation of children in the Republic of Moldova and the situation of the education system and presents four categories of problems and needs of the pre-university education system of the Republic of Moldova in 2011 and related to the systems’ capacity to ensure the inclusion of all children: respectively regulatory, institutional, pedagogical and socio-economic factors.

**Regulatory factors:**

a) the lack of the regulatory-conceptual framework for development of inclusive education;

b) the lack of coherence between the legislation in the education field and in the social protection field;

c) the lack of appropriate mechanisms for the evaluation of children’s development and determination of special educational needs;

d) the imperfection of the referral procedures of children with special educational needs to the education institutions;

e) inadequate implementation, at the level of local public administration and providers of educational services, of the adopted regulatory framework;

f) the insufficiency of cross-sector implementation mechanisms of child rights protection legislation;

g) the lack of mechanisms for collection and processing of valid statistic data on the number and categories of children, young people and adults, currently excluded from the education system.

**Social and economic factors:**

a) the differences in the access and quality of education services by residence environments;

b) underestimation of the value of expenses on education in the structure of consumption expenses of families;

c) insufficient parents’ information about education opportunities available for various groups of children and young people;

d) increasing number of disintegrated families and of children left to be cared for by relatives or abandoned because of parents’ migration abroad;

---

17 The document could not be consulted during the elaboration of this inception report, but its content is derived from the Annual Activity Reports of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Moldova (Ministry of Education, Culture and Research).
e) ill-treatment, neglect and abuse of children and young people in families and in social institutions;

f) insufficiency and inefficient use of allocated budget resources.

**Pedagogic factors:**

a) the lack of inclusive practices models theoretically founded and experimentally validated;
b) overloaded, inflexible curriculum not oriented towards the use of the potential of each child, young person, adult, textbooks unadjusted to special educational needs;
c) evaluation system unadjusted to individual educational needs;
d) the lack or insufficiency of specialized services (psychological, psycho-pedagogical, speech therapy, social etc.) in education institutions for children, young people and adults;
e) inconsistent initial and continuous inclusive education system;
f) the lack of support teaching staff and of special assistance qualified staff: psychologists, speech therapists, psychologists-teachers, social workers, psychotherapists, kinesitherapists, psychiatric neurologists etc., necessary for insurance of inclusive education;
g) the poor/lack of cooperation between education institutions at various levels and stages, between general education and special education, between school and family, family and community.

**Institutional factors:**

a) lack of preschool institutions in 230 localities of the country and lack of schools in 250 localities;
b) the insufficiency of teaching aids: textbooks, books, equipment, visual aids, toys etc.;
c) the inconsistency of education institutions infrastructure with specific access needs of children and young people with disabilities: lack of access ramps, of wide exits, lifts, adjusted restrooms, adequate equipment etc.;
d) inefficient and irrational resources administration (material, human, time resources etc.) in education institutions compared to the real needs of communities;
e) the lack of participative education management (teachers, pupils, family, community), based on results and quality within the education institution;
f) the lack of autonomy of education institutions in financial resources management according to educational requirements of various categories of children;
g) the lack of cooperation between public institutions and social services, between the governmental and non-governmental sector in the field of development and implementation of inclusive education.

To address these issues and needs, the programme sets out **four general objectives:**

I. **Promoting inclusive education** as an educational priority in order to avoid exclusion and/or marginalization of children, young people and adults.

II. **Developing the normative and didactic-methodical framework** for promoting and ensuring the implementation of inclusive education.

III. **Creating a friendly, accessible educational environment,** capable of meeting the expectations and special requirements of the beneficiaries.

IV. **Creating an inclusive culture and society.**

The four general objectives were planned to be achieved by reaching **20 specific objectives:**

1. Harmonization of the national regulatory framework from the perspective of ensuring access to education and equal opportunities in the field of education for each child, young, adult.
2. Developing and promoting policies for the implementation of inclusive education in the national educational system.
3. Developing cross-sectoral strategies for promoting inclusive education.
4. Developing and implementing a system of standards for inclusive education.
5. Reorganization of general/special education, optimization of the network of institutions for inclusive education.
6. Review and develop appropriate funding mechanisms in the field of education.
7. Strengthening institutional capacities and developing support services for excluded and/or marginalized children.
8. Initial and in-service training, from the perspective of inclusive education, of human resources in education and related fields.
9. Reconsideration of mechanisms for identifying, assessing, determining special educational needs, diagnosing the psychophysical development of children, young people and adults from the perspective of adapting educational programs and forms.
10. Early identification of special educational needs and provision of appropriate qualified intervention.
11. Individual approach, respecting the development pace of each child (initial assessment, individual educational plan, continuous monitoring and evaluation, final evaluation).
12. Development of ways and forms of integration in line with the possibilities of children and special educational requirements.
13. Adapting/implementing the inclusive curriculum, which is essential for flexibility.
14. Developing/implementing a flexible evaluation system from the perspective of inclusive education.
15. Applying educational, informational, communication technologies and equipment suitable for inclusive education.
16. Accessibility of educational and training institutions through the application of assistive techniques and technological innovation.
17. Empowering and empowering families and the community.
18. Monitoring the process of implementing inclusive practices in the education system.
19. Developing partnerships between governmental structures, local authorities, civil society and family to ensure community inclusion and access to the integrated social services system.
20. Raising awareness of society and forming public opinion on inclusive education.

For solving problems and achieving goals, external funds and budget funds are mobilized. Also, within the Action Plans, institutional building and training elements are planned for education system professionals who also become resources for further implementation of the programme.

The programme describes the process of implementing the programme at the central and educational level, proposing a series of specific or general activities in order to achieve the objectives:

**At central level:**

a) Elaborating/harmonizing the normative framework on inclusive education.
b) Developing mechanisms for collecting, monitoring, synthesizing data on educational participation rates of all children (by age, gender, disability, ethnicity, region, income, etc.).
c) Initiating and carrying out special studies to evaluate the outcomes of the “Education for All” Strategy and linking them to the objectives of inclusive education.
d) To carry out exclusion and inclusion studies (types of existing inclusive policies, programs, projects and budgets allocated to government, civil society, international agencies, donors, etc.) for this purpose.
e) Piloting inclusive education models.
f) The establishment of an advisory body for the coordination at national level of the development of inclusive education.
g) Involvement of parents’ and teachers’ associations, branch unions in the implementation/promotion of inclusive education at district, community, school, classroom level.

h) Developing the human resources database (scientists, teachers, non-governmental organizations, etc.) and the material resources available to support the implementation of inclusive education.

i) Integration of inclusive education objectives into current social policies.

j) Reconsidering the principles and methodology of child assessment and reforming child development assessment structures.

k) Creation of the methodological framework for evaluating the activity of the general education institutions from the perspective of inclusive education.

l) Setting up national cooperation networks and support for the implementation of inclusive education.

m) Initiating and carrying out public awareness campaigns on inclusive education, promoting good practice.

At educational institution level

a) Setting up the coordination and information group in inclusive education.

b) Elaboration of the institution’s development plan from the perspective of inclusive education.

c) Reorganizing the functional structures of the school and adapting them to the needs of the children.

d) Formation of the school environment (school administration, children, cadres, parents).

e) Information and support of teachers from the perspective of inclusive education (principles, methods, techniques, practical activities, etc.).

f) Applying the new ways of teaching and reconsidering the didactic-child relations, the curricular and didactic-methodical adaptation, the adaptation of the infrastructure, etc.

g) Participatory evaluation of the inclusive education process (involvement of parents, children, experts, teachers, representatives of civil society, etc.).

h) Raise awareness of community public opinion in promoting inclusive education.

Also, the Government’s decision on the programme also contains a list of services to be provided at central, district and community level (educational institution) to reach the objectives.

At community level, services will be developed:

a) identification, early assessment and diagnosis of children’s development;

b) early intervention;

c) schooling, education, professional orientation, socialization, professionalization;

d) evaluation, diagnosis, monitoring of the school evolution for different categories of children (through the internal evaluation team);

e) psycho-pedagogical: recovery and rehabilitation of development, school support, elaboration of individual service plans, curricular adaptations etc.;

f) psychological: assistance and counselling for children, young people, adults, family, teachers, community;

g) support: support teacher, personal assistant, assistive technologies, mimicogestual interpretation services, etc.;

h) complementary and optional education;

i) specialized assistance (speech therapist, physical therapist, physical therapist etc.).

j) social assistance;

k) legal aid;

l) transport, movement and accessibility;

m) promoting and disseminating inclusive education and practices.

At district level, services will be developed:
a) evaluation / re-evaluation, early diagnosis and monitoring of the development of children;
b) information, training and support of teaching staff, social, medical, legal staff, etc. in inclusive education;
c) referring children with special educational needs to specialized schooling services;
d) social and legal assistance, other types of assistance, relevant to the field;
e) transport, movement and accessibility;
f) promoting and disseminating inclusive education and practices.

**The services set up at central level will be:**

a) complex and multidisciplinary evaluation / re-assessment, early diagnosis and monitoring of the development of children;
b) specialized assistance for the implementation of inclusive education;
c) training of staff from the perspective of inclusive education;
d) evaluation and accreditations of services and certification of personnel;
e) research and development of didactic materials, guides and information support in the field of inclusive education;
f) coordinating and monitoring, at national level, the implementation of inclusive education;
g) promoting and disseminating inclusive education and practices.

The programme proposes a **phased implementation**, reflected in the Action Plans, over the following periods:

1. 2011 – 2012: drafting the legal framework for inclusive education development;
2. 2013 – 2016: piloting inclusive education models;
3. 2017 – 2020: large scale implementation of the Program.

Beyond this planning, as it results from the Annual Activity Reports of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Moldova (Ministry of Education, Culture and Research), pilot modelling started in 2011 in some educational units. The elaboration of the normative framework continued after 2012 and some normative acts continue to be part of the activities to be carried out in 2019-2020 (eg the normative framework on student or pre-school funding, including adjustment coefficients for children with disabilities). On the other hand, some activities planned for the period 2018-2020 are still not implemented, taking into account that the action plan for the period is not approved by government decision.

**Overall, the implementation strategy includes activities that meet the objectives of the following categories:**

1. Adoption of the strategic and regulatory framework for inclusive education (strategic documents, normative acts on child assessment and reference, standards)
2. Development of the methodological and pedagogical framework for the inclusion of all children, including the development of curriculum, guides and individual plans
3. Endowment of the schools and providing the necessary infrastructure for access to all students
4. Reorganization of the special education system and of the residential system (especially to ensure the reintegration in the family of the children institutionalized because they could attend education only within these residential institutions)
5. Evaluating and monitoring all children to identify those with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and developing individual educational integration plans
6. Piloting the inclusive education practices in 124 mainstream education institutions and subsequently in 15 pre-school education institutions and 9 vocational and ethnic education institutions (in partnership with NGOs)
7. Providing specialised (psycho-pedagogical) services at the municipality or department level available for all educational institutions, including those in rural areas.
8. Development of support services in educational institutions: services for teaching staff (including training), resource centres for inclusive education, etc.
9. Increasing the level of transparency and participation of parents and students, including those with SEN, in the management of education and educational institutions.

Therefore, the following action categories are planned in Action Plans:

- Adoption of normative acts
- Development of supporting documents and tools for public policy (studies, evaluations, guides, curriculum, methodologies, didactic support documents, regulations)
- Inventory and presentation of available service maps
- Partnerships and inter-institutional collaboration methods
- Awareness and accountability campaigns to promote inclusive education
- Implementation of detailed piloting plans for inclusive education
- Activities of endowment and construction works for educational units
- Institutional reorganization activities for residential education institutions
- Training for education professionals
- Developing other resources for professionals in the educational system
- Providing personalized services for children through multidisciplinary teams
- Including parents and pupils with ESCs in public policy or school management bodies

As a result of implementing these types of activities, the program envisages the following outcomes:

1. Harmonization of the national legislation with international policies on inclusive education.
2. Increase enrolment rate in preschool and general institutions of children with special educational needs.
3. Decrease of the number of children in residential education and their integration into general education.
4. Increasing the correlation between educational technologies, curriculum, teaching aids, etc. with the level of child development and different learning needs.
5. Increasing the adaptability of the school environment to the specific needs of children with special educational needs.
6. A larger number of teacher trained (initially and continuously) for inclusive education.
7. Diminishing the social exclusion of vulnerable children.
8. Increasing the efficiency of the use of resources in the education system.
9. Establishment of national and international partnerships for the development and promotion of inclusive education.
10. Raise awareness on inclusive education in public opinion.

As far as the expected impact is concerned, it should be reflected at pedagogical level, in the quality of education in the Republic of Moldova, psychologically, in a more harmonious development of all children, socially, through their better integration into society and economy, through better economic success generated by the social integration and personal development of all students.

From the pedagogical point of view the implementation of the Inclusive Education Development Program will have an impact on the quality of education, given that the changes will focus on:

- child approaching methods, relations between participants to education, teacher's attitude;
- educational technologies, the inclusive curriculum, teaching aids adapted and correlated with the child's development level and various learning needs;
c) a safe and friendly school environment, appropriate for child development, provided with necessary special equipment;

d) initial and continuous education of teachers;

e) early identification and intervention in case of children at risk of dropping out of school;

f) support services for various categories of children with special educational needs.

**From the psychological point of view inclusive education will contribute to:**

a) building self-esteem and dignity of the pupils;

b) improving methodologies evaluation and identifying special needs of children;

c) reducing stereotypes, prejudices and exclusion, marginalization practices;

d) awareness and positive social perceptions of differences;

e) increasing community interest in inclusive education;

f) assertive communication between parents, children and teachers

**From the social point of view the impact will be felt in:**

a) universal and equal access to education;

b) observance of children's rights and of the equal opportunities principle;

c) ensuring educational and social inclusion for all people;

d) involvement of parents and community in education;

e) school and professional socializing skills development;

f) reduction / elimination of violence in education institutions and society;

g) increase of educational opportunities for children, young people and adults throughout their lives;

h) reducing migration of population

**From the economic point of view inclusive education will determine:**

a) the efficient use of resources in education;

b) ensuring stability in social sectors funding;

c) decrease of tax pressure on the productive sector;

d) formation of human capital for society sustainable development;

e) raising the national economy level by ensuring the quality of education;

f) reduction / eradication of social exclusion, with the effective employment of human resources;

g) efficient use of international financial support to implement inclusive education.

Factors that affect the achievement of goals, outcomes and impact are not described by the programme documents. However, they can be identified based on the issues discussed and include among others:

- administrative inertia in relation to the novelty of the concept of inclusive education, which may lead to delays

- lack of necessary inter-institutional collaboration

- lack of system data for realistic planning of actions

- lack of available human resources, willing to be trained / specialize in inclusive education

- lack of budget allocations and / or delayed allocations and / or poor budget management

- the mentality and attitude of professionals in the system towards children with SEN

- the mentality and attitudes of parents towards children with SEN

- the mentality and attitude of communities towards children with SEN

- economic barriers for access to education (poverty and social exclusion)
## Annex 3. Evaluation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria / evaluative approach to answer the evaluation question</th>
<th>Indicators/denominators</th>
<th>Source of data/verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 1. To what extent are the objectives of the Programme still valid and up to date to the national and international contexts?</strong></td>
<td>The question concerns the relevance of the program to the national and international context (other strategies, policies, relevant legislative framework, as presented in chapters 1 and 2 of this Initial Report). The analysis will focus on the following parameters: 1. Are the key elements of the Programme (objectives/outcomes, activities, outputs) in line with the international strategies, policies and legislative framework in place as regards inclusive education? Including the European strategies, policies and legislative framework and the EU-Moldova Association Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). 2. Are the key elements of the Programme (objectives/outcomes, activities, outputs) in line with the national strategies, policies and legislative framework in place as regards inclusive education?</td>
<td>1. The extent to which the Program is coherent with international strategies and programs in the field of education? 2. The extent to which the program is coherent with other national policies in the field of education and capitalizes on previous interventions. 3. The extent to which the Program supports education reform in the Republic of Moldova. 4. The extent to which the program is consistent with other activities of UNICEF and UN agencies in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>1. Desk-based research 2. Interviews at national level 3. Experts panel 4. Workshop for results validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 2. Are the objectives of the Programme consistent with the overall goal? Are implemented activities and outputs consistent with the intended impacts and effects?</strong></td>
<td>The question refers to the internal coherence of the program. The evaluation will examine whether the inputs are relevant to the problems identified, on the one hand, against the (general and specific) objectives, on the other hand, with regard to the effects, results and impact pursued. Also, the analysis examines the logical link (the possibility of generating effects) based on the theory of change between objectives, activities and results.</td>
<td>1. Extent to which activities planned are relevant for the objectives set 2. Extent to which outputs produced are relevant for the objectives set 3. Extent to which additional activities were needed in order to reach the set objectives 4. Extent to which additional outputs were needed in order to reach the set objectives 5. Extent to which the outputs produced could determine results and impacts (effects) – in other words if they adequately contribute to the achievement of the general and specific objectives</td>
<td>1. Desk-based research (including the analysis of the extent to which the underlying factors of the program are still active/valid) 2. Interviews at national level 3. Workshop for results validation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to answer the question, the logic of the intervention of the model will be analysed and presented in a graphical form (as it is already presented in chapter 2.2 and the appendix) and it will be analysed how much normative, socio-economic, pedagogical factors, institutional are still valid.

The purpose of the evaluation in terms of relevance criteria is to determine whether the input selection and definition has succeeded in achieving the expected results, not measuring the (existing, relevant) indicators.

The first step to be taken in order to answer this evaluation question is to identify and make an as complete as possible inventory of actions undertaken and outputs produced. This inventory will be compiled based on the:
1. actions and indicators provided for by the Programme and the two Action Plans adopted (2015-2017 and 2018-2020), for all actors, including MoECR, CRAP, PAS, ISE, NACE, ANACEC etc.
2. MoECR annual reports (available for the years 2012-2016 as per bibliography attached)

**EFFECTIVENESS**

**EQ 3. To what extent were the objectives (general and specific), activities and expected results at output and outcome levels achieved / are likely to be achieved?**

**Important note:** The (wide) definition of impact refers to the extent to which the general objectives of an interventions (5 in the case of the evaluated Programme) are reached. Considering the alignment between the IMPACT evaluation questions (see under) and the 5 objectives of the programme – as envisaged
6. Extent to which the assumptions and risks were (adequately) identified
7. Other factors (outside the identified hypotheses and risks) that interfere with the causal link between results, results, results and impact.

1. Extent to which the strategic and regulatory framework for inclusive education is complete and clear.
2. Extent to which the methodological and pedagogical framework for the inclusion of all children, including curriculum development, guides and individual plans, is complete and appropriate.
3. Extent to which the necessary infrastructure for the access of all pupils to mainstream education is provided.
4. Extent to which Resource Centres for Inclusive Education brought added value from an inclusive education perspective.
5. Degree of correlation between educational technologies, curriculum, teaching aids, etc. with the child development level and different learning needs.
6. The degree of adaptation of the school environment to the specific needs of children with special educational needs.
7. Percentage of teachers who received initial and in-service training in the area of inclusive education.

1. Desk-based research
2. Interviews at national level
3. Workshop for results validation
4. Interviews at district and municipality level
5. FG with professionals/teachers
6. Case study at school level
7. Administrative and statistical data analysis
general criteria of the programme, we will assess their attainment under the IMPACT criterion.

(3) other data provided by the Ministry as collected from NGOs involved in the implementation of the Programme,
(4) PAS annual report (annex activities carried out with partners and capacity building activities).

A second step would be to assess the adequacy of the indicator system\(^{18}\) (taking into consideration the reconstructed ToC), identify gaps and make recommendations as to what other indicators (including result indicators) should be taken into consideration by this evaluation. These indicators and their values (annual since 2011) will be added to the inventory mentioned above, to the extent to which data is available – their value may constitute the baselines for the indicator system for the future Programme (or future IE interventions).

For each of the specific objectives and the results (as per reconstructed ToC) we will assess whether progress was booked in line with expectations. These expectations will be determined qualitatively, as the programme does not set targets for the indicators used, and quantitatively, for the indicators for which the national Strategy 2020 sets targets (Table 9, page 71).

8. Percentage / extent to which training actions and other capacity-building activities of teachers are effective.
9. Number of activities for training support staff (support teachers)
10. Extent to which the training and support activities for teachers are of the necessary quality to create the necessary professional competences (including aspects which have a significant impact on teaching practices – such as motivation, self-esteem, attitudes towards diversity etc.) – training needs addressed, training needs still to be addressed, improved teaching practices, attitudinal changes towards inclusion, self-assessment of readiness to work with classes including SEN students.
11. Extent to which teachers appreciate the usefulness of the documentation requested for the implementation of the inclusive education model
12. Extent to which support teachers are sufficiently and adequately (effectively) trained.
13. Extent to which SAP has all the resources needed to facilitate inclusive education.
14. Extent to which specialized (psycho-pedagogical) services at the city or district level are available and easily accessible.

\(^{18}\) The assessment of the indicator system will be carried out in line with international standards, thus the following criteria will be applied: COVERAGE: the extent to which the indicators have the capacity to reflect the programme objectives and operations, BALANCE: the degree to which the indicator system includes a well-distributed mix of indicators (context, input, output, result, impact), and answers, through this mix, to the requirement for information for different categories/levels of stakeholders. PROPORTIONALITY: the indicator systems is as complex as necessary and as small as possible under the specific circumstances of a specific programme. MANAGEABILITY: the extent to which institutional capacity facilitates ease of collecting, measuring, processing, monitoring and communicating the indicators.
| EQ. 4. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or nonachievement of the objectives? | For each set of specific objective / result expected the factors driving/influencing either achievement, or non-achievement, will be identified based on primary and secondary data collected. | 1. Number of factors driving/facilitating in a significant manner the achievement of the outputs and outcomes planned/needed.  
2. Number of factors impeding in a significant manner the achievement of the outputs and outcomes planned/needed.  
3. Number of good practices identified. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | Particular attention will be paid to good practices (as per Objective 2 of the evaluation) related, in the case of this evaluation question, to good examples of activities implemented (activities particularly effective). | | 1. Desk-based research  
2. Interviews at national level  
3. Interviews at district and municipality level  
4. FG with professionals/teachers  
5. Case study at school level |
| EFFICIENCY | In order to answer this evaluation question a cost-efficiency analysis will be undertaken. For this purpose costs per activities/outputs will be calculated, based on budget data provided by MECR for all activities implemented in the framework of the Programme, from different sources, budget or extra-budget / made available by other organizations through NGOs (to the extent that data on financial inputs will be provided by them). The analysis will take into account the actually spent funds (according to the data provided by the MECR) | 1. Budget / type of action according to each Approved Action Plan and related budget execution  
2. "Unit cost" for comparable actions or activities  
3. Extent to which activities are judged to be cost-effective (and thus increased, according to the program’s objectives, the efficiency of resource use in the education system). | 1. Desk-based research  
2. Interviews at national level  
3. Quantitative analysis of budget information  
4. Interviews at district and municipality level  
5. FG with professionals/teachers  
6. Expert Panel |
and the Reports on the implementation of the sectoral expenditure strategy for the education sector of the MECR, but, overall a comparison between envisaged funds and actually spent funds will also be undertaken.

If possible, similar/identical types of activities will be identified (e.g. scientific events, promotional materials), their costs (“unit cost”) will be calculated and compared among each other in order to assess the cost of the program by reference to one or more referentials. Also, as far as possible, we compare the costs of similar actions made by different entities / NGOs.

The effectiveness of the budget dedicated to inclusive education (2% of the total budget for the education sector at district level) and the appropriateness of the expenditures made in this context in order to identify possible improvements of the IE financing model in Moldova will also be analysed.

As far as possible, alternative activities / design / set of activities that may have the same results, estimated costs and two sets of cost comparisons (the activities implemented versus the alternative ones) will be identified. If quantitative data is problematic, a panel of experts may be convened in order to validate the findings of the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ6. Were objectives (general and specific), activities and expected results at output and outcome levels achieved on time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis will focus on comparing the proposed timetable of each Action Plan with the activities actually implemented. Also, by taking the information from the efficacy assessment, the answer to this question will aim to reflect if the immediate results and the effects of the implemented activities have been obtained in a timely / reasonable manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Extent to which the activities were implemented on time 2. Extent to which immediate results have been obtained in time 3. Extent to which the effects were obtained in a timely / reasonable manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent to which the costs of activities under the Program are more effective than costs for similar activities (if such costs are identified). 5. Extent to which the IE financing model in Moldova leads to the best results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workshop for results validation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 7. Are the resources (money, human resources, facilities/capital assets) sufficiently efficient? (proposed by the Evaluator: efficiently deployed)</th>
<th>In order to complement and triangulate the monetary analysis (EQ 5) and especially where “unit costs” cannot be calculated due to lack of data on financial data (or the activities are not budgeted in the action plans as they are nonmonetary activities), efficiency will be assessed qualitatively based on straightforward input (all types of resources outside money, i.e. human resources, facilities/capital assets) - output relations. The analyses to answer to this EQ will complement previous analyses of IE 3 (resource sufficiency - see EQ3 related indicators) and 5, including the adequacy of IE financing model in Moldova.</th>
<th>1. Exhaustive list of resources used, determined on the basis of qualitative analysis 2. Extent to which human resources have been used efficiently and have produced notable results and effects 3. Extent to which the existing material resources have been efficiently used and have produced notable results and effects 4. Extent to which other types of resources have been used efficiently and have produced notable results and effects</th>
<th>6. Workshop for results validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 8. How well the implementation of activities has been managed? What management and monitoring tools have been used and what tools could have been used?</td>
<td>The question concerns the management of the Program and the answer can be formulated only on the basis of the answers to the questions regarding the effectiveness and efficiency. However, in order to answer the evaluation question, it is necessary first to rebuild and describe the program management system. The question will be addressed having also in mind the best practices, management methods and techniques. In order to properly evaluate the proposed indicators, in the first phase, in order to answer the evaluation question, a benchmarking system on the use of best management and monitoring practices will be established. Subsequently, the most effective and efficient elements of the management strategy will be determined, including management and monitoring tools that give the best results.</td>
<td>1. Extent to which a program management plan has been defined 2. Extent to which a program monitoring and evaluation plan has been defined 3. Extent to which the management strategy has been effective overall 4. Estimated efficiency level for each identified program management technique or tool 4. Estimated efficiency level for each identified technique or monitoring tool of the program</td>
<td>1. Desk research 2. Interviews at national level 3. Interviews at district and municipality level 4. Expert panel 5. Workshop for results validation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main added value of the answer to this evaluation question is the formulation of recommendations for the professionalising and streamlining of the program / intervention management system in IE, as well as monitoring in addition to the recommendations related to the indicators mentioned in EQ 3.

**SUSTAINABILITY**

**EQ 9. Were the achieved results and targets sustainable? Is sustainability ensured through implementation of the Programme?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The analysis to be carried out in order to answer this evaluation question will focus on the extent to which the necessary preconditions are in place for sustainability of actions already implemented:</td>
<td>1. Continuity of employment of human resources involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The stakeholders have the understanding and capacity to continue activities implemented (at both national and local level).</td>
<td>2. Extent to which funds are secured for the continuation of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The human resources involved continue activities beyond their completion (there is low turnover of staff among personnel involved in activities implemented – all types, including legislation development)</td>
<td>3. Commitment of stakeholders (at all levels, including parents) to continue activities necessary to ensure sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New knowledge and tools developed under the activities implemented continue to be implemented after project completion (training kits for teachers in the inclusive education area).</td>
<td>4. Provisions related to inclusive education in MoECR long-term programme and budgetary allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship built between schools, parents and other members of the community is maintained.</td>
<td>5. Extent to which knowledge and tools developed continue to be used by their beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall, funds are secured (national budget and or/EU funds) for the continuation of activities planned for the implementation of the Programme. Good practices (at national or local level) of sustainable activities or measures taken to ensure sustainability will be identified and presented in the evaluation report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQ10. What were the major factors**

For each set of specific objective / result expected the factors driving/influencing sustainability (or lack |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of factors driving/facilitating the sustainability of outputs and outcomes.</td>
<td>1. Desk-based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of factors impeding the</td>
<td>2. Interviews at national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Desk-based research  
2. Interviews at national level  
3. Interviews at district and municipality level  
4. FG with professionals/teachers  
5. FG with parents  
6. Case study at school level  
7. Workshop for results validation
which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of results at output and outcome levels? thereof, will be identified based on primary and secondary data collected.

Particular attention will be paid to good practices (as per Objective 2 of the evaluation) related, in the case of this evaluation question, to good examples of sustainable activities.

sustainability of outputs and outcomes.

3. Number of good practices identified in terms of sustainability.

3. Interviews at district and municipality level
4. FG with professionals/teachers
5. Case study at school level
6. Workshop for results validation

### IMPACT

**EQ 11. To what extent the implementation of the Programme had and can further impact on the access, quality and relevance of inclusive education services for the rights holders?**

What has happened because of the implementation of the Programme and what is the real difference made to the rights holders? How many children have been benefitting from the Programme? (to this evaluation question we answer under EQ 3 - Effectiveness, as this should be an outcome indicator of the Programme)

A theory-based approach will be taken in order to address this evaluation questions. The theory based approach will be based on quantitative data available (see indicators in the next column, since 2011, to the extent it is available) and on the qualitative data already in place (in existing studies) and collected specifically for this evaluation (mainly through interviews, FG organised separately or in the framework of the case study).

The approached proposed (detailed in the next chapter – school-based case study-like) is meant to ensure an adequate assessment of impact, in line with the reconstructed ToC / the elements required by the evaluation question and the main aspects indicated by the general objectives of the Programme:

- Access to inclusive education services for the rights holders (in line with the GO 1)
- Quality of inclusive education services for the rights holders (GO 2, 3)
- Relevance of inclusive education services for the rights holders
- Creation of an inclusive culture and society.

To complement the analyses to be carried out in order to answer EQ 3, the analyses carried out in order to identify impact will focus on the final beneficiaries of the programme.

1. Number of school age children with special education needs (SEN) / disabilities at national / rayon level;
2. Enrolment rate in pre-school and general education of children with special educational needs (national level, rayon, municipality) / Number of children with SEN / disabilities included in the education system (mainstream education / special education / at home)
3. Number of children in residential education (age groups, types of disabilities / special needs);
4. Number of children at risk of social exclusion (complete time series and territorial disaggregation are not available);
5. Children under 18 y.o., with disability recognized for the first time by causes of disability;
6. Children with disabilities under 18 years, at the observation (end-year) per 1000 children of respective age, in territorial aspect;
7. Children with disabilities aged under 18, at the observation (end-year) by causes of disability,
8. Extent to which all children are monitored

| 1. Desk-based research  
| 2. Interviews at national level  
| 3. Interviews at district and municipality level  
| 4. FG with professionals/teachers  
| 5. FG with children  
| 6. Case study at school level  
| 7. Expert panel  
| 8. Workshop for results validation |
the Programme – children, as per expected impact in the reconstructed ToC: Regarding the expected impact, this will be reflected at pedagogical level, in the quality of education in the Republic of Moldova, at psychological level, in a more harmonious development of all children, socially, through a better integration in society and in economic terms, through a better economic success generated by the increase of social integration and personal development of all students.

Public opinion on IE will be assessed based on secondary data already in place (analysed in different studies available) and indirectly, through data collected from the stakeholders involved in the evaluation.

Issues related to Gender Equality, Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming and Results-Based Management will be addressed across the evaluation questions or, if required, developed as specific points as per United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Guidance on Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation.

**COVERAGE**

**EQ 12.** Was representativeness of coverage ensured by the activities and interventions? Have vulnerable children and their families been reached, including children left behind by migrant parents, poor and marginalised children?

The analyses will aim to identify the children who have been benefitted from the Programme, with a focus on vulnerable children and their families. The question concerns the scope of the Program and the extent to which the activities and interventions carried out targeted the categories of beneficiaries according to the initial planning. It also refers to the extent to which children in different vulnerabilities have benefitted from these, including socio-economically and affectively disadvantaged children (children with one or both parents abroad, children in poor families or at risk of marginalization).

The question will follow both the analysis of the relevant legal and normative provisions, analyses of the qualitative data (the understanding of inclusive education, the understanding of the target groups of the Program by decision makers, specialists, and evaluated to identify their potential SEN)

9. Extent to which individual educational integration plans are fully implemented.
10. Extent to which IE criteria are met at university education level (based on ANACEC assessment reports).
12. The extent to which parents are satisfied with inclusive educational practices and have increased their involvement in the child’s school life (based on secondary data from studies already carried out).

See section 4.3.
teachers) as well as analysis of statistical data
(existing secondary data will be assessed).
The question will be analysed in relation to the EQ 3
and EQ 11 indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COORDINATION</th>
<th>EQ 13. What was the role of the MECR, Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection, Ministry of Finances, as well as other ministries, LPAs, CSOs, community and other key actors in the design, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the Programme? What was the role and comparative advantage of UNICEF?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|              | The question refers to the effectiveness of coordination and cooperation mechanisms in program planning, implementation and monitoring, the extent to which there were clear roles and responsibilities, and mechanisms for information and adjustment between partners. The analysis explores:
|              | - common understanding of the Program at key stakeholders level
|              | - existence of effective coordination mechanisms between them
|              | - existence of mechanisms for monitoring and information on the activities, achievements or challenges of each key actor,
|              | - the role of UNICEF as a catalyst for interventions and implementation efforts |
|              | 1. Type and level of involvement of stakeholders in design, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the initiative based on their needs and priorities. |
|              | 2. The extent to which UNICEF has catalysed efforts to support inclusive education. The factors that influenced the role of UNICEF. |
|              | 1. Desk research | 2. Interviews at national level | 3. Interviews at district and municipality level | 4. Expert panel | 4. Results validation workshop |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHERENCE</th>
<th>EQ14. What were the areas and ways of cooperation with other UN agencies and development partners regarding implementation of the Programme? Was there coherence across interventions supported by different agencies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|           | The analysis will assess whether the programme is implemented in complementarity and possibly synergy with other relevant interventions (national or funded by other donors, including UNICEF) This assessment will comprehensively take into account other UN agencies and development partners involved in the implementation of the Programme or in other initiatives concerning inclusive education.
|           | In this context an inventory of complementary interventions (outside the ones provided for in the Action plans) financed by all UN agencies and development partners involved. |
|           | 1. Extent to which the Program is coherent with international strategies and programs in the field of education developed by other donors |
|           | 2. Extent to which there were mechanisms of cooperation between agencies and partner institutions, in order to ensure the synergy of interventions (during all cycles of the programme) |
|           | 1. Desk research | 2. Interviews at national level | 3. Expert panel | 4. Results validation workshop |
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Interview guidelines – Stakeholders at national level

- **MECR**
- **UNICEF**
- **NGOs**
- **Republican Centre of Psycho-pedagogical Assistance**
- **National Agency for Quality Assurance in Vocational Education**
- **Other partners**

  according to the interviewee profile, questions will be selected or eliminated from the list. The complete list will be addressed to MERC and the RCPA.

Knowledge of the model and coordination

1. How would you describe in a few words the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?
2. How was your institution involved in the design, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the Programme?
Relevance and coherence

1. How does the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 correlate with public policies or other initiatives developed/promoted/advocated for/implemented (the role in public policy to be adapted according to the interviewee) by your institution?

2. In what strategic framework is your institution supported or involved in the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020?

3. To what extent factors identified as problems and needs in 2010-2011 when the programme was designed (factors listed in annexe to the guidelines) continued to be present / relevant for the educational system in Moldova in the last years?

Effectiveness

4. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova?

5. Based on your experience and knowledge, the existing methodological and pedagogical framework for the inclusion of all children, developed between 2011 and 2019, including the development of curriculum, guides and individual plans, is complete and appropriate? How well adapted are these resources and the technologies used to different child’s learning needs and different development stages?

6. Based on your experience and knowledge, to what extent is the school infrastructure accessible for all children?

7. Based on your experience and knowledge, to what extent is the school environment inclusive and friendly for children with Special Educational Needs? Please think at infrastructure, technologies used, the methodological and pedagogical framework, but also the school institutional cultures, classroom interactions between pupils/students etc.

8. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the reforms implemented for des-institutionalisation of children with Special Educational Needs? How successful was the process from your point of view? Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation (please refer to factors which had both positive or negative influence).

9. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the role and activity of the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education? How would you define their added value for the inclusion of all children in the educational system?

10. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the role and activity of the Psycho-pedagogical Assistance Services and the Republican Centre (SAP and CRAP)? How would you define their added value for the inclusion of all children in the educational system? How is the monitoring of this process conducted by the SAP and CRAP?

11. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the level of training and competences of teachers concerning inclusive education? Have been training and resources available for teachers? Have them been effective to generate adequate competences? Please make the difference between support teachers for children with Special Educational Needs and the other teachers.

12. To what extent are support services for children with Special Educational Needs available at department/municipal level?

13. Based on your experience and knowledge, how are parents involved in the educational process, including the preparation of the individual development plans?

14. Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation concerning the inclusive education in Moldova? Please think at factors affecting the strategic and legal framework, the methodological and pedagogical framework, school infrastructure and environment, the institutional
framework, the capacity of human resources, availability of services and participation of parents to school management and the development of the individual development plans.

15. Based on your experience and knowledge, is the institution you represent involved in national or international cooperation for the development of inclusive education?

Efficiency *(questions 16-18 will be addressed only to public authorities and UNICEF)*

16. Based on your experience and knowledge, is the budgeting model for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 efficient?

17. How do you appreciate the costs of the implemented actions related to the outcomes already discussed?

18. How do you appreciate the costs of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 in comparison to other policies in the field of education?

19. How do you appreciate the time needed for measures to be implemented and outcomes to be visible in the field of inclusive education?

20. Do you think resources planned for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 are enough? What additional resources would be needed?

21. How do you appreciate the management of the programme? What management tools or techniques have been used? Please think at the existing and clarity of a management plan, the monitoring plan etc.

Sustainability

22. To what extent funds are secured for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

23. To what extent human resources at all level trained and prepared for inclusive education will continue to be employed?

24. To what extent knowledge and tools developed for the inclusion of all children in education continue to be used by their beneficiaries?

25. To what extent you are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education? To what extent other stakeholders are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

26. Which are the most important factors influencing the availability of funds, human resources, use of other resources or the stakeholders’ involvement for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

Impact

27. Based on your experience and knowledge, please describe the most important impact of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova.

28. Based on your experience and knowledge, please indicate the most important data available to measure this impact. Please also tell us if your institution manages any of these data. A list of indicators will be discussed with each institution!

Coverage

29. Based on your experience and knowledge, have been all children in need targeted by the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova? Is any target group that was not covered by the scope or activities of the programme?
Annex. Factors which determine and aggravate exclusion of children, young people and adults from the education system according to the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020

Regulatory factors:
   a. the lack of the regulatory-conceptual framework for development of inclusive education.
   b. the lack of coherence between the legislation in the education field and in the social protection field;
   c. the lack of appropriate mechanisms for the evaluation of children’s development and determination of special educational needs;
   d. the imperfection of the referral procedures of children with special educational needs to the education institutions;
   e. inadequate implementation, at the level of local public administration and providers of educational services, of the adopted regulatory framework;
   f. the insufficiency of cross-sector implementation mechanisms of child rights protection legislation.
   g. the lack of mechanisms for collection and processing of valid statistic data on the number and categories of children, young people and adults, currently excluded from the education system.

Social and economic factors:
   a. the differences in the access and quality of education services by residence environments;
   b. underestimation of the value of expenses on education in the structure of consumption expenses of families;
   c. insufficient parents' information about education opportunities available for various groups of children and young people;
   d. increasing number of disintegrated families and of children left to be cared for by relatives or abandoned because of parents' migration abroad;
   e. ill-treatment, neglect and abuse of children and young people in families and in social institutions;
   f. insufficiency and inefficient use of allocated budget resources.

Pedagogic factors:
   a. the lack of inclusive practices models theoretically founded and experimentally validated;
   b. overloaded, inflexible curriculum not oriented towards the use of the potential of each child, young person, adult, textbooks unadjusted to special educational needs;
   c. evaluation system unadjusted to individual educational needs;
   d. the lack or insufficiency of specialized services (psychological, psycho-pedagogical, speech therapy, social etc.) in education institutions for children, young people and adults;
   e. inconsistent initial and continuous inclusive education system;
   f. the lack of support teaching staff and of special assistance qualified staff: psychologists, speech therapists, psychologists-teachers, social workers, psychotherapists, kinesitherapists, psychiatric neurologists etc., necessary for insurance of inclusive education;
   g. the poor/lack of cooperation between education institutions at various levels and stages, between general education and special education, between school and family, family and community.

Institutional factors:
a) Lack of preschool institutions in 230 localities of the country and lack of schools in 250 localities;
b) the insufficiency of teaching aids: textbooks, books, equipment, visual aids, toys etc.;
c) the inconsistency of education institutions infrastructure with specific access needs of children and young people with disabilities: lack of access ramps, of wide exits, lifts, adjusted restrooms, adequate equipment etc.;
d) inefficient and irrational resources administration (material, human, time resources etc.) in education institutions compared to the real needs of communities;
e) the lack of participative education management (teachers, pupils, family, community), based on results and quality within the education institution;
f) the lack of autonomy of education institutions in financial resources management according to educational requirements of various categories of children;
g) the lack of cooperation between public institutions and social services, between the governmental and non-governmental sector in the field of development and implementation of inclusive education.
Interview guidelines – Stakeholders at national level

Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection, National Agency for Social protection

Knowledge of the model and coordination
1. How would you describe in a few words the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?
2. How was your institution involved in the design, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the Programme?

Relevance and coherence
1. How does the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 correlate with public policies or other initiatives developed and implemented by your institution?
2. In what strategic framework is your institution supported or involved in the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020?

Effectiveness
3. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova?
4. Based on your experience and knowledge, to what extent is the school infrastructure accessible for all children and in particular for children with Special Education Needs?
5. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the reforms implemented for des-institutionalisation of children with Special Educational Needs? How successful was the process form your point of view? Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation?
6. To what extent are support services for children with Special Educational Needs available at department/municipal level?
7. Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation concerning the inclusive education in Moldova? Please think at factors affecting the strategic and legal framework, school infrastructure and environment, the institutional framework, the capacity of human resources, availability of services.
8. Based on your experience and knowledge, is the institution you represent involved in national or international cooperation for the development of inclusive education?

Efficiency
9. Based on your experience and knowledge, is the budgeting model for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 efficient?
10. How do you appreciate the costs of the implemented actions related to the outcomes already discussed?
11. How do you appreciate the time needed for measures to be implemented and outcomes to be visible in the field of inclusive education?
12. Do you think resources planned for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 are enough? What additional resources would be needed?
13. How do you appreciate the management of the programme? What management tools or techniques have been used? Please think at the existing and clarity of a management plan, the monitoring plan etc.

Sustainability
14. To what extent funds are secured for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
15. To what extent human resources at all level trained and prepared for inclusive education will continue to be employed?
16. To what extent the institution you are representing is committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education? To what extent other stakeholders are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

17. Which are the most important factors influencing the availability of funds, human resources, use of other resources or the stakeholders’ involvement for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

Impact

18. Based on your experience and knowledge, please describe the most important impact of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?

19. Based on your experience and knowledge, please indicate the most important data available to measure this impact? Please also tell us if your institution manages any of these data. A list of indicators will be discussed with each institution!

Coverage

20. Based on your experience and knowledge, have been all children in need targeted by the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova? Is any target group that was not covered by the scope or activities of the programme?
Interview guidelines – Stakeholders at national level

• Ministry of Finances

Knowledge of the model and coordination
1. How would you describe in a few words the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?
2. How was your institution involved in the design, coordination, implementation and monitoring of the Programme?

Efficiency
1. Based on your experience and knowledge, is the budgeting model for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 efficient?
2. How do you appreciate the costs of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 in comparison to other policies in the field of education?
3. Do you think resources planned for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 are enough? What additional resources would be needed?
4. How do you appreciate the management of the programme? What management tools or techniques have been used? Please think at the existing and clarity of a management plan, the monitoring plan etc.

Sustainability
5. To what extent funds are secured for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
6. To what extent you are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education? To what extent other stakeholders are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
7. Which are the most important factors influencing the availability of funds or the stakeholders' involvement for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
Interview guidelines – Stakeholders at district level

• Psycho-pedagogical Assistance Services in the districts and in Chișinău
• District/municipality departments of education

Knowledge of the model and coordination
1. How would you describe in a few words the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?
2. How was your institution involved in the implementation and monitoring of the Programme?

Relevance and coherence
3. How does the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 correlate with public policies or other initiatives implemented by your institution?
4. To what extent factors identified as problems and needs in 2010-2011 when the programme was designed (factors listed in annexe to the guidelines) continued to be present / relevant for the educational system in Moldova in the last years?

Effectiveness
5. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova?
6. Based on your experience and knowledge, the existing methodological and pedagogical framework for the inclusion of all children, developed between 2011 and 2019, including the development of curricula, guides and individual plans, is complete and appropriate? How well adapted are these resources and the technologies used to different child’s learning needs and different development stages?
7. Based on your experience and knowledge, to what extent is the school infrastructure accessible for all children?
8. Based on your experience and knowledge, to what extent is the school environment inclusive and friendly for children with Special Educational Needs? Please think at infrastructure, technologies used, the methodological and pedagogical framework, but also the school institutional cultures, classroom interactions between pupils/students etc.
9. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the role and activity of the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education? How would you define their added value for the inclusion of all children in the educational system?
10. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the level of training and competences of teachers concerning inclusive education? Have been training and resources available for teachers? Have they been effective to generate competences? Please make the difference between support teachers for children with Special Educational Needs and the other teachers.
11. To what extent are support services for children with Special Educational Needs available at department/municipal level?
12. Based on your experience and knowledge, how are parents involved in the educational process, including the development of the individual development plans?
13. Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation concerning the inclusive education in Moldova? Please thin at factors affecting the strategic and legal framework, the methodological and pedagogical framework, school infrastructure and environment, the institutional framework, the capacity of human resources, availability of services and participation of parents to school management and the development of the individual development plans.
14. Based on your experience and knowledge, is the institution you represent involved in national or international cooperation for the development of inclusive education?
Efficiency
15. Have been resources needed for the implementation of activities for inclusive education always available for your institution?
16. How do you appreciate the time needed for measures to be implemented and outcomes to be visible in the field of inclusive education?
17. Do you think resources planned for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 are enough? What additional resources would be needed?
18. How do you appreciate the management of the programme at district level? What management tools or techniques have been used? Please think at the existing and clarity of a management plan, the monitoring plan etc.

Sustainability
19. To what extent funds are secured for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
20. To what extent human resources at all level trained and prepared for inclusive education will continue to be employed?
21. To what extent knowledge and tools developed for the inclusion of all children in education continue to be used by their beneficiaries?
22. To what extent you are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education? To what extent other stakeholders are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
23. Which are the most important factors influencing the availability of funds, human resources, use of other resources or the stakeholders’ involvement for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

Impact
24. Based on your experience and knowledge, please describe the most important impact of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?
25. Based on your experience and knowledge, please indicate the most important data available to measure this impact? Please also tell us if your institution manages any of these data. A list of indicators will be discussed with each institution!

Coverage
26. Based on your experience and knowledge, have been all children in need targeted by the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova? Is any target group that was not covered by the scope or activities of the programme?

Annex. Factors which determine and aggravate exclusion of children, young people and adults from the education system according to the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020

Regulatory factors:
- the lack of the regulatory-conceptual framework for development of inclusive education.
- the lack of coherence between the legislation in the education field and in the social protection field;
- the lack of appropriate mechanisms for the evaluation of children’s development and determination of special educational needs;
- the imperfection of the referral procedures of children with special educational needs to the education institutions;
- inadequate implementation, at the level of local public administration and providers of educational services, of the adopted regulatory framework;
f. the insufficiency of cross-sector implementation mechanisms of child rights protection legislation.
g. the lack of mechanisms for collection and processing of valid statistic data on the number and categories of children, young people and adults, currently excluded from the education system.

**Social and economic factors:**

a. the differences in the access and quality of education services by residence environments;
b. underestimation of the value of expenses on education in the structure of consumption expenses of families;
c. insufficient parents’ information about education opportunities available for various groups of children and young people;
d. increasing number of disintegrated families and of children left to be cared for by relatives or abandoned because of parents’ migration abroad;
e. ill-treatment, neglect and abuse of children and young people in families and in social institutions;
f. insufficiency and inefficient use of allocated budget resources.

**Factorii pedagogici:**

a. the lack of inclusive practices models theoretically founded and experimentally validated;
b. overloaded, inflexible curriculum not oriented towards the use of the potential of each child, young person, adult, textbooks unadjusted to special educational needs;
c. evaluation system unadjusted to individual educational needs;
d. the lack or insufficiency of specialized services (psychological, psycho-pedagogical, speech therapy, social etc.) in education institutions for children, young people and adults;
e. inconsistent initial and continuous inclusive education system;
f. the lack of support teaching staff and of special assistance qualified staff: psychologists, speech therapists, psychologists-teachers, social workers, psychotherapists, kinesitherapists, psychiatric neurologists etc., necessary for insurance of inclusive education;
g. the poor/lack of cooperation between education institutions at various levels and stages, between general education and special education, between school and family, family and community.

**Institutional factors:**

a. Lack of preschool institutions in 230 localities of the country and lack of schools in 250 localities;
b. the insufficiency of teaching aids: textbooks, books, equipment, visual aids, toys etc.;
c. the inconsistency of education institutions infrastructure with specific access needs of children and young people with disabilities: lack of access ramps, of wide exits, lifts, adjusted restrooms, adequate equipment etc.;
d. inefficient and irrational resources administration (material, human, time resources etc.) in education institutions compared to the real needs of communities;
e. the lack of participative education management (teachers, pupils, family, community), based on results and quality within the education institution;
f. the lack of autonomy of education institutions in financial resources management according to educational requirements of various categories of children;
g. the lack of cooperation between public institutions and social services, between the governmental and non-governmental sector in the field of development and implementation of inclusive education.
Interview guidelines – Stakeholders at district level

- District/municipality social protection departments (direction)

Knowledge of the model and coordination

1. How would you describe in a few words the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?
2. How was your institution involved in the implementation and monitoring of the Programme?

Relevance and coherence

1. How does the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 correlate with public policies or other initiatives implemented by your institution?

Effectiveness

2. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova?
3. Based on your experience and knowledge, to what extent is the school infrastructure accessible for all children and in particular for children with special educational needs?
4. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the reforms implemented for des-institutionalisation of children with Special Educational Needs? How successful was the process form your point of view? Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation?
5. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the role and activity of the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education? How would you define their added value for the inclusion of all children in the educational system?
6. To what extent are support services for children with Special Educational Needs available at department/municipal level?
7. Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation concerning the inclusive education in Moldova? Please thin at factors affecting the strategic and legal framework, school infrastructure and environment, the institutional framework, the capacity of human resources, availability of services.

Efficiency

8. Have been resources needed for the implementation of activities for inclusive education always available for your institution?
9. How do you appreciate the time needed for measures to be implemented and outcomes to be visible in the field of inclusive education?
10. Do you think resources planned for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 are enough? What additional resources would be needed?
11. How do you appreciate the management of the programme at district level? What management tools or techniques have been used? Please think at the existing and clarity of a management plan, the monitoring plan etc.

Sustainability

12. To what extent funds are secured for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
13. To what extent human resources at all level trained and prepared for inclusive education will continue to be employed?
14. To what extent knowledge and tools developed for the inclusion of all children in education continue to be used by their beneficiaries?
15. To what extent you are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education? To what extent other stakeholders are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
16. Which are the most important factors influencing the availability of funds, human resources, use of other resources or the stakeholders’ involvement for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

**Impact**

17. Based on your experience and knowledge, please describe the most important impact of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?

18. Based on your experience and knowledge, please indicate the most important data available to measure this impact? Please also tell us if your institution manages any of these data. A list of indicators will be discussed with each institution!

**Coverage**

19. Based on your experience and knowledge, have been all children in need targeted by the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova? Is any target group that was not covered by the scope or activities of the programme?
Interview guidelines – Stakeholders at district level
- Representatives of local public authorities – City halls

Knowledge of the model and coordination
1. How would you describe in a few words the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?
2. How was your institution involved in the implementation and monitoring of the Programme?

Relevance and coherence
3. How does the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 correlate with public policies or other initiatives implemented by your institution?

Effectiveness
4. Based on your experience and knowledge, how do you appreciate / assess the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova?
5. Based on your experience and knowledge, to what extent is the school infrastructure accessible for all children and, in particular, for children with special educational needs?
6. To what extent are support services for children with Special Educational Needs available at local level?
7. Which are the most important factors that influenced the implementation of the planned measures and the present situation concerning the inclusive education in Moldova? Please think at factors affecting the strategic and legal framework, school infrastructure and environment, the institutional framework, the capacity of human resources, availability of services.
8. Based on your experience and knowledge, is the institution you represent involved in national or international cooperation for the development of inclusive education?

Efficiency
9. Have been resources needed for the implementation of activities for inclusive education always available for your institution?
10. How do you appreciate the time needed for measures to be implemented and outcomes to be visible in the field of inclusive education?
11. Do you think resources planned for the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020 are enough? What additional resources would be needed?
12. How do you appreciate the management of the programme at district level? What management tools or techniques have been used? Please think at the existing and clarity of a management plan, the monitoring plan etc.

Sustainability
13. To what extent funds are secured for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
14. To what extent human resources at all level trained and prepared for inclusive education will continue to be employed?
15. To what extent you are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education? To what extent other stakeholders are committed to continue activities concerning the development of inclusive education?
16. Which are the most important factors influencing the availability of funds, human resources or the stakeholders’ involvement for the continuation of activities concerning the development of inclusive education?

Impact
17. Based on your experience and knowledge, please describe the most important impact of the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?

18. Based on your experience and knowledge, please indicate the most important data available to measure this impact? Please also tell us if your institution manages any of these data. A list of indicators will be discussed with each institution!
Annex 6. Focus groups – guidelines and lists of participants

Focus groups participants at district level

1. **Professionals focus groups Petru Ștefanucă High-school – Ialoveni**
   - Budoi Sihiria
   - Balmuș Olga
   - Levca Ecaterina
   - Petca Rodica
   - Golescu Valentina
   - Cișlari Veronica
   - Carâjelascov Valentina
   - Chihai Ruslana
   - Leahu Oxana
   - Vasiliiu Diana

2. **Pupils focus groups Petru Ștefanucă High-school – Ialoveni**
   - Flaviu
   - Daniela
   - Marina
   - Ana-Maria
   - Vlad

3. **Pupils focus groups Petru Ștefanucă High-school – Ialoveni**
   - Daniela
   - Cristina
   - Daria
   - Vasile
   - Ana Maria
   - Valeria

4. **Professionals focus groups Regina Maria kindergarten – Ialoveni**
   - Vrâmaș Tatiana
   - Russu Natalia
   - Iuncașu Natalia
   - Guzun Natalia
   - Aftene Lilia
   - Aftene Mihaela
   - Mustățea Aliona
   - Rimbu Aliona
   - Chilimicenco Natalia
   - Zabolatnî Aliona
   - Guțu Lilia
   - Lașcu Ana
   - Muntean Aurelia
   - Preguza Crestina

5. **Teaching staff focus group – Bozieni School**
   - Tronciu-barbălată Veronica
   - Cirpală Victoria
   - Rusu Galina
   - Mariniuc Elena
   - Bozeci Andrei
   - Dimitrașcu Angela
   - Iacobciuc Ludmila

6. **Pupils focus group – Bozieni school**
   - Nadia
   - Mădălina
   - Veronica
   - Maria
   - Ghiunai
   - Vlad
7. **Pupils focus group – Bozieni School**

Eugenia
Tamara
Marina
Lilia
Tabita
Nicolae
Vlad
Magdalena

8. **Pre-primary school teachers focus group – Bozieni Kindergarten**

Brinzi Daria
Iuțuleac Lilia
Spinu Eugenia
Matei Victoria
Cebotari Valentina
Roman Nina
Spinu Nelea
Roman Nina

9. **Pupils focus group - Mihai Viteazul Gymnasium – Hîncești**

Victoria
Mihai
Tatiana
Lina

10. **Pupils focus group - Mihai Viteazul Gymnasium – Hîncești**

Mădălina
Gabriela
Virgiliiu
Alexei

11. **Pre-primary school teachers focus groups - Ciorești**

Tulei Svetlana
Luca Larisa
Fetcu Tatiana
Crismaru maria
Adam Iradia
Cobzaru catalina
Luți Viorica

12. **Teachers focus group - Ciorești**

Trifoi ttiiana
Azembri Nina
Mirza Zinovia
Bojoga Rodica

13. **Pupils focus group - Ciorești**

Laurenția
Livia
Evelina
Bianca
Ion

14. **Pupils focus group - Ciorești**

Augustin
Laura
Nina
Emilia
Doïna

15. **Pre-primary school teachers focus groups – Basarabeasca Kindergarten**

Iarsian Tatiana
Florea Irina
16. Teachers focus group – Alexandr Puşkin Highschool
Urdea Galina
Urdea Iofina
Dorojan Elena
Radova Svetlana
Psiul Natalia
Platon Maria
Cebanova Liubovi
Banari Olesea
Ambrusevici Alla
Ghimisli Ana
Angeaba T.

17. Pupils focus group – Alexandr Puşkin Highschool
Svetlana
Nichita
Carina
Sofia

18. Pre-primary school teachers focus group – Colibaşi Kindergarten (Cahul)
Cojon Lidia
Horneț Ecaterina
Sleinav Elena
Ghencea Maria
Vicol Eugenia

19. Pupils focus group – Colibaşi High-school (Cahul)
Lina
Dinu
Mihaela
Andreea-Claudia
Bianca
Ionela

20. Pupils focus group – Dim. Cantemir Gymnasium (Cahul)
Arina
Anastasia
Natalia
Anastasia
Anastasia
Alexandra
Denis
Nichita
Maxim

21. Teachers focus group – Colibaşi High-school (Cahul)
Toma Ana
Roșca Elena
Cojan Elena
Covaci Aliona
Palsian Liliana
Vutcarius Alexandra
Vasilachi Ecaterina
Cojian Silvia
Gregoriță Ana
Eremia Elena

22. Teachers focus group – Donici Primary school (Cahul)
Manila Mariana
Saduleschi Axenia
Rusu Svetlana
Creciun Cristina
Zlatin Angela
Poștaru Liliana
23. Teachers focus group – Dimitre cantemir Gymnasium (Cahul)
Porvana Galina
Jilghina galina
Ghețiu Svetlana
Cebotaru Irina
Iurova Mariana
Bracolova Maria
Șerepceea Svetlana
Jantuan Mariana
Chiosă Aliona
Davleaceaia Inessa
Cemberji Valentina
Copilov Olga
Mititelu Tamara
Lambov Liudmila
Nebunu Alia

24. Pupils focus group – Pelinia (Drochia)
Paula
Dora
Ghenadie
Vasile
Madalina
Ionela
Gabriela
Ion
Paul

25. Pupils focus group – Pelinia (Drochia)
Veaceaslav
Ana-Maria
Mihaela
Daniela
Nicoleta
Romina

26. Pupils focus group – Pelinia (Drochia)
Adriana
Ruxanda
Corina
Valeria
Daniela
Vlad

27. Pre-primary school teachers focus group – Kindergarten (Drochia)
Sovca Liliana
Ileavan Tatiana
Grosu Valeria
Şoimu Valentina
Leahu Elena
Filip Zinaida
Reveţchi Anna
Rusu Eugenia

28. Teachers focus group – Pelinia (Drochia)
Dabijia Lidia
Irumeza Galina
Ţurcanu Anișoara
Ţurcanu Veronca
Postolachi Emilia
Băbălău Elena
Andrei Viorica
Proca Victoria
Focus group guideline – Professionals in schools (teachers)

Introduction
- Short presentation of the moderator and topic of discussion
  It explains what a focus group and "discussion rules" are: there are no right or wrong answers, the discussion will remain confidential, the opinions of all those present are interesting, the spontaneous interventions are very important.
- Presentation of the participants (each participant will have to answer the questions, a table tour will be held for each question)
- We will start with a brief introduction: first name, education, profession, social / health / education experience

Knowledge
1. How familiar are you with the inclusive education in general and the Programme for Development of Inclusive Education for the years 2011-2020, implemented in Republic of Moldova?

Relevance
2. Which are, in your opinion, the most important problems of the educational system in Moldova? Are these generating access barriers for any children?

Effectiveness and impact
3. Have all children access to education and are all children included in education? If not, why not? If yes, how?
4. How do you appreciate / assess the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova?
5. Are the existing methodological and pedagogical framework for the inclusion of all children, developed between 2011 and 2019, including curriculum development, guides and individual plans, is complete and appropriate? How well adapted are these resources and the technologies used to different child’s learning needs and different development stages?
6. Is the school environment inclusive and friendly for children with Special Educational Needs? Please think at infrastructure, technologies used, the methodological and pedagogical framework, but also the school institutional cultures, classroom interactions between pupils/students etc.
7. How do you appreciate / assess the role and activity of the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education? How about the role and activity of the Psycho-pedagogical Assistance Services?
8. Did you receive training concerning inclusive education? How about other resources? How do you appreciate / assess the quality and utility of the training and/or other resources you received?
9. How are parents involved in the educational process, including the development of the individual development plans?
10. Which are the most important factors that influenced the extent of inclusiveness of the schools in Moldova?

Efficiency
11. Have been resources needed for the implementation of activities for inclusive education always available?
12. How do you appreciate the time needed for measures to be implemented and outcomes to be visible in the field of inclusive education?

Sustainability
13. Please give us your opinion/vision on the continuation of the activities concerning the development of inclusive education in your school?
Focus group guidelines – Beneficiaries (pupils/students)

Introduction

• Short presentation of the moderator and topic of discussion
  It explains what a focus group and "discussion rules" are: there are no right or wrong
  answers, the discussion will remain confidential, the opinions of all those present are
  interesting, the spontaneous interventions are very important.

Presentation of the participants (each participant will have to answer the questions, a table tour
will be held for each question)

• We will start with a brief introduction: first name, age, class, brothers / sisters (how many)?
• What do you want to do after you finish school?

Inclusive education evaluation

1. What do you like about school where you learn?
2. In your opinion is school accessible for all children? Is any children willing to go to school
   able to do so?
3. Do you have colleagues that have Special Educational Needs / colleagues that have special
   needs concerning their learning (e.g.: children with disability)?
   If yes, please describe how you interact with them during classes? What about after classes,
   or during the breaks?
   If no, please think how you would interact with them during classes? What about after
   classes, or during the breaks?
4. Are teachers paying attention to what students say, to their needs? How do they support
   students in difficult situations? What about other school personnel?
5. Have you ever felt mistreated or misunderstood in school? Please give us an example. In
   such situations, have been your teachers, parents or colleagues supportive? Did you feel
   they care or can help?
6. Did you ever participate in extra-curricular activities of the school? Are them accessible for
   all children?
Annex 7. Case studies – design and reports

Case study – Chișinău Municipality

INTRODUCTION
Drafting this Case study was based on the collection of information and data at Chisinau Municipality level (by means of desk-based research, interviews, focus groups) and their interpretation and analysis in accordance with the methodology approved in the Inception Report.

The case study drafted has an exploratory nature, describing context and implementation mechanisms and assessing the changes and impact that occurred as a result of actions implemented in the framework of the Programme on inclusive education implemented during 2011-2019. The case study will also provide information on reasons for success of the programme implementation, as well as challenges of this implementation. Moreover, the case study provides evidences on the effectiveness and impact of the programme on the whole.

Several districts (and the Municipality of Chisinau) were chosen for conducting the study, based on comprehensive criteria developed and inserted in the Inception Report. In this regard, Chisinau Municipality is highly developed (an issue which determines access and participation in education), a relatively great number of children with SEN (including children with disabilities), with PAS and well-endowed human resources, schools having benefitted from other interventions, as well as good representation in terms of education (early education and primary and secondary level).

In order to adequately capture the context of the intervention, but also to observe the dynamics between the child protection system and the educational system (mass /common and schools for children with disabilities) and children supported in this context, we will embed the data collection activities planned at municipality level (Directorate for Education Chisinau, PAS Chisinau, Cuty hall) and local level (school, kindergarten) in the case study.

The data collected as such were contextualised and analysed taking into account the status and evolution at district level as regards inclusive education (i.e. how children with SEN were integrated in mass education), as well as in conjunction with quantitative and qualitative data requested to the parties involved in Programme implementation.

Chișinău is the capital city, the largest city and the administrative, territorial, economic, scientific and cultural centre of the Republic of Moldova.

At Chisinau Municipality level, the total number of children between 7-18 years old who attend primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II) is of 80672 children. Out of these, 758 are children with SEN, i.e. about 0.94%. Out of the total number of children with SEN enrolled in primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II), 174 are children with certified disabilities. 153 of the children enrolled in primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II) are home-schooling children (61 children with SEN and 49 children with disabilities).

Regarding the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II) who were registered by PAS at the end of 2018, this number

---

19 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
was of 174 children in Chisinau. Out of these, 114 children presented severe disability, 51 had an increased degree of disability and 9 children had a moderate degree of disability.

Figure 1. Number of children with disabilities attending primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II) based on degree of disability in Chișinău Municipality

As regards the inclusion of these children in education levels, 86 of the children with disabilities were enrolled in primary education and 67 were included in secondary education, level I (gymnasium). At the end of 2018, 21 children were included in secondary education, level II (upper secondary education).

With regard to the types of disability degree, out of the 174 children with disability enrolled in educational institutions, the majority (51) have neuromotor (physical) disability, 47 have psychiatric disability (ASD - autism spectrum disorders), 42 have intellectual (mental) disabilities, 17 have somatic disabilities, 11 have visual impairment and 6 present hearing impairment.20

According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, at Chisinau municipality level, 41 young people with SEN/disabilities were enrolled in vocational education.

As regards the number of children with SEN reassessed by PAS in 2018, (children with special educational needs in primary, secondary educational institutions, level I and II), this comprised 223 children, and 201 of these are children with SEN confirmed during the reassessment process. The number of children (in primary and secondary educational institutions) assessed by PAS in 2018 was of 203 children. Out of these, 192 were identified with SEN. Thus, at the end of 2018, 758 children with SEN were registered at PAS. SEN categories are presented in the table below. Thus, a number of 326 children have learning difficulties, 117 have mental retardation/disability/intellectual disability/severe learning difficulties, 78 have physical/neuromotor disability, 164 have emotional and behavioural disorders, 24 have visual impairment, 11 hearing impairment, 29 belong to the group at risk (disadvantaged environments for growth and development; belonging to minority ethnic groups; immigrant families; street children; children affected by AIDS), and 9 have language disorders.

Source: Adapted by authors

---

20 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
The total number of children aged between 3-7 years old who attend pre-school educational institutions is 37905 children[^21]. Out of these, 374 children with SEN (registered at PAS) and 153 have a certified disability. According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, the records of PAS included 153 children with disabilities (102 with severe degree of disability, 44 with increased degree and 7 with moderate degree).

In terms of SEN categories, these are as follows:

---

[^21]: Data on children with special educational needs (aged 3-7) enrolled in pre-school educational institutions and support services provided to them as of 31 December 2018, PAS.
**PAS staff, including the available specialised staff**

The analysis report of PAS activity for 2018 showed the existence of a number of 7 specialists at PAS Chișinău. According to the latest PAS report there is a great workload for PAS Chișinău, with about 294 education institutions\(^3\).

Moreover, the complex evaluation as a process implies responsibility of the specialists involved, ensuring professional training, objectivity and flexibility. PAS Chișinău specialists faced various difficulties/impediments in organising and developing the complex evaluation/re-evaluation process, among which\(^3\):

- Insufficient time to observe children in the educational process, as this parameter is very important;
- Formal evaluation development by the IMC;
- The reluctance of some institutions (they do not relegate children for evaluation, including those with disabilities);
- The reluctance and refusal of some parents to give their agreement for the complex evaluation;
- Absence of children when they are to be re-evaluated and repeated planning/travelling of PAS specialists to re-evaluate the absent children;
- Insufficient knowledge of parents about the children data;
- Great number of requests and insufficient number of PAS specialists (Chișinău);

Regarding the number of specialists from the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education (RCIE), at the end of 2018, in early education institutions, in the RCIEs in Chișinău municipality, the number of specialists was of 48, of whom 1 psychologist and 47 speech therapists. There are no STS or RCIE for this age category (early education).

Regarding primary and secondary education institutions, at municipality level there were 68 RCIE, 70 STS and 171 specialists (134 psychologists and 37 speech therapists)\(^4\).

1) Relevance

1.1. The most important needs of the stakeholders

The most important needs of children from Chișinău schools refer to the development of a friendly infrastructure for all children. Children do not talk about the need of inclusive education development in Chișinău, because they identify two different situations. (A) For some institutions (for example the students from Mihai Viteazu Theoretical High-school) students do not feel the need for an increase of the level/measure in which children with SEN are included because they do not consider they have colleagues in such a situation. (B) In schools where the inclusive education programme was conducted (for example Prosuces Theoretical High-school) students see school as being very inclusive, they know and use the concept, but they do not identify new needs referring to inclusive education anymore (See Effectiveness section).


Regarding the teaching staff, they firstly need more training and methodological support to initiate and continue an inclusive education process. This need is doubled by the need of material investments in schools since in Chişinău, a municipality with a still large school population, classes with over 30 students are quite numerous. There are also material needs regarding accessible infrastructure in Chişinău, but at a smaller scale.

At the level of specific institutional level (public administration and PAS) one of the needs is about a better inter-institutional collaboration because of the limited co-operation between institutions from the educational field and those from the social field. Also, although they admit they are "privileged" compared to the institutions in the districts farther from the capital city, the representatives of Chişinău institutions show that they would need more support from the central authorities, especially from CRAP, and the school staff need training that is over the provision capacity of PAS Chişinău.

In Chişinău 4 special schools for children with sensory disabilities and 3 auxiliary schools for children with SEN/severe disabilities (development delay, autism, etc.) (2 in Romanian language, 1 in Russian language) are still active. The special and auxiliary schools include 500 children. Out of these 7, only one school is residential. These schools need a solution for the integration of children with severe disabilities and/or with aggressive behaviour deviations.

On the other hand, a stakeholder identified by all parties interviewed and participating at focus groups, but relatively little included in activities from the inclusive education programme are the parents. Participants in the educational system: the representatives of PAS and of directorates in the field and even teaching staff admit that a specific approach for parents is needed in order to promote inclusive education, related to both parents of children with SEN (who in certain situations must be convinced not to take their children to auxiliary schools) and to parents of children without SEN, who should change their attitude towards inclusion.

Generally, legislation is considered to be satisfactory, without generating additional needs, with the notable exception of the legislation for early, pre-school education, which is not developed enough. For example, resource centres cannot be developed in kindergartens.

1.2. Activities needed to reach the objective of inclusive education, but not yet implemented

The activities necessary to achieve the inclusive education objectives, but which have not been yet implemented are:

- Developing the capacity of all institutions and stakeholders involved (PAS, schools and teaching staff, including the support ones) to work with children with severe disabilities and children with behaviour deviations. As far as PAS and the Directorate in the field education subordinated to Municipality Council are concerned, their representatives still support special and auxiliary schools for children with severe disabilities, because they cannot see another system where these children can be integrated in education, without affecting negatively the mass schools educational process. On the other hand, even in a pilot-school where inclusive education is promoted successfully, such as Prosucces Theoretical High-school, the teaching staff admitted that they do not have the necessary training in working with children with severe disorders. The focus group participants presented a situation when the teacher needed personal psychological counselling after the attempt to manage in the classroom the case of a child with severe aggressive behaviour deviations, because the previous training did not provide enough help, although it provided useful intraining in working with most children with SEN.

- Developing a functional collaboration between the education system and the social assistance one, especially in identifying functional solutions in the cases of children who need permanent personal assistant.

- Developing the legislation but also the possibility to implement inclusive education in early education, in kindergartens, as well as in vocational schools, where the programme is not implemented.
• Developing and extending training programmes for teaching staff with emphasis on practical situations management. Even the teaching staff who took part in training and began working with children with SEN feel the need for trainings. On the other hand, situations when Chișinău teaching staff from all levels (kindergarten, primary school, middle-school, high-school) did not receive any training on inclusive education were also mentioned.

• Increasing the number of support teaching staff trained correspondingly according to needs.

• Developing a functional collaboration between educational system, the social assistance and employment services so that after children with SEN graduate the education levels they can attend – with syllabus adapted according to the inclusive education policy – they do not become isolated young people and adults. The people interviewed expressed their concern that children with SEN can become competitive young people and adults on a 100% competitive labour market. The need for the parallel development of protected workshops and of social economy was mentioned in this context.

• Developing a collaboration with parents since currently, as it results from the interviews and focus groups conducted, on the one hand the education system, teaching staff, other specialists working with children do not feel the necessary support coming from parents, and on the other hand the means of involving, motivating, educating parents are not known either. Although the evaluation experts brought them into discussion during the interview, the people interviewed did not identify models of parenting programmes developed for inclusive education.

2) Effectiveness (as per evaluation matrix)

2.1. Expected effects at public administration level (in the context of inclusive education, i.e child protection or health system): what has been achieved compared to what was expected

In the vision of the representatives of institutions in the field in Chișinău (PAS, Local directorate in the field) the Programme for inclusive education refers only to children with SEN. According to these institutions in Chișinău, more attention should be given to the other children as well. In the case of a great number of children with emigrated parents, no pedagogic approach methodology which can help children during their parents absence was identified during the interview. Moreover, the representatives of PAS and of the townhall structure in the field showed that there is no substantial support coming from social assistance structures to include all children, that there are still unsolved issues concerning school violence (bullying), etc.

The representatives of institutions in the field in Chișinău (PAS, Local directorate in the field) identify an important progress considering the integration of children with SEN and with disabilities in general education, but they also find a series of deficiencies of the programme at legal and institutional level:

• The legal framework for kindergartens is not sufficiently developed because resource centres cannot be established in kindergartens.

• The legal framework for the integration of children from some special schools (ex: children with hearing disabilities) in high-school has not been drafted.

• Inclusive education has not been developed in vocational schools either and it has been in a pilot phase for a very short time. Therefore, the access on the labour market of children with SEN after school graduation is almost impossible. In this regard, the development of a functional collaboration between education system, the social assistance and the employment services is necessary, so that after children with SEN graduate the education levels they can attend – with syllabus adapted according to inclusive education policy – they do not become isolated young people and adults.

• Collaboration between the education system and the social assistance one is minimal and its development is necessary especially for the identification of functional solutions for the cases of children who need permanent personal assistant.
As such, it can be seen that until 2019 the inclusive education development policy remained more familiar only to the institutional system of education and the continuation of communication, both public and institutional, is necessary to increase the co-operation level.

- The establishment of institutional responsibilities for the development and implementation of parenting programmes is necessary.
- Although infrastructure investments are regularly made, from architectural point of view it is impossible for all schools in Chişinău to be available to children. People understand and it was stated that classes attended by children with disabilities are often moved to the ground floor. But the problem of infrastructure is serious in terms of providing travelling conditions from home to school and children with motor disabilities often remain at home after graduating primary school.
- Behaviour cognitive therapy psychologists are not available for children with behaviour deviations.
- The teaching staff from Prosuce Theoretical High-school propose the following curriculum changes:
  - More emphasis laid on practical exercises and assurance of infrastructure and equipment,
  - Developing teaching-learning methods by means of art and the training of teachers in this regard,
  - The elimination of marks if IEP makes the process of marking a completely artificial exercise, that gives no added values to the educational process, but disorientates parents regarding the development level of the children.

2.2. Expected effects at PAS level: what has been achieved compared to expectations (including development and implementation of individual educational plans)

At Chişinău municipality level, PAS representatives show that the institution has an experience of over 27 years since PAS Chişinău activates as part of the Speech therapy and psychological assistance for children centre. PAS and the Centre work with both children with SEN and with children without declared SEN, but not with those from special and auxiliary schools.

As they do not identify another integration solution, PAS representatives support special schools for children with severe disabilities or needs. According to the interview conducted, in the case of children with more serious disabilities, parents leave them children in the care of special schools in the morning and take them in the evening and they also go to work. In the case of mass schools, children need a personal assistant who most of the times is the parent, who cannot have a job. On the other hand, according to the same interview, in the case of children with severe disabilities and behaviour deviations, home-schooling is a “trick”, because it leads in fact to children isolation. Those children "will not see the daylight". These opinions reflect an increased concern for a real and impactful integration of children with SEN, but also the lack of vision regarding the long term development of the system.

On the other hand, issues concerning the wage grid are stated because PAS employees are paid the same as a kindergarten teacher.

Regarding the relation with CRAP, PAS representatives say that they expect more support from CRAP in managing the most difficult problems and the provision of models and assistance necessary to fill in all documents for each child.

2.3. Expected effects at school level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including preparation and implementation of individual development plans and added value of support centres)

There are substantial differences between schools in Chişinău regarding the progress in developing the inclusive education programme. Pilot schools, among which Prosuce Theoretical High-school, visited for the evaluation, show a major progress regarding inclusive education:
• Teachers feel prepared and do not have problems in developing Individual Education Plan (IEP), even if when evaluating their needs they continue to require training. An important aspect is that they argue more easily for what type of training they need, respectively: they identify the diagnosis type of the child for which they need more training in order to be able to work with them in the classroom later.

• There is an inclusion model shared to all those who come at school/high-school: new educators, teachers, but also children and their parents. A sort of emulation that supports inclusion is formed. Teachers participating at the focus group show from this point of view the importance of the teacher in this aspect: to educate children from early ages in what concerns inclusion and as such to contribute to the development of an inclusive educational environment.

• Prosucces High-school is in the position of having young teaching staff, former students of the high-school, who were trained to support the inclusion of children with SEN since primary levels and who returned to their former high-school after college.

• Although there are no programmes developed for parents or a support centre, the parents of children with SEN benefit monthly from individual counselling.

• Extracurricular activities promoting the participation of students and inclusion are organised.

Even at the level of this school, Prosucces Theoretical High-school, teaching staff and (in a less degree) children participating at focus groups identify a series of problems as such:

• The great number of children in a classroom, sometimes over 30, brings real problems to the teaching staff, especially if 1-2 students have SEN.

• Although IEP development does not raise many issues, its implementation is a challenge because the number of support teaching staff is low and resource centres are not always endowed at optimal level, the implementation of all elements in IEP can be difficult. Moreover, discussions with teachers show that they need more practical training. For most of them developing IEP is not an issue because they have theoretical knowledge about what it contains, but its implementation can be a challenge since they have not developed the necessary practical abilities to work with children with SEN regarding the application of inclusive methodologies.

• The number of support teaching staff is not sufficient compared to the great number of children with SEN.

• There is no material basis necessary for resource centres and IEP implementation, for example there is no equipment for practical, simple Physics and Chemistry experiments.

• Structured programmes of working with parents are needed because they have unrealistic expectations about their children progress and results.

• The teaching staff propose curriculum changes (See above Effectiveness at institutional level).

On the other hand, the teaching staff from the biggest kindergarten in the Republic of Moldova, Kindergarten no. 225 in Chişinău, have never received training for inclusive education. Although they know the concept, they do not know how to apply it and they notice the reluctance of the parents of kindergarten children in accepting additional help. The refusal of an adapted early education can lead to the worsening of some special problems and needs. But the ability of working with parents on this aspect, but also with children with SEN, is lacking at the biggest kindergarten in the Republic of Moldova, Kindergarten no. 225 in Chişinău.

Also, an elite school in Chişinău municipality: Mihai Viteazu Theoretical High-school shows major deficiencies regarding inclusive education. Focus groups organised in this educational unit showed that, surprisingly, children understand better and are more open to the integration of children with SEN than the teachers. Teachers are at a level of increased conformism and support the maintenance of status quo, a very small number of children with SEN at the school, respectively.
2.4. Expected effects at professionals level (including training): what has been achieved compared to what was expected

The interviews and focus groups conducted show that training sessions with teachers have taken place. However they did not include all schools and focused on the training of the teachers from the pilot schools. The need of training is therefore different:

- For pilot schools there is the need of training in working with certain children types/diagnosis. Also, the teaching staff participating at the focus group showed that training must be very practical.
- For the other schools that were not pilot for inclusive education and in kindergartens the training of the teaching staff is needed because it lacks to a great or very great extent at teacher level. Moreover, beyond the theoretical training for an inclusive education teachers need a very practical approach of training in order to later manage the children from the classroom.

On the other hand, PAS staff, but other teachers as well benefitted from experience exchanges and study visits that they found very useful.

2.5. Factors likely to have a positive influence on the resulting effects

According to the interviews conducted, the legislative and strategic framework is currently a success factor for inclusive education.

On the other hand, for the implementation of this framework are necessary:

- The model provided in a school by the headmaster regarding acceptance or rejection of the inclusive education model
- The type of SEN in question, as the integration of children with severe problems or aggressive behaviour deviations still represents a great issue
- Teachers’ attitude and the training that is currently too theoretic

Trained human resources are at this point a success factor identified by the interviewed stakeholders even if training must continue and comprise a much greater number of teaching staff.

2.6. Factors likely to have a negative influence on the effects

The model provided in a school by the headmaster regarding acceptance or rejection of the inclusive education model and teacher attitude (the factors presented above) can be both positive and negative factors in achieving the effects.

From human resources perspective, their instability and fluctuation are negative factors. Teaching staff, as well as other trained professionals are not attracted to work in the educational system and they often leave for other careers after they received training.

3) Efficiency (as per evaluation matrix)

3.1. Approaches or solutions with high efficiency related to the generated effects

In Chișinău no solution with high efficiency related to the generated effects was identified.

People interviewed say that the necessary resources have always been available although the teaching staff complain about:

- The great number of children in a classroom, often over 30 and sometimes over 40, which poses real problems to teaching staff, especially if 1-2 students have SEN
- Insufficient support teaching staff in schools
- There is no material basis necessary for resource centres and IEP implementation, for example there is no equipment for practical, simple Physics and Chemistry experiments.
3.2. Measures needed to simplify/reduce the costs incurred for approaches, solutions, activities – to ensure greater efficiency with less input

The way the resulted budgets (savings) are used after closing down the special schools remains unknown to the people interviewed and this is identified as one of the main sources of further financing the inclusive education programme.

Other approaches, solutions, activities to ensure a greater efficiency with a lower input were not identified.

4) Sustainability (as per evaluation matrix)

4.1. What activities are to be continued until and beyond 2020 and how will they be developed? (at all levels)

The interviews and focus groups organised in Chișinău show that PAS human resources have been and are trained. There are many teaching staff and the continuity of training is needed. They are willing to continue all the activities and the increase of training requests from teachers is confirmed.

4.2. The main risks in continuing the activities and the maintenance/improvement of the obtained effects.

The main risks concerning the progress of activities and maintenance/improvement of the obtained effects (sustainability) are related to: job instability and in many cases migration of teaching staff.

On the other hand, starting with 2018 a growth of the number of children at auxiliary schools in Chișinău was noticed, giving that parents remove their children from mass schools and register them in auxiliary schools, after a one year experience during which children could not adapt to the mass school.

5) Impact (as per evaluation matrix)

5.1. Changes at children level, for children with SEN from general mass education

The interviews and focus groups developed in Chișinău show that in schools where the programme was conducted a very good level of integration of children with SEN is reached. On the other hand, no progress is visible at the level of the other schools.

On the other hand, two elements were repeated during the discussions for this present evaluation at Chișinău:

- The inclusion of children with severe disabilities has not yet been solved and there is no training at institution, school and teaching staff level
- What happens with children with SEN after they finish studies is an open problem and the development of a functional collaboration between the education system, the social assistance and the employment services is necessary so that after children with SEN graduate the levels they can attend – with syllabus adapted according to the inclusive education policy – they do not become isolated young people and adults. The people interviewed showed concern regarding the fact that children with SEN can become competitive young people and adults on a 100% competitive labour market. The need of parallel development of protected workshops and social economy was mentioned in this context.

5.2. Attitude changes regarding inclusive education

A positive change of attitude is seen at parents level. This change however, although has a good direction, is in fact very small. Teaching staff do not feel the necessary support coming from parents and there is no partnership between school and the family. In many situations, the teaching staff
feel parents as "opponents" in the inclusion process, either because parents of children with SEN refuse diagnosis or because the parents of ordinary children refuse the integration of children with SEN in the classes their children study. In many situations the teaching staff and PAS representatives notice a passive attitude of parents who leave the whole educational process to schools, without any explanation.

6) The priorities of the stakeholders on short, medium and long term

The stakeholders involved and interviewed did not set priorities. In all cases they expressed the wish of continuing the activities they had begun.

Teachers, especially from pilot schools in the first part of the programme, need training as soon as possible, very practical training in order to deal with the programme in the future and to be able to face closing down of special and auxiliary schools in Chișinău.
Case study – Ialoveni District

INTRODUCTION
Drafting this Case study was based on the collection of information and data at Ialoveni district level (by means of desk-based research, interviews, focus groups) and their interpretation and analysis in accordance with the methodology approved in the Inception Report.

The case study drafted has an exploratory nature, describing context and implementation mechanisms and assessing the changes and impact that occurred as a result of actions implemented in the framework of the Programme regarding inclusive education implemented during 2011-2019. The case study will also provide information on reasons for success of the programme implementation, as well as challenges of this implementation. Moreover, the case study provides evidences on the effectiveness and impact of the programme on the whole.

Several districts were chosen for conducting the study, based on comprehensive criteria developed and inserted in the Inception Report. In this regard, Ialoveni is a district with a high development level (an issue which determines access and participation in education), a relatively great number of children with SEN (including children with disabilities), with PAS and well-endowed human resources, schools having benefitted from other interventions, as well as good representation in terms of education (early education and primary and secondary level).

In order to adequately capture the context of the intervention, but also to observe the dynamics between the child protection system and the educational system (mass /common and schools for children with disabilities) and children supported in this context, we will embed the data collection activities planned at district level (Ialoveni district Town Hall, Social Assistance Department, General Directorate for Education, PAS) and local level (“Petru Ștefănuță” High School, “Regina Maria” kindergarten) in the case study.

The data collected as such were contextualised and analysed taking into account the status and evolution at district level as regards inclusive education (i.e. how children with SEN were integrated in mass education), as well as in conjunction with quantitative and qualitative data requested to the parties involved in Programme implementation.

Ialoveni district is located in the central region of the country, near Chișinău, being made up of 25 Town Halls. The district consists of one city: Ialoveni; 6 townships: Rusești Noi, Răzeni, Țipala, Zimbreni, Milești Mici, Gangura and 18 villages: Bardar, Cărba, Cărgeni, Costești, Dânceni, Hansca, Horești, Horodca, Malcoci, Molești, Nimoreni, Pojăreni, Puhoi, Sociteni, Suruceni, Ulmu, Văratic and Văsieni.

At Ialoveni district level, the total number of children between 7-18 years old who attend primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II) is of 10295 children 25. Out of these, 330 are children with SEN, i.e. about 3%. Out of the total number of children with SEN enrolled in primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II), 94 are children with certified disabilities. 12 of the children enrolled in primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II) are home-schooled children (8 children with SEN and 8 children with disabilities).

Regarding the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II) who were registered by PAS at the end of 2018, this number

---

25 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
was of 94 children in Ialoveni. Out of these, 57 children presented severe disability, 29 had an increased degree of disability and 8 children had a moderate degree of disability.

Figure 4. Number of children with disabilities attending primary and secondary educational institutions (level I and II) based on degree of disability in Ialoveni district

As regards the inclusion of these children in education levels, 42 of the children with disabilities were enrolled in primary education and 52 were included in secondary education, level I (gymnasium). At the end of 2018, no child was included in secondary education, level II (upper secondary education).

With regard to the types of disability degree, out of the 94 children with disability enrolled in educational institutions, the majority (36) have intellectual (mental) disability, 26 have neuromotor (physical) disability, 20 have psychiatric disability (ASD - autism spectrum disorders), 7 have hearing impairment and 5 present visual impairment.

According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, at Ialoveni district level, 5 young people with SEN/disabilities were enrolled in vocational education.

As regards the number of children with SEN reassessed by PAS in 2018, (children with special educational needs in primary, secondary educational institutions, level I and II), this comprised 378 children, and 315 of these are children with SEN confirmed during the reassessment process. The number of children (in primary and secondary educational institutions) assessed by PAS in 2018 was of 21 children. Out of these, 15 were identified with SEN. Thus, at the end of 2018, 330 children with SEN were registered at PAS. SEN categories are presented in the table below. Thus, a number of 223 children have learning difficulties, 36 have mental retardation/disability/intellectual disability/severe learning difficulties, 26 have physical/neuromotor disability, 22 have emotional and behavioural disorders.

---

26 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
The total number of children aged between 3-7 years old who attend pre-school educational institutions is 5195 children. Out of these, 106 children with SEN (registered at PAS) and 19 have a certified disability. According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, the records of PAS included 19 children with disabilities (9 with severe degree of disability, 4 with increased degree and 6 with moderate degree).

4 of these children were aged between 3-4 years old, 8 children were aged between 5-6 years old, and 7 of them were aged 7 years old\(^\text{27}\).

In terms of SEN categories, these are as follows:

---

\(^{27}\) According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
According to the qualitative research on-site, over the last few years, at district level, the number of institutionalised children has decreased. At the time this report is drafted, 18 children are placed in residential institutions (5 children at an early age (up to 5 years old – but work is done on these cases in order to be reintegrated into families). A part of these children has behavioural issues (deviant behaviour).

**PAS staff, including available specialised staff**

PAS in Ialoveni district was established in 2012 by decision of District Council. This was established as part of a public educational institution (optimised/adapted institution) provided by the Local Public Authority, that was considered to be available at the time of the establishment, namely within “Petru Ștefăuca” High School in Ialoveni city. This location favours access to services for children, parents, but also for the teaching staff in the district/municipal localities.

The analysis of the reports on PAS activity in 2018 has highlighted the existence of 5 specialists within PAS Ialoveni and 2 vacancies for psychologist.

As regards the number of specialists within the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education (RCIE), at the end of 2018, in early educational institutions, in the 6 RCIE existent at Ialoveni district level, there were 15 specialists, of which 7 support teaching staff, 2 psychologists, 4 speech therapists and 2 physiotherapists.

In the case of primary and secondary educational institutions, at district level, there were 31 RCIE and 53 specialists (37 support teaching staff, 13 psychologists, 2 speech therapists and 1 physiotherapist)\(^\text{28}\).

---

6) Relevance

1.1. The most important needs of the stakeholders.

Taking into consideration that Ialoveni district is one of the two districts where inclusive education was piloted earlier (starting with 2011), some of the needs of the most important stakeholders have either intensified in time or have changed.

In terms of the needs existent at the level of pre-school institutions, the information collected during discussions with the representatives of the local authority, as well as the representatives of “Regina Maria” kindergarten included on the visit list for in-depth research purposes, shows the fact that the lack of places in kindergartens (especially, due to the great number of children and, by extension, to the upward demographic trend) is the main issue that pre-school education system deals with in Ialoveni city. This issue is also influenced by the proximity of the city to Chişinău capital city. As a consequence of the great number of children enrolled in this institution, the number of pre-primary school teachers is low in comparison with the number of children in one group (who are most often 41, 37, 38, 39, 46 children in one group). This issue greatly hinders the performance of inclusive education, especially in the context where that group also includes children with SEN.

“Regina Maria” kindergarten was included as pilot pre-school institution for inclusive education together with 6 pilot schools within the district. This makes inclusive education to be ensured both by appropriate provision with the necessary equipment, as well as necessary specialists. However, a number of needs have been identified within the focus group with pre-primary school teachers and support teaching staff. On one hand, there were highlighted needs related to the availability of the necessary specialists, and on the other hand, to how children with SEN are assessed. First of all, there is an urgent need of speech therapists (2-3 speech therapists would be required to meet the needs), in addition to the existing one (1), taking into account the total number of children enrolled in kindergarten (527), of which 24 are children with SEN (severe disabilities). In this respect, only 2 institutions in Ialoveni city have a speech therapist. Another need identified is the lack of a kindergarten therapist to work with 14 children with autism, locomotor disability, intellectual disability, epilepsy, emotional and behavioural disorder.

As for the assessment of children with SEN, the need for them to be assessed by PAS at an early age (even before 3 years old) was identified, as, the earlier the intervention, the sooner different disorders can be identified. Children with speech impairments were not assessed within this kindergarten. It is estimated that the number of children with SEN would be much greater if this assessment would be performed. This issue was also confirmed by the interview with the PAS representative who mentioned that in kindergartens there are still unidentified/non-assessed children who need services and an evaluation to determine their needs.

Related to the children assessment method, the information collected shows the need for the PAS assessment to be performed in group and not individually (the assessment method to be implemented correctly), and over a longer period of time, so that the child’s cognitive development level can be adequately observed.

Another need identified both at the level of the pre-school and school institutions is represented by the need to review the job title lists of staff working in the institutions because the job title list dates back to 1999 and does not provide for the necessary positions (e.g. “Regina Maria” kindergarten has only a part-time position assigned for psychologist).

Another need brought to notice by the specialists within the kindergarten and the support teaching staff at “Petru Ștefănuță” High School refers to the lack of standard materials to be used while working with children with SEN. These have confirmed that they spend a lot of time, including for the procurement and preparation (adjustment) of materials which makes work difficult for the teaching staff.
Needs have been identified at the level of school educational institutions (primary and secondary). To this end, the information collected shows the lack of specialists in problems of children with emotional and behavioural disorders, including Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), psychologist shortage in educational institutions (gymnasium), support teaching staff (STS) shortage in some schools in different localities, including the need for empowerment of the existing specialists in different narrower areas (working with children with severe disabilities, e.g. ASD, behavioural disorders). At this point the teaching staff is not ready to face these challenges. Training actions in this field were identified as necessary by all representatives taking part in the research (PAS, pre-primary school teachers, teaching staff, support teaching staff).

In terms of behavioural disorders (not necessarily in the case of children with SEN), although there are services at the level of the educational institution (STS/psychologist/head teacher), at the community level the need for additional services has been identified (centres where specialised intensive therapies can be performed, specialised behaviour modelling services, where there are specialists with advanced training in this field). Such services are required for children with deviant behaviour (109 children in Ialoveni district) who cannot be permanently integrated in educational institutions.

As for the needs of children with SEN in Ialoveni district schools, it was found that out of the 30 children with SEN diagnosed with ASD, only 10 have a personal assistant, which partially ensures them access to an inclusive education. Information collected from teaching staff (TS) and support teaching staff (STS) shows the need for each child diagnosed with ASD to be permanently accompanied at school by a personal assistant, so that the quality of the educational process does not decrease. Moreover, it was highlighted the need that even the personal assistant to be schooled/trained in ASD therapy.

Taking into account aspects such as migration of parents to other countries, as well as their lifestyle, which can influence the development and educational process of the child, an earlier intervention on the children is needed, as well as actions of prevention and parental empowerment. The data collected shows that there are cases in which the parents’ lifestyle contributes to worsening the situation of children.

In general, as far as this legislation is concerned, it is considered to be sufficient, without generating additional needs, except for the PAS Regulation which needs to be changed. At the time of the qualitative research on-site, they were still working on adjusting it. To this end, PAS representatives confirm the need to resize the activity of PAS. In this respect, the period assigned by professionals for reassessment is subject to change (so that they have more time for individual assistance). Also, the need for PAS working hours to become standard was identified (currently, the working hours are different from one district to another (in some districts, specialists work 7 hours, while in other districts they work 8 hours). The heads of (all) PAS work 8 hours/day.

1.2. Activities needed to reach the objective of inclusive education, but not yet implemented.

Among the activities required to achieve the objectives of inclusive education, first of all, we mention the development of the capacity of all the institutions and actors involved (PAS, school, kindergarten, pre-primary school teachers and support teaching staff) to work with children with severe disabilities and deviant behavioural disorders, including ASD. In Ialoveni district, a large part of those involved are not in favour of special and auxiliary schools for children with severe disabilities, but rather for setting up additional services at community level (centres where specialised intensive therapies and specialised behaviour modelling services can be performed, where there are specialists with advanced training in this area). Such services are also needed for children with deviant behaviour who cannot be permanently integrated in educational institutions (because in their opinion it would affect the educational process in schools). This issue was also confirmed by the representatives of “Petru Ştefănescu” High School, a pilot school where inclusive education is promoted with great success, (both because of the Inclusive Education Unit and the available equipment that provides access to inclusive education for children with SEN and severe
disabilities). On the other hand, training activities of the existing specialists in different areas/therapies are needed, such as therapies used for children with ASD (autism). Training activities in this field were identified as necessary for all representatives taking part in the research (PAS, Ialoveni General Directorate for Education, pre-primary school teachers, teaching staff, support teaching staff).

Developing the legislation, but also the ability to achieve inclusive education in early education, respectively in kindergartens that are not currently covered. These are actions necessary to ensure an inclusive education throughout the district. Given that out of the 36 pre-school institutions within Ialoveni district, only 6 kindergartens provide inclusive education (these are correspondingly equipped), actions are needed to incorporate inclusive practices in all the other kindergartens (where children with SEN are present, because not all kindergartens have children with SEN). In localities with 2-3 kindergartens, it is advisable to introduce inclusive education at least in one, so as to give each child with SEN the possibility to participate in the educational process. This will allow an early intervention and the results will be much better in further development of children with SEN.

Another element needed to reach the objective of inclusive education is the increase in the number of support teaching staff (both in pre-school and school institutions). Currently, their number is limited and insufficient (1 STS for 5 children with severe SEN, or 1 STS for 12 children with SEN).

On the other hand, although some actions have been taken to inform/train the parents, in order to reach the objective of inclusive education, a more intense cooperation with them is necessary, especially for those with children with SEN. Children from disadvantaged backgrounds need support (not just material), so it is necessary to develop parental skills in parents, thus insisting on prevention.

Another element necessary for achieving the objective of inclusive education consists of the availability of specialists at Ialoveni district level (especially, that of speech therapists, therapists, psychologists. To this end, only 2 educational institutions in Ialoveni city benefit from the services of a speech therapist.

2) Effectiveness (as per evaluation matrix)

2.1. Expected effects at public administration level (inclusive education - specific and context, i.e. child protection, health system): what has been achieved compared to what was expected.

All the representatives of the specialty institutions in Ialoveni (Town Hall, PAS, General Directorate for Education, Social Assistance Department) identify a real progress concerning the integration of children with SEN and disabilities in general and pre-school education. This progress is generated by the subsequent piloting and implementation of the Inclusive Education Programme, starting with 2011, when Ialoveni district was selected for implementation of the pilot programme in the 6 schools and in “Regina Maria” kindergarten (Kindergarten no. 5 Ialoveni).

One of the most important effects produced at the level of the public administration refers to the collaboration between the institutions at district level with a role in ensuring inclusive education. If in the beginning the collaboration was more difficult, over time, it has considerably improved, carrying out in collaboration a series of actions and activities with a role in identifying, referring and solving cases of social and educational exclusion from the entire district. Following such collaboration, a number of cases were identified and it was possible to obtain clear records and data regarding the number of children at risk and social and educational exclusion. Currently, in Ialoveni
district there are no pre-school and school-age children with SEN who are not enrolled in kindergarten or school.

Since the beginning of the Programme (2011), at district level a Cross-sector Steering Committee was set up (made of representatives of the Town Hall, Health Department, Education Department, Social Assistance Department, Police) whose role is to identify and discuss the most urgent needs at the community level, including those related to access to inclusive education. Depending on the need, the representatives of this structure meet for collaboration and cooperation and take the necessary measures to solve the identified cases. In the following period (2019), at district level, it is desired to create an early intervention service (for children aged 0-3 years old).

To ensure an efficient correlation between the measures covered by each institution, the strategic management plans that each school/kindergarten has to achieve are correlated with the Strategic plan concerning inclusive education, drafted by the General Directorate for Education.

As regards the cooperation between social and educational assistance at district level, there is a person responsible for inclusive education who takes part in several structures (committees) regarding the social services existent at district level Thus, this person is a member of the Committee for Children in difficulty and the Committee for Children at Risk. In addition, at district level there is also the Early Intervention Committee, prevention service (identifying, granting some forms of protection) in order to prevent risk situations. Also, at Town Hall level, there is a multidisciplinary team made of school/kindergarten principal, physician, psychologist, social worker, representative of the local public authority and police who work together so as to identify and solve different cases, to identify children with disabilities and/or SEN, including to ensure inclusive education.

Another important element constituted at district level is the mobile team, which was created in 2013, in order to intervene for children and adults with a degree of disability, thus preventing their institutionalisation. At the time the assessment report was drafted, of the 171 beneficiaries of this type of service, 151 were children (74 school-age children and 45 pre-school-age children). Out of these, 37 were enrolled in school/kindergarten with the help of the mobile team. For children with a severe degree of disability, at district level, another type of assistance was extended (achieved together with the representatives of the local public authority), i.e. home-schooling. 8 children within the district benefit from this service.

On the other hand, the representatives of specialty institutions in Ialoveni (PAS, General Directorate for Education, Social Assistance Department) identify a number of deficiencies of the programme at institutional and legal level. To this end, the representatives consider the legal framework for kindergartens as being insufficiently developed because RCIE cannot be established within kindergartens.

In addition, although within the 2 institutions visited (“Petru Ștefănuca” High School and “Regina Maria” Kindergarten) investments in infrastructure/equipment have been achieved/are constantly achieved, it is possible that the other pre-school (with inclusive education) and school institutions within the district might not be as accessible for all children. “Petru Ștefănuca” High School in Ialoveni has all the infrastructure necessary to ensure inclusive education, including for children with severe disabilities. This aspect is due, mainly, to the existence of the Inclusive Education Unit within the high school (structure inclusively equipped with means of transportation for children with severe disabilities). All representatives/participants interviewed in focus groups have appreciated the importance and usefulness of such unit, confirming that in its absence, children
with severe disabilities would have never arrived at school (even if they do not attend all classes due to the degree of disability). It was mentioned that Resource Centres for Inclusive Education within education units are not so equipped to ensure the same high level of inclusive education comparable with the one provided within the Inclusive Education Unit.

Another deficiency identified refers to the insufficient number of psychologists in kindergartens and schools within the entire district. There are not enough psychologists for cognitive-behavioural therapy for children with behavioural disorders, including ASD.

Both high school teaching staff and teachers at “Regina Maria” kindergarten have emphasised the lack of standard materials that they could use while working with children with SEN. They have confirmed that they spend a lot of time including for the procurement and preparation (adjustment) of materials, making their job and also the quality of the educational process more difficult.

2.2. Expected effects at PAS level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including preparation and implementation of individual development plans).

PAS was established based on the decision of the District Council in 2012 (pilot phase) in partnership with Lumos. At district level, it was decided that PAS team shall consist of 2 teachers (both for primary and secondary education and early education), 2 psychologists, 1 psychotherapist, 1 speech therapist. PAS staff is undersized in relation with the number of school and pre-school institutions which they in charge with (currently, the number of children with SEN depending on PAS staff is 436 children²⁹).

If in the beginning PAS was perceived as an inspection, the teaching staff understood that PAS supports the educational process of child with SEN (by the methods it applies during the child’s observation process).

The interview with the PAS representative confirms that there are still unidentified children with SEN in kindergartens who need services, need to be assessed and to be set their needs. In this context, there is still reluctance on the part of parents (who do not agree to have their children assessed by PAS). In such cases, if the institution where the child with SEN is enrolled approaches PAS, the institution specialists will go and talk to the parents for explaining why it is important to identify their child’s development deficiencies at an early stage. Where appropriate, specialists even go into the community to explain why the child needs assistance.

PAS has been assigned over the years the competence of identifying children with disabilities. Therefore, by means of form no. 5³⁰, drafted by PAS specialists, the child’s degree of disability is being established and thus, with this document the parent goes to the National Council for Disability and Work Capacity Determination, structure subordinated to the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection. For extension of the disability degree, parents require the issuance of necessary documents from PAS.

Ialoveni PAS with the General Directorate for Education and various NGOs have extended another type of assistance at district level, i.e. home-schooling. Currently, 8 children within the district benefit from home-schooling. To this end, PAS together with partners have drafted a curriculum by merging and exclusion (modified curriculum) and have cut down the objectives of the former curriculum so that each child could learn what he/she needs and depending on the learning skill of each child (individualised curriculum). In this context, they have involved even the mobile team, but have strengthened the parents’ role in the child’s education. However, according to the PAS representative, the 2 hours a week per child in this situation are not enough. Therefore, steps are being taken during this period to increase the number of hours (from 2 hours to 4 hours a week).

---

²⁹ According to interview with PAS representative. Information available on the date the data is collected on site.
³⁰ The form contains data on the child’s development, the services he/she benefits from, the training/education/rehabilitation conditions and other circumstances – in the case of children that are registered in PAS records.
As regards the relationship with RCPA (Republican Centre for Psycho-pedagogical Assistance), PAS representatives confirm that they receive all the support needed in managing the most difficult issues.

2.3. Expected effects at school level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including designs and implementation of individual development plans and added value of support centres).

At district level, RCIE were created in each school during 2012-2016, thus contributing to the development of inclusive education. Currently, all education (school) institutions have RCIE and are equipped so as to ensure inclusive activities.

Considering that the piloting of the programme was carried out earlier in the 6 schools and one kindergarten at district level, the representatives of the educational institutions within the district have confirmed a major progress in terms of inclusive education. In this context, both teaching staff and pre-primary school teachers feel prepared to a great extent and do not encounter major problems in the implementation of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP), even if, at first, they have encountered some obstacles. The support received from PAS, as well as the trainings performed by several providers (NGOs, General Directorate for Education, educational institutions) have made a major contribution to their empowerment in filling out the necessary documents, as well as in working effectively with children with SEN. However, some training activities in different therapies for working with children diagnosed with ASD (e.g. ABA therapy) or for working with children with emotional and behavioural disorders are needed both in schools and in kindergartens that integrate the inclusive practice.

All teaching staff, support teaching staff and pre-primary school teachers who participated in focus groups have emphasised the importance of integrating inclusive practices in pre-school education. This contributes to the development of a more inclusive educational environment and it can prevent the development of more serious deficiencies in children with SEN, if they are identified at an early stage.

The opportunities for them to benefit from the necessary services increase with the early identification and assessment of needs. In this context, it was emphasised the need for inclusive practices to be introduced also in kindergartens where there is no such assistance (only 6 kindergartens have assistance services and STS, respectively).

All representatives (teaching staff, support teaching staff) have confirmed that different extracurricular activities which promote students’ participation and inclusion are being held in school education institutions (“Petru Ștefănucă” High School). In addition, volunteer actions that also involve typical students from the high school, aspect also confirmed within the focus group with students, are being held on a regular basis in the Inclusive Education Unit within “Petru Ștefănucă” High School. Such extracurricular activities are possible due to the existent equipment and facilities, especially within the Inclusive Education Unit which enables the participation of all children with SEN in activities (including children with severe disabilities and those from other localities).

In terms of understanding the concept of inclusive education by the students, the majority of the participants in the focus group held at “Petru Ștefănucă” High School knows and applies inclusive practices. In this respect, it was appreciated that the presence of a child with SEN in classroom does not influence the quality of the education process or the learning ability of typical children. Also, children taking part in FG have confirmed that they participate in various activities carried out within the Inclusive Education Unit together with children with SEN. They are regularly visiting children with severe disabilities within the unit and they do not perceive as an impediment the inclusion of children with SEN in classrooms with them. Moreover, they notice an improvement in the perception of typical children towards children with SEN (they relate to them, they support each other). Also, participants have confirmed that students with SEN feel accepted within the school.

Although there is clear progress in terms of inclusive education at the level of schools and kindergartens with inclusive practices within the district, a number of deficiencies that still persist and negatively influence the provision of an educational process was identified. These include:
Large number of children in classroom (both in pre-school and school institutions). In most cases, a group/class consists of more than 30 children, which makes it difficult for kindergarten teachers and teaching staff, especially if 1-2 students have SEN. The teaching staff have considered that it cannot pay more attention each time to children with SEN. Sometimes, the teaching staff stay during breaks in order to better explain them certain aspects.

The insufficient number of support teaching staff both in kindergartens and schools in comparison with the large number of children with SEN.

Speech therapists’ shortage in kindergartens and schools. In the case of “Regina Maria” Kindergarten, there is only one speech therapist and 2-3 speech therapists are necessary to cover the existent need.

The therapist shortage in kindergartens to work with children with autism, locomotor disability, intellectual disability, epilepsy, emotional-behavioural disorder

The insufficient number of psychologists in kindergartens and schools. This is also generated by the job title list at the level of each institution.

Collaboration with parents who have unrealistic expectations related to the progress and performance of children with SEN.

Lack of standard materials for teaching staff to use while working with children with SEN.

2.4. Expected effects at professionals’ level (including trainings): what has been achieved compared to what was expected.

The most important effect is that throughout this period, the professionals have gained knowledge and experience for the education of all children, not just for those with SEN.

The interviews and focus groups performed show that training sessions were carried out with kindergarten teachers and teaching staff, as well as with the auxiliary staff (in the case of “Regina Maria” kindergarten). Specialists from the first 6 pilot schools went abroad (Great Britain) for training. Specialists were trained both with the help of NGOs (Lumos, Femeia ș Copilul, Keystone) and the General Directorate for Education and PAS. As regards “Regina Maria” kindergarten, its representatives have confirmed that once a month/trimester they request the presence of specialists from different organisations (psychologists, speech therapists, specialists on autism spectrum) to learn from them and to be able to implement new techniques while working with children (especially, children with autism spectrum disorder). The focus group with the kindergarten representatives confirms that specialists were trained by PAS and General Directorate for Education representatives (160 hours of work with children with severe SEN).

Nevertheless, schools and kindergartens were inclusive practices are implemented require training of the teaching staff (including the support teaching staff) and kindergarten teachers in different narrower areas (for children with severe disabilities, ASD, behavioural disorders) who represent a challenge for pre-school and school institutions. The teaching staff is not ready to face the challenges. This need was also identified within PAS representatives, who need training exclusively in therapies necessary for working with children with this type of disabilities.

In addition, both teaching staff, support teaching staff and PAS representatives have emphasised the need for even personal assistants and/or parents of children with this type of disabilities to benefit from training for these therapies.

2.5. Factors conducing to/causing effects.

The programme concerning inclusive education is believed to be the triggering factor of the educational revolution in Republic of Moldova.

A first factor that positively affects the production of effects at the level of the inclusive education system is the legislative and strategic framework, which represents at this moment a success factor for inclusive education. To this end, at Ialoveni district level there is a Strategic plan for the development of inclusive education that is adjusted depending on the needs and requirements identified at the level of the entire district. Another element mentioned by the respondents is the regulation of the Interdisciplinary Methodological Committee (IMC) that was recently approved. On the other hand, methodological benchmarks regarding home education for children with disabilities
were appreciated by all representatives of the interviewed institutions as being very useful in producing effects.

Trained human resources have been identified as a success factor, even if the training must continue and include a much larger number of teachers, including the training of support teaching staff.

Non-governmental organisations represent a special factor in the development and implementation of procedures regarding inclusive education, especially in terms of training of the teaching staff, kindergarten teachers, PAS representatives as well as material facilities for the Inclusive Education Unit and RCIE in schools.

Another significant factor is represented by the very good cooperation and collaboration between district institutions and structures, issue materialised in the established cross-sectoral and integrated structures, which serve and provide services necessary for the inclusive education process to take place, and thus, ensure access for all children with SEN to the educational process within the district. To this end, it must be noted the role of the Cross-sectoral Steering Committee (structure which includes specialists in medicine, police, social assistance, education), the role of the multidisciplinary mobile team (established at city hall level), the role of the Directorate for Early Intervention within the Directorate for Social Assistance (preventive role in terms of hazardous situations), Committee on Child in Distress, Committee on Child at Risk.

2.6. Factors hampering the effects.

In terms of human resources, their instability and migration are negative factors that can negatively influence the effects produced.

The lack of vocational and technical schools within the district can make difficult the route of children with SEN who want and can study a profession after they graduate 9th grade. Although Ialoveni district is near the city of Chişinău and collaboration with a number of pilot institutions takes place (vocational schools), for children from different localities within the district, this can only mean a factor in giving up, as they do not have the resources necessary to study in Chişinău.

Another factor that negatively affects the effects produced is the STS working time which is too high according to specialists, related to the number and degree of severity of children with SEN. The majority of STS taking part in focus groups has confirmed that they make considerable efforts to cope with the number of children with SEN assigned. This thing is also influenced by the different age of children with SEN, and therefore of the class where they are enrolled. This has an influence to some extent, including the quality of the educational process that kindergarten teachers or teaching staff must perform.

3) Efficiency (as per evaluation matrix)

3.1. Particularly cost-efficient / effective approaches, solutions.

There has not been identified any solution to have a high efficiency in relation to the generated effects in Ialoveni.

Responders claim that the necessary resources were mainly available (both from the District Council and the Ministry of Education, but also thanks to NGOs that have contributed to a great extent to provision of equipment for the centres). Nevertheless, the teaching staff and kindergarten teachers claim:

- The large number of children in a classroom, often exceeding 30 and sometimes even above 40, which poses real problems to kindergarten teachers and teaching staff, all the more so if 1-2 children have SEN.
- The support teaching staff is not enough in schools or kindergartens.
- Speech therapist’s shortage in kindergartens.
- Psychologists’ shortage in kindergartens and schools.
- The nutrition for children with SEN of the 2% assigned to inclusive education was not considered.
3.2. **Measures to be taken to simplify/shorten/lower costs for approaches, solutions, actives – to ensure more effects with lower input.**

No other approaches, solutions and activities were identified to ensure a higher efficiency with lower input.

4) **Sustainability (as per evaluation matrix)**

4.1. *How/what activities continue in 2020 and beyond (at all levels).*

The interviews and focus groups performed in Ialoveni show that PAS human resources were and are ready, although they still need training on specific issues (working techniques for children with autism and behavioural problems). There are plenty teachers (although the issue of the large number of children included in a class was raised), but it is necessary to continue training in different areas and to increase the number of support teaching staff. There is willingness to continue all activities and the increase in training requests from most of the teachers, kindergarten teachers and support teaching staff is confirmed.

By drafting and adjusting the *Strategic plan for the development of inclusive education in Ialoveni district during 2017 - 2021*, together with drafting the *Strategic management plan* by each school, the inclusive practices will continue to be implemented up to 2021, including.

In order to implement this strategic plan, the Steering Committee for the Development of Inclusive Education in the District was established at district level, being mainly in charge with coordination and monitoring of the development process for the inclusive education, as well as ensuring cross-sectoral cooperation throughout this process.

**The objectives of the strategic plan are as follows:**

- The analysis of education services from the perspective of their capacity to meet the needs of all children within the district.
- Emphasising the lacks, deficiencies of the education and related service network in ensuring quality education for all children.
- Establishing, by participative process and mutual information, the district’s needs in the field of inclusive education.
- Prioritizing the district’s needs in terms of inclusive education and setting up the development objectives of inclusive education within the district.
- Drafting, by participative process and cross-sectoral coordination, the District plan for the development of inclusive education.

**Strategic objectives:**

- Early identification, referral and tuition of children with special educational needs.
- Creation of multidisciplinary support systems at district and education institution level.
- Strengthening the institutional capacities and the different groups of specialists regarding the achievement of inclusive education.
- Raising public awareness about children inclusion and participation in the life of the community, communication, media coverage.
- Setting up the monitoring, coordination and assessment mechanisms for the development of inclusive education.
- Creation of social-educational partnerships able to help identify the problems dealt by each education institution, disadvantaged family with children with disabilities.
- Collaboration with NGOs, economic operators, other relevant actors for the performance of projects, drawing in extra-budgetary funding sources, in order to develop/upgrade the technical-material base and its adaptation to the children needs, procurement of services, equipment, as well as for other purposes to support the development of inclusive education at district level, education institution level and for each child.
4.2. The main risks in continuing the activities and the maintenance/improvement of the obtained effects.

The main risks regarding the continuation of the activities and the maintenance/improvement of the obtained effects (sustainability) are related to: the migration of teaching staff or support teaching staff, the way budget is set up for kindergartens, the shortage of specialists in the problems of children with emotional and behavioural disorders, the lack of psychologists in schools and the migration of parents to other countries.

5) Impact (as per evaluation matrix)

5.1. Changes at child level, for the children with SEN involved in mass education.

The interviews and focus groups performed in Ialoveni show a very good level of children with SEN integration is achieved in schools and kindergartens where the programme was piloted. Some of the children have recorded extremely high progress (issue which is influenced by the child’s diagnosis and the parents’ degree of involvement). In terms of learning difficulties, the focus groups with kindergarten teachers and teaching staff note slight progress, in the sense that there are some cases that have already graduated from vocational schools and are already working. The facilities of the Inclusive Education Unit are greatly appreciated, in the way that including children with severe disabilities from other localities can take part in the educational process and the activities organised thereof. According to the people consulted, these services (for children with severe disabilities) could not be achieved within RCIE because these are not adapted at the level of the Inclusive Education Unit.

Currently, according to the information collected during the interview with the PAS representatives, starting with 2018, the number of children with SEN started to decrease due to early intervention. If in 2017 in the PAS database were 463 children with SEN, in 2018, their number was of 436. The number has also decreased due to the assistance provided by STS (which contributes to the children education progress). At this point, there are 30 children within the district to whom SEN category is withdrawn (when they reach 5th grade, 6th grade, 7th grade, some of them go on to general education). If SEN category is being withdrawn from them, they remain in the IMC records (they are further monitored).

As for the number of children with SEN who complete the 9th grade in 2019, at district level there are 43 children who have studied according to an adapted curriculum and 26 graduates who will take the exam (individualised test).

Another significant change is represented by the decrease of institutionalised children.

At the level of Ialoveni district there are still:

- 18 children placed in residential institutions and in Community Home respectively (children at risk), but work is being done on cases for being placed within families, adoptions.
- 7 young people in the community home for young people with disabilities (Hansca Home) – 1 was recently institutionalised (serious problems). Two more young people were placed with their families.
- Family-type community home (5 family-type homes)
- 14 PPA (professional personal assistance)

5.2. Changes in attitudes towards inclusive education.

There is a positive attitude change throughout the society, which can be identified in the positive attitude change both at school (teachers, students) and parents’ level.
As regards pre-school education institutions, the discussions held at “Regina Maria” Kindergarten have emphasised that there is still a certain reluctance of parents with typical children in terms of inclusion of children with SEN in the same classroom with their children. This issue was not identified as being available also in the case of parents of students at “Petru Ștefănuca” High School. Students taking part in the focus group have confirmed that their parents encourage them to support and relate to children with SEN and also to participate in different activities held jointly with these children. Also, in the case of pre-school institutions, the information collected has shown that these still deal with refusal of some parents in diagnosing children with SEN.

6) Priorities of stakeholders on short, medium, long term

The actors involved and interviewed are eager and ready to continue their work on inclusive education both at local public authority level and kindergarten and school level (at least in the case of “Petru Ștefănuca” High School and “Regina Maria” Kindergarten). Public authorities confirm their willingness and support necessary to continue this approach and pre-school and school institutions are in the process of improving the soft and hard infrastructure (as in the case of “Regina Maria” Kindergarten).

Priorities are/will be adjusted according to the Strategic plan on inclusive education at Ialoveni district level, being in compliance with the District strategy on people with disabilities.
Drafting this Case study was based on the collection of information and data at Hîncești district level (by means of desk-based research, interviews, focus groups) and their interpretation and analysis in accordance with the methodology approved in the Inception Report.

The case study drafted has an exploratory nature, describing context and implementation mechanisms and assessing the changes and impact that occurred as a result of actions implemented in the framework of the *Programme regarding inclusive education* implemented during 2011-2019. The case study will also provide information on reasons for success of the programme implementation, as well as challenges of this implementation. Moreover, the case study provides evidences on the effectiveness and impact of the programme as a whole.

Several districts were chosen for conducting the study, based on comprehensive criteria developed and inserted in the Inception Report. In this regard, Hîncești is a district with a medium development level, a relatively large number of children with SEN (including children with disabilities), with PAS and well-endowed human resources, schools having benefited from other interventions, as well as good representation in terms of education (early education and primary and secondary level).

In order to adequately capture the context of the intervention, but also to observe the dynamic between the protection system of the child still institutionalised/child protection system and the educational (inclusive) system and children supported in this context, data collection activities were performed at district level (Hîncești district city hall, Social Assistance Department, General Directorate for Education, PAS) and local level (the Kindergarten in Bozieni, the Secondary school in Bozieni, “Mihai Viteazul” High School in Hîncești, “Pasărea Albastră” Day-care Centre) in the case study.

Thus, the data collected will be contextualised and analysed taking into account the status and evolution at district level in terms of inclusive education (i.e. how children with SEN were integrated in mass education), as well as in conjunction with quantitative and qualitative data requested to the parties involved in Programme implementation.

Hîncești district is an administrative-territorial unit located in the central part of Republic of Moldova, covering 1,472 square km. The territory of Hîncești district includes 63 localities, including 1 town, 38 townships and 62 localities comprised by the townships. The total population of the district is about 121.2 thousand inhabitants, out of which 23,501 (19.4%) are children aged between 0 and 18 years old.

Approximately 34% of the total number of children from this age range are concentrated in 6 localities of the district, including about 11% in Hîncești city. Out of the total number of children, 2,443 (10.4%) have disabilities.

At Hîncești district level, the total number of children aged between 7-18 years old who attend primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II) is of 10,328 children. Out of these, 425 are children with SEN, i.e. about 4%. Out of the total number of children with SEN enrolled in

---

31 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II), 41 are children with certified disabilities. 9 of the 41 children enrolled in primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II) are home-schooled children (9 children with SEN and 9 children with disabilities)\textsuperscript{32}.

Regarding the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II) who were registered by PAS at the end of 2018, this number was of 41 children in Hînceşti district. Out of these, 19 children presented severe disability, 20 had an increased degree of disability and 2 children had a moderate degree of disability.

\textit{Figure 7. Number of children with disabilities attending primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II) based on degree of disability}

![Graph showing the number of children with disabilities attending primary and secondary education institutions (level I and II) based on degree of disability.](Image)

Source: Author processing

As regards the inclusion of these children in education levels, 23 of the children with disabilities were enrolled in primary education and 18 were included in secondary education, level I (gymnasium). At the end of 2018 no child was included in secondary education, level II (upper secondary education).

In terms of the types of disability degree, out of the 41 children with disabilities enrolled in education institutions, the majority (14) have somatic symptom disorder, 7 have neuromotor (physical) disability, 7 have related/complex disability, 6 have intellectual (mental) disability, 5 have hearing impairment and 2 have psychiatric disability (ASD - autism spectrum disorders)\textsuperscript{33}.

According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, at Hînceşti district level, 17 young people with SEN/disabilities were enrolled in vocational education (of which 2 with certified disability).

As regards the number of children with SEN reassessed by PAS in 2018, (children with special educational needs in primary, secondary education institutions, level I and II), this comprised 67 children, and 60 of them are children with SEN confirmed during the reassessment process. The number of children (in primary and secondary education institutions) assessed by PAS in 2018 was of 43 children. Out of these, 33 were identified with SEN. Thus, at the end of 2018, 425 children with SEN were registered at PAS. In terms of SEN categories, these are presented in the table

\textsuperscript{32} According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.

\textsuperscript{33} According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
below. Thus, a number of 319 children have learning difficulties, 6 have mental retardation/disability/intellectual disability/severe learning difficulties, 7 have physical/neuromotor disability, 88 have speech impairment and 5 have hearing impairment. In the case of 11 of the assessed children, form no. 5 regarding the determination of the disability was filled out.

*Figure 8. Total number of children with SEN in primary and secondary education institutions, level I and II (gymnasia and high schools) per SEN category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of children with SEN in primary and secondary education institutions, level I and II (gymnasia and high schools) per SEN category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>350</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children in the risk group (disadvantaged backgrounds for growth and...)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with physical/neuromotor disabilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with visual impairment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with hearing impairment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with mental retard/disability/intellectual disability/severe learning difficulties</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with learning difficulties</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with speech disorders</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of children with emotional and behavioural disorders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author processing*

The total number of children aged between 3-7 years old who attend pre-school education institutions is 5,468 children. Out of these, 25 children have SEN (registered at PAS) and 1 child of these has a certified disability. According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, the records of PAS included 1 single child with disability (with severe degree of intellectual (mental) disability, aged between 5-6 years old.

In terms of SEN categories, these are as follows:
Figure 9. Total number of children with SEN in pre-school education institutions per SEN categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children with emotional (affective) and behavioural disorders</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children with speech impairment</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children with learning difficulties</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children with mental retard/disability/intellectual disability/severe learning difficulties</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children with hearing impairment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author processing

**PAS staff, including available specialised staff**

PAS in Hincești district was established in 2012. It was located within a public education institution (“Mihai Viteazul” Secondary School in Hincești. This location favours access to services for children, parents, but also for the teaching staff in the district/municipal localities.

The analysis of the reports on 2018 PAS activity has emphasised the existence of 8 specialists within PAS Hincești. PAS comprises one speech therapist unit.

As regards the number of specialists within the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education (RCIE), at the end of 2018, in early education institutions, in the 3 RCIE existent at Hincești district level, the number of specialists was of 3 support teachers.

In the case of primary and secondary education institutions, at district level, there were 34 RCIE and 62 specialists (46 STS, 12 psychologists and 4 speech therapists).[*]

---

1) **Relevance**

1.3 *The most important needs of the stakeholders.*

The most important needs of children attending the schools in Hincești district relate, on one hand, to the development of the infrastructure necessary for the access of all children within the school, and on the other hand, to more attentive information of typical children on the need of inclusion of children with SEN within school. Firstly, this aspect is determined by existent differences from one school to another in terms of understanding the concept of inclusive education and knowledge related to this aspect: if in the case of the secondary school in Bozieni, the majority of students know the concept of inclusive education, in the case of the “Mihai Viteazul” Secondary School in Hincești city, students have never heard and do not use this concept, in the case of the school in Bozieni, children do not feel the need to increase the extent to which they are included together with their colleagues with SEN because school is perceived as inclusive (students with SEN are included in all activities held by the school and hence, by students). In the case of “Mihai Viteazul” Secondary School in Hincești, students who take part in the focus group do not know the concept of inclusive education. They assign this concept to the Roma colleagues, who do not necessarily have SEN, but who they identify as a “troublesome” group.

As regards the teaching staff and the kindergarten teachers, they need, first of all, methodological training and support to initiate and continue the inclusive education process. This need is also reinforced by capital investment regarding the infrastructure of schools and kindergartens which do not seem to be accessible in all cases (80% of school institutions have an accessible infrastructure)\(^{35}\), as well as the increase in the number of kindergarten teachers who barely succeed in dealing with the large number of children in a group, especially in the context where in that group there is at least one child with SEN.

Another need brought to notice by the specialists within the kindergarten in Bozieni and the teachers and the support teaching staff at the secondary school in Bozieni, refers to the lack of standard materials to be used while working with children with SEN. They have confirmed that they spend a lot of time including for the procurement and preparation (adjustment) of materials which makes work difficult for the teaching staff.

Another need identified at the level of school education institutions (primary and secondary) refers to the need for training in different specialised fields. To this end, the information collected shows the lack of specialists in problems of children with emotional and behavioural disorders, including ASD, psychologist shortage in education institutions (secondary school), STS shortage in some schools in different localities, including the need for empowerment of the existing specialists in different narrower areas (working with children with severe disabilities, e.g. ASD, behavioural disorders or children with speech and hearing impairment). At this point the teaching staff is not ready to face these challenges. Training actions in this area were identified as necessary by all representatives taking part in the research (PAS, kindergarten teachers, teaching staff, support teaching staff).

As for PAS specialists, the information collected shows that, although they have taken part in different trainings held by RCPA, they still need support in terms of filling out the documents (especially speech therapists who find it difficult to fill out the speech therapy form and/or the daily plan). They need a better explanation, e.g. as part of seminars where specialists (STS) within institutions (RCIE) are also invited, not only those from PAS. Also, both PAS psychologists and those from school institutions have shown the need for training in different techniques (e.g. “way back” home technique).

The focus groups and interviews performed with the representatives of pre-school and school institutions at Hincești district level have emphasised the need to increase the working hours of the

\(^{35}\) According to the representative Hincești city hall.
support teaching staff from part-time (for institutions that have foreseen one part-time STS) to full-time, regardless of the number of children with SEN in that institution.

Taking into account aspects such as the migration of parents to other countries, as well as their lifestyle, which can influence the development and educational process of the child, an earlier intervention on the children is needed, as well as actions of prevention and parental empowerment. The data collected shows that there are cases in which the parents’ lifestyle contributes to worsening the situation of children.

Hîncești district still presents a number of boarding/residential institutions serving approximatively 200 children:

- 4 day-care centres (for children from vulnerable families)
- Hîncești boarding school for children with severe disabilities (25 children with severe disabilities are enrolled here – in a wheelchair). In this centre, children benefit from specialised medical assistance (physiotherapy, kinetotherapy). Children have access to education within the school, so they were not integrated in mass schools. However, the school stopped institutionalising children for about 5 years. All children will graduate 9 grades and 2-3 of them will be integrated in the vocational education system, the rest of them being placed in their families.
- Cărpini residential school (in which orphan children are to be found, including children with SEN. They benefit only from social assistance services because since 2015, they are learning at the local schools/kindergarten). After classes, they come back to the boarding school where they also sleep over. However, some of them go to their families in the evening. Children in this centre come from disadvantaged families and do not have disabilities).
- The day-care centre for children with multiple disabilities – Pășăra Albastră – the centre also receives children with severe disabilities from other localities throughout the district.
- The maternal centre (22 places, of which 4 are places meant for mothers-children, and the rest are intended for children, victims of violence),
- The temporary placement centre (Brîndușa Centre) has 16 children,
- The boarding home for children with mental deficiency (they are not schooled due to mental deficiency),
- The boarding school (children who also have parents, but with disabilities and they can also go home),
- Professional Parental Assistance (PPA) (1 child),
- Protected home (2 young people who are no longer institutionalised at the boarding home in Orhei, with Down syndrome and mental retard).

In general, as far as this legislation is concerned, it is considered to be sufficient, without generating additional needs.

1.4. Activities needed to reach the objective of inclusive education, but not yet implemented.

Among the activities required to achieve the objectives of inclusive education, first of all, we mention the development of the capacity of all the institutions and actors involved (PAS, school, kindergarten, kindergarten teachers, teaching staff and support teaching staff) to work with children with severe disabilities and deviant behavioural disorders, including ASD, and hearing and speech impairment. Currently, all institutions involved in providing such information have confirmed that the needs of children with SEN are not sufficiently known by the teaching staff. In addition, it was emphasised the need for the support teaching staff to be trained in specific areas (visual and hearing impairment, deviant behaviour, autism).

Another element needed to reach the objective of inclusive education is the increase in the number of support teaching staff (both in pre-school and school institutions). Currently, their number is limited and insufficient in comparison with the number of children with SEN. This increase is requested especially in the context where some children with SEN, children with severe disability,
would need personal assistant to accompany them during classes, so that to ensure the quality of the educational process. The information collected both at level of the teaching staff and the General Directorate for Education emphasises that parents do not want to acknowledge the problems of their children and for this reason, some of the children with SEN, with severe disability are not registered and do not have personal assistant.

Given that the number of children with SEN within the kindergarten and the secondary school in Bozieni is low, however the number of STS seems to be limited, in the context in which the classes at which a STS must attend overlap (taking into account the groups to which the activity must be provided). The general opinion of the teaching staff, as well as the support teaching staff is that the smaller the number of children in a classroom, the more the educational process takes place in a qualitative environment and children with SEN can be provided with more attention (in direct presence of a support teacher and the personal assistant, as needed).

On the other hand, permanent provision (on a regular/daily basis) of specialised services is necessary for categories of children with SEN, severe difficulties so that the chance of recovery/improvement is higher for them. Due to the lack of specialists in hearing impairment, visual impairment, ASD or deviant behaviour, the Resource Centres cannot contribute to the improvement and provision of the inclusive education of children with SEN of this type, especially in the context where even the support teaching staff needs training in these areas. Moreover, although during 2013-2016, PAS specialists have participated in several seminars held by RCPA via Kultur Kontakt, CCF Moldova, LUMOS, UNICEF, and each specialist benefited from training (at least 3 times a year) in his/her field of expertise, among PAS representatives there is a need of enhancement in certain specific cases (more applied seminars) on certain techniques (e.g. way back home technique).

To ensure quality of the services provided within PAS Hîncești, the unit still needs 4 units of psychologists and speech therapists to provide services directly to the child. In the case of school institutions, out of the 45 schools, only 12 have psychologists and only 6 have speech therapists. The information collected emphasises the permanent need for psychological counselling, but also the need for speech therapists.

As regards STS within RCIE, according to the representatives of the General Directorate for Education in Hîncești district, out of the 35 RCIE, for 10 there is still need of certain training in terms of the process of drafting IEP, as well as identifying children with SEN and sending those cases to PAS.

To ensure inclusive education following the completion of the 9 grades, concrete actions are needed to ensure continuity of inclusive education at the level of vocational schools. Since the end of last year (2018), there is an attempt to introduce inclusive education in vocational and technical education, but the results are at an early stage. In this case, the information collected from the representatives of the interviewed institutions confirm that it is necessary to work in parallel on several levels for inclusive education and social inclusion of the young graduate to take place. For example, it should be considered supporting young graduates of vocational school by finding a place to live (for cases where the young person comes from vulnerable families or from residential institutions), but also a workplace and monitoring over a longer period of time after employment.

Another element necessary for ensuring inclusive education for all children with SEN, but who are not identified and assessed, refers to the displacement of some teams of specialists (physicians) in the localities throughout the district in order to identify and address to the competent authorities for release of the disability degree (which can be achieved only at parental request). This way, the physician could provide recommendations to parents and hence, to the child concerned in order to benefit from the necessary services.

On the other hand, although some actions have been taken to inform/train the parents, in order to reach the objective of inclusive education a more intense cooperation with them is necessary, especially for those with children with SEN. According to DSA, at district level there are several social cases not covered in the way that parents of children with hearing impairment are not ready to integrate them in mass schools. Moreover, they do not work with children so that these have the
necessary skills. In such cases, it is necessary to train parental skills in parents, thus insisting on prevention.

2) Effectiveness (as per evaluation matrix)

2.7. Expected effects at public administration level (inclusive education - specific and context, i.e. child protection, health system): what has been achieved compared to what was expected.

The representatives of the specialty institutions in Hinceşti (City hall, General Directorate for Education) identify a significant progress concerning the integration of children with SEN and disabilities in general education, but they also identify deficiencies of the programme at institutional and legal level:

- The legal framework for kindergartens is insufficiently developed because resource centres cannot be established within kindergartens.
- Inclusive education is achieved only in 3 pre-school institutions of the 45 established at district level. Therefore, it is not clear for education institutions how many children with SEN will be enrolled in 1st grade.
- Inclusive education in vocational schools is in pilot stage for a very short time. In this context, access to employment for children with SEN following graduation is almost impossible. In this sense, it is necessary to achieve a functional collaboration between the education system, the social assistance system and the one for employment services, so that after children with SEN complete education stages where they can participate – with adjusted curriculum according to the inclusive education policy – they do not become isolated young people and adults, but they are supported to find and keep the workplace, as well as a living space.
- Collaboration between pre-school and school institutions is flawed. In this respect, PAS representatives have developed a record grid to identify pre-school children with SEN, i.e. how many children with certified disabilities will reach 1st grade.
- Collaboration between the education system and the social assistance system is minimal and would require development, especially to identify some functional solutions for cases with children who need permanent personal assistant.
- It is necessary to establish institutional responsibilities for the development and implementation of some parenting/prevention program.
- Although infrastructure investment is foreseen (equipment, materials, access routes), 20% of the education institutions are not accessible for all children.
- There are not enough psychologists, special education teachers and speech therapists at the level of pre-school and school education institutions.
- There is a shortage of specialists on specific areas (visual and hearing impairment, ASD, deviant behaviour).

2.8. Expected effects at PAS level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including designs and implementation of individual development plans).

Hinceşti PAS was established in December 2012 and started its activity at the beginning of 2013. Among PAS basic responsibilities, we mention (1) the complex children assessment, (2) the provision of methodological services and training in the field of inclusive education and (3) the provision of (assessment and re-assessment) service.

At the level of Hinceşti district, it was decided that PAS team should include 1 pedagogue, 1 special education teacher, 1 psychologist, 1 speech therapist and 1 head of service. PAS staff is undersized in relation with the number of school and pre-school institutions which it considers (44 school institutions and 45 pre-school institutions). It was emphasised the need of 2 more psychologists and 2 speech therapists within PAS team (directly providing services to the child with SEN).

In all PAS activity since its establishment, the attention was focused on the complex children assessment and re-assessment. Requests regarding complex assessment (generally) come from school and pre-school institutions and a very small number of requests come directly from parents.
Over the last few years, attention was channelled on provision of specialised services directly to the child. Given the experience acquired, according to PAS representatives during interviews, the initial assessment is more qualitative because the teaching staff notes earlier the child with SEN and if he/she cannot meet the child's needs within the school institution, he/she addresses to PAS for the complex assessment. Given PAS records, out of the 507 children with SEN (2019), 347 children study according to the adjusted curriculum and 160 children benefit from psychological and speech therapy services.

Given that there is still a reluctance on the part of parents to give their consent for their children to be assessed by PAS, although some of these children are certified with disability degree by the National Council for Disability and Work Capacity Determination, in order to identify all pre-school-aged children with SEN, PAS has developed a record grid to identify pre-school children with SEN. As for the identification of pre-school children with SEN, it is not very clear if all children are identified by PAS, given that PAS initiates the assessment procedure at the request of kindergarten teachers and teaching staff, and IMC, respectively.

Given PAS ability (but also because it does not identify another solution for integration), PAS representatives support (the same as the parents of these children) the integration of children with severe disabilities in special institutions, depending on the type of disability with temporary placement (on weekdays). The information collected from PAS representatives confirm that PAS offers a number of services but within the limits of its abilities and not necessarily the specialised services that children with severe disabilities need.

As for the special institutions still existent at the level of Hîncești district, PAS representatives confirm that within these institutions, all conditions are met for provision of medical services (physiotherapy, kinetotherapy) (e.g. Hîncești boarding school for children with severe disabilities where 25 children are enrolled). In this case, access to education takes place within the school, without the need for transporting the children with severe disabilities to school institutions.

PAS identifies a category of children who present intellectual disabilities (but who are not certified). These children come from vulnerable families and parents do not present to physician. It seems that there are numerous such cases, therefore PAS representatives recommend the displacement of some specialists (physicians) in localities. PAS already identifies children (it includes them in SEN category), but obviously they have to be assessed by a physician. In this case, it is needed a cross-sectoral collaboration between medical specialists and PAS representatives (so that the health condition is more real determined by psycho-neurological specialist or psychiatrist). Thus, the child has to benefit from certain psychiatric assessments and afterwards the child ends up at PAS (with disability degree).

As regards PAS human resources, besides the need of some additional units of psychologist and speech therapist, these also need support for filling out some documents (in the case of the speech therapist), such as the speech therapy form, the daily plan. To this end, PAS representatives suggest organising some seminars where specialists from school institutions (STS) are also invited, not only those from PAS.

Moreover, besides the guidance activities, they have emphasised the issue of lacking materials (which every specialist has to draft). According to these specialists, certain standard materials (test sets) would be useful for them, so that they no longer have to take certain materials and adjust them to their development level.

Given the trainings and seminars they participated during 2013-2016, PAS representatives have gained the knowledge and expertise necessary to carry out the activity in qualitative terms, but the need to enhance certain specific cases was emphasised (more applied seminars). For example, psychologists want to enhance new working techniques (way back home technique), techniques in working with children with autism or deviant behaviour.

As regards the relationship with RCPA, PAS representatives confirm that they have a very good collaboration with RCPA, they receive the support needed in managing activities and they are waiting for some standard templates and assistance to be provided for filling out all the necessary documents.
2.9. Expected effects at school level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including designs and implementation of individual development plans and added value of support centres).

At Hincești district level there are few differences between schools in terms of inclusive education concept, especially among children. If children at Bozieni secondary school know the inclusive education concept (aspect due including to participation of the 3 children with SEN in the educational process via total inclusion they receive within the school, but also due to the measures of information that the teachers have carried out among students), the students at “Mihai Viteazul” Secondary School have not heard of the inclusive education concept or children with SEN. They rather associate the concept with their Roma colleagues (because they do not have colleagues with SEN at school).

As for the teaching staff, the information collected within focus groups held with kindergarten teachers from the Kindergarten in Bozieni, but also with teachers from the secondary school in Bozieni, emphasises that they do not deal with major issues in achieving the Individual Educational Plan (IEP). In the case of kindergarten teachers, it was confirmed that they support each other where there is no experience in working with children with SEN and they need no additional guidance for implementing IEP, taking into consideration the training sessions from which they benefitted from CCF Moldova. Nevertheless, kindergarten teachers have emphasised that the time available for developing the activity plan for the next day (both for class and children with SEN) is not enough.

As for the implementation of IEP, both kindergarten teachers and teachers consider that more (additional) attention is needed from the teaching staff for that child with SEN to reach his/her maximum development level. In the absence of the support teaching staff, the quality of the educational process for the rest of the group decreases.

Both kindergarten teachers and teaching staff have benefited from several trainings and receive PAS support each time they request it. However, at kindergarten level but also in the case of the teaching staff and the support teaching staff within the school in Bozieni, it was emphasised the need for training on working with children with speech, visual and hearing impairment, ASD, and children with deviant behaviour. In addition, besides activity within the school, these children need specialised services on a regular basis.

Moreover, the data collected highlights the need for a psychologist within each school. Currently, there are only 12 psychologists at the level of education institutions throughout the district. Furthermore, for education to be more inclusive for all children, both for those with SEN and disabilities, it is necessary to assign at least one full-time STS (in the case of the secondary school in Bozieni, there is only one STS with one quarter-time job).

At the time of data collection, within the secondary school in Bozieni were enrolled 3 children with SEN with total inclusion. They regularly attended classes but also take part in activities held within RCIE. The students who participated in the focus group have confirmed that they feel very good with children with SEN and there are no barriers in communicating and relating with them. So that all 3 children have access to RCIE, the timetable of classes was adjusted accordingly, and children have access to different sports games, individual discussions etc.

As regards the equipment of RCIE, the information collected have emphasised the need of additional materials for work with children with SEN, especially for teaching foreign languages, but also videos, interactive materials and manuals.

Although, progress in terms of inclusive education is visible in the case of the school in Bozieni, in the context where it is already known that at the beginning of the school year a girl with severe deficiencies (deaf-mute) will be enrolled at the school from kindergarten, the teachers and STS do not feel ready for this situation. As such, they confirm that they are overcome by the situation and the right solution for this type of cases is inclusion in special centres.

2.10. Expected effects at professionals level (including trainings): what has been achieved compared to what was expected.
The interviews and focus groups performed show that training sessions were carried out with kindergarten teachers and teaching staff. Nevertheless, the need for training is still present, especially in certain specialised fields such as (work with children with visual, hearing and speech impairment, ASD, deviant behaviour), as well as in various special work techniques. Further, beyond the theoretical training for inclusive education, kindergarten teachers, teaching staff and support teaching staff need an extremely practical approach of training in order to be then able to manage children in the classroom, using the techniques and procedures learned.

As for PAS specialists, they participated in various training sessions held by RCPA, aspect which contributed to the development and strengthening of the ability to provide, in turn, the information received. At the level of PAS representatives, it was confirmed that they still need support in filling out the documents (especially in the case of the speech therapist), aspect also available for specialists within RCIE who should be invited to take part in seminars on this subject together with PAS.

2.11. Factors conducing to/causing effects.

A first factor that positively affects the production of effects at the level of the inclusive education system is the legislative and strategic framework, which represents at this moment a success factor for inclusive education. This does not need adjustments or changes according to respondents.

Another significant factor is related to the fact that at Hîncești district level there is a Strategic plan for the development of inclusive education, as well as a Steering committee for the development of inclusive education throughout the district during 2015-2020.

Trained human resources have been identified as a success factor, even if the training must continue and include a much larger number of teachers, including the training of support teaching staff.

Non-governmental organisations represent a special factor in the development and implementation of procedures regarding inclusive education, especially in terms of training the teaching staff, kindergarten teachers and PAS representatives, but also in the provision of materials needed for different situations. For example, CCF Moldova was actively involved in the deinstitutionalisation process and has created the living conditions necessary for several families that were in a vulnerable situation and thus, it has created an adequate environment for children from those families.

Another factor brought up refers to the collaboration between education institutions, DSA and Local Public Authorities. If at the beginning of the implementation of the program, the activity was dispersed, currently, there is a very good collaboration between the institutions, thus contributing to the common interest. Following this collaboration, some kindergartens have requested to the Local Public Authorities and got the approval for establishing RCIE in several kindergartens (Cărpineni, Leușeni, Vingir). As for schools, out of the 44 school institutions, 35 have Resource Centres for Inclusive Education and are correspondingly equipped.

On the other hand, several factors have to be taken into consideration:

- Introduction of the inclusive education concept and practices in many pre-school institutions throughout the district.
- The type of SEN we are talking about, still representing a major problem the integration of children with severe disabilities or aggressive behavioural disorders.
- The attitude of teachers and the necessary training on specialised levels (training should continue and include a much larger number of teachers).

2.12. Factors hampering the effects.

In terms of human resources, the instability and migration of the teaching staff are negative factors that may negatively influence the effects produced.

The large number of children in a group/classroom can influence the quality of the educational process, especially in the context where STS is limited or their working time is too low to cover the needs within the education institutions.

The shortage of personal assistants in the case of children with severe disabilities may represent a negative factor for the participation of children with SEN and disabilities in the educational process.
Parental reluctance to accept the assessment and diagnosis of children with SEN may lead to impossibility for children to receive specialised services and thus, to worsening of the situation regarding access to inclusive education. Also, PAS temporary services take place only at the level of education institutions and parents do not undertake the continuation of assistance at home.

- The lack of resource centres for inclusive education in pre-school institutions.
- The insufficient development of assistance services in the field of psychology and speech therapy to meet children’s needs.
- The lack of specialised services: kynetotherapy, specialised transportation.
- The insufficient cross-sectoral collaboration and the flawed communication between the representatives of different areas with responsibilities in problems of children in trouble.
- The insufficient involvement of parents as educational partners.

3) Efficiency (as per evaluation matrix)

3.3. Particularly cost-efficient / effective approaches, solutions.

There has not been identified any solution to have a high efficiency in relation to the generated effects in Hincești.

Responders claim that the necessary resources were always available and teachers claim:

- The large number of children in a classroom, especially in kindergartens, poses real problems to the teaching staff, all the more so if 1-2 children have SEN.
- The support teaching staff is not enough in schools, although the schools that were visited have few children with SEN enrolled.
- There is no material basis for the resource centres and IEP implementation.
- All RCIE have benefited from enough sources of funding, but currently they identify a lack of these sources (finances are not directed or are not efficiently directed from the amount granted).
- Speech therapist’s shortage.
- Psychologists’ shortage in so many schools. The need for counselling is permanent.
- Although they benefited from education/training sessions, the teaching staff and the support teaching staff need training in different specialised areas for working with children with visual, hearing and speech impairment, deviant behaviour.
- Also, there are STS who still need training for drafting and implementing IEP (for 10 RCIE of the 35 it is intended to organise trainings during 2019-2020).
- Some of the teachers still need to learn to identify children with SEN and to send to PAS those cases.
- The low payment level of STS.

3.4. Measures to be taken to simplify/shorten/lower costs for approaches, solutions, actives – to ensure more effects with lower input.

No other approaches, solutions, activities were identified to ensure a higher efficiency with lower input.

4) Sustainability (as per evaluation matrix)

4.2. How/what activities continue in 2020 and beyond (at all levels).

The interviews and focus groups performed in Bozieni and Hincești show that PAS human resources were and are ready, although they still need training on specific issues (working techniques for children with autism, those with visual, hearing and speech impairment, but also children with behavioural problems). Also, at PAS level, 4 units for specialists are needed (2 for psychologists and 2 for speech therapists). There are relatively plenty teachers (although the issue of the large number of children included in a class was raised), but it is necessary to continue training in different areas
and to increase the number of support teaching staff and their appropriate training. There is willingness to continue all activities and this is confirmed by the increase in training requests both from PAS and teachers, kindergarten teachers and support teaching staff. The experience gained so far will contribute to the continuation and improvement of inclusive practices in terms of work with children with SEN.

Activities regarding inclusive education at the level of vocational and technical schools are ongoing since the end of 2018 when the pilot phase of inclusive education was started at the level of these education institutions. At Hîncești district level, the Vocational School in the city of Hîncești is already ready to receive children with SEN who will graduate the secondary school. In order for such measures to lead to the expected results (i.e. obtaining a certificate and implicitly the right to perform a job), complementary measures are needed regarding the support granted in order to find a job, as well as finding/offering a home for young people who either come from vulnerable families or from special/residential institutions.

The existence at district level of the Strategic plan for the development of inclusive education in Hîncești district during 2015-2020, together with the Strategic management plan drafted by each school, the inclusive practices will continue to be implemented up to the end of 2020. Through this strategic plan, the structures of the District Council have adapted, performed and updated the activity plans to this plan, and they will make sure that all provisions of the plan will be performed at community level, by development of sustainable partnerships with the education institutions and other actors relevant at local level. As for the General Directorate for Finance in Hîncești, this ensures the planning and allocation of financial resources necessary to the implementation of the provisions of the strategic plan for the development of inclusive education during 2015-2020. In order to implement this strategic plan, the Steering Committee for the Development of Inclusive Education in the District was established at district level, being mainly in charge with coordination and monitoring of the development process for the inclusive education, as well as ensuring cross-sectoral cooperation throughout this process.

The objectives of the strategic plan are as follows:

- Early identification, referral and tuition of children with special educational needs.
- Creation of multidisciplinary support systems at district and education institution level.
- Strengthening the institutional capacities and the different groups of specialists regarding the achievement of inclusive education.
- Raising public awareness about children inclusion and participation in the life of the community, communication, media coverage.
- Setting up the monitoring, coordination and assessment mechanisms for the development of inclusive education.

Thus, by the end of 2020, it is intended to establish/develop RCIE in all the 45 pre-school units within the district, as well as in all the 44 secondary education institutions (100% coverage). Also, the strategic plan foresees setting up STS job openings in all the 45 primary and secondary education institutions (100% coverage), as well as in all the other pre-school institutions.

In terms of setting up job openings for psychologist in pre-school institutions, until the end of the implementation period of the strategic plan, 10 institutions (20% coverage) will benefit from the services of a psychologist. As for the secondary education, 26 schools will have a psychologist unit (55% coverage).

The plan also provides the setting up of speech therapist jobs, both in pre-school institutions (35% coverage) and primary and secondary education institutions (up to 10% coverage).

Furthermore, the plan provides that until the end of 2020, 24 children with severe disabilities to benefit from the service of a personal assistant.

4.2 The main risks in continuing the activities and the maintenance/improvement of the obtained effects.

The main risks to continuation of activities and maintain/enhance obtained effects are related to: the migration of teaching staff or support teaching staff, the way budget is set up for kindergartens (the existence of the necessary funds from the Local Public Authorities), the shortage of specialists...
in the problems of children with emotional and behavioural disorders, the lack of knowledge in working with children with visual and hearing impairment, the lack of psychologists and speech therapists in kindergartens and schools and the migration of parents to other countries.

5) **Impact (as per evaluation matrix)**

5.1. **Changes at child level, for the children with SEN involved in mass education.**

The interviews and focus groups performed in Hîncești district show that a good level of children with SEN integration is achieved in schools and kindergartens where the inclusive practices were introduced and where children with SEN are present. On the other hand, where there are no children with SEN until now, the level of inclusion can be assessed only based on the existent facilities at RCIE level.

As for the kindergarten in Bozieni, currently, there is only one child with SEN but there were also other cases in the previous period which have benefited from inclusive practices. For example, a girl with locomotor disability who attended kindergarten for 4 years and who also benefited from the services of a speech therapist, has succeed in being enrolled in primary education. According to kindergarten teachers, she would not have developed as well if she had not gone to kindergarten. Another case (a girl with 99% severe deafness, with hearing aid) has represented a challenge for kindergarten teachers and STS because they could not succeed in understanding her (due to her very early age). As for communication between the girl and the other children, this was achieved by signs, which became a skill for the other children. Although this behaviour was seen as a setback for the other children, there is also a positive progress in terms of inclusion, in the way that children learn a few body signs.

Regarding the case of the children with SEN currently enrolled at kindergarten (4-year old child initially diagnosed with autism and subsequently with development disorders), according to kindergarten teachers, there is no change in the child’s development and behaviour as a result of attending the kindergarten for 1 year. In addition, according to the group’s kindergarten teacher, there are days when he cannot teach the other children and he/she cannot include the child in activities with the other children. As for the typical children, they play with him and help him (they are not afraid of him). Although the child goes to the specialist on a regular basis, no progress is noticed regarding him. Nevertheless, parents are pleased that they can leave their child at kindergarten.

It seems that in Bozieni, there is one child with SEN who does not attend the kindergarten because his parents prefer the residential environment.

As for the vulnerable children, kindergarten is also inclusive for these children. To this end, the General Directorate for Education is considering to identify all pre-school aged children (kindergarten teachers are being sent to their homes, together with the social assistant).

Regarding the general school in Bozieni, the concept of inclusive education is known and applied by all children. Within the focus group, they have confirmed that they communicate with children with SEN, they help them when required and they involve them in daily activities, especially in the context where the 3 children with SEN regularly attend classes (total inclusion) and their presence at RCIE. According to kindergarten teachers, children with SEN feel very good together with their colleagues because it is an environment favourable for all children.

At school level were identified situations in which, if a child could not master the 4th grade subjects, the teachers send the file to PAS in order to be included in SEN category and to be able to change the curriculum. As a consequence of modifying the curriculum, small changes were noted (the child is willing but he cannot acquire knowledge at math. On the other hand, progress is noted at Romanian language. He memorizes the poems from the classroom). Since he is diagnosed with mental retard (due to a physical disability), according to teachers, he needs more attention from them (more time assigned).

The information collected by PAS confirm that there are several cases where the child benefited from inclusive education services within school institutions (including modified curriculum) and
came back to general curriculum. Moreover, it seems that the number of assessed children has decreased and the assessment is more qualitative, taking into account that teachers notice the child and already give him the help he needs, and if they cannot meet the child’s needs by themselves, within the school, they refer to PAS for complex assessment.

Regarding the number of children with SEN, if in 2013 the PAS database included 555 children with learning difficulties and intellectual disabilities, in 2019 there are 507 children, of which 347 with modified curriculum and 160 benefit from services provided by psychologists and speech therapists.

According to PAS representatives, the enrolment rate (tuition) is at 100%. All children with SEN are being considered (all children who have addressed to PAS were assessed).

On the other hand, at district level there are still children with severe disabilities who are enrolled in different residential institutions/boarding schools, who cannot attend school or perform school activities with that institution. For example, out of the 25 children with severe disabilities who attend the residential institution “Pasărea Albastră” Day-care Centre, 17 children attend on a daily basis the centre but cannot attend school. In this respect, a number of educational activities for these children take place within the centre. According to the representative of the day-care centre, within the centre there are 2 cases of children diagnosed with autism who will be enrolled in school. These children need personal assistant in the institution (at least during classes). Otherwise, there are cases of children with extremely severe disabilities for whom school is not a feasible option (the centre is adjusted accordingly and has all the resources necessary for the daily activity of these children). The same thing takes place also in the case of the boarding school for children with severe disabilities in Hîncești. Due to severe disabilities, they cannot go to school elsewhere. Within the boarding school, they participate in the educational process and all the services they need (physiotherapy, kinetotherapy). But the institution stopped institutionalising children for about 5 years. Those 17 children with extremely severe disabilities will graduate the 9th grade. Of these, 2-3 will attend vocational education and the rest return to families.

As for the Boarding school for children with mental deficiencies, the children do not attend any school institution and permanently stay within the boarding school.

According to DSA, about 200 children are partially/totally in the care of the State (those who receive social services), including those with disabilities.

Regarding the inclusion of severely disabled children, this was not achieved yet and there is no training at the level of the institutions, schools and teaching staff for this thing to happen in the forthcoming period. Moreover, some of these cases are much too severe to take part in the educational process within a school. These cases cannot attend school not even in the presence of a permanent personal assistant.

5.2. Changes in attitudes towards inclusive education.

There is a positive attitude change throughout the society, which can be identified in the positive attitude change both at school (teachers, students) and parents’ level.

As for pre-school education institutions, discussions with Bozieni Kindergarten have emphasised that reluctance is still present on the part of parents with typical children in terms of inclusion of children with SEN in the same classroom with their children. This aspect was not identified as being available also in the case of the parents of students at the secondary school in Bozieni. Students taking part in the focus group have confirmed that their parents encourage them to support and relate to children with SEN and also to participate in different activities held jointly with these children. In the case of the secondary school in Hîncești, the perception of parents with typical children regarding the inclusion of children with SEN in the same classroom with their typical children was not confirmed, either in a good way or a bad way, and this aspect is due to the lack of children with SEN in school. Instead, children taking part in the focus group have confirmed that parents are guiding their children not to get into conflict with Roma children, who according to them are “troublesome”.

Also, in the case of pre-school institutions, the information collected has emphasised that these still deal with the refusal of parents in diagnosing children with SEN (aspect also confirmed by PAS). Moreover, in some situations the teaching staff and PAS staff notice a passive attitude of the parents.
who leave the entire education process on the schools, with no explanation. They feel relieved because their children attend kindergarten/school and consider to be the duty of the teaching staff and the support teaching staff to take care of children.

6) Priorities of stakeholders on short, medium, long term

The actors involved and interviewed did not set any priorities. In all cases they have expressed their desire to continue with the activities that were initiated. Priorities are guided including by the Strategic plan on inclusive education at district level, whose objectives and activities must be achieved by the end of 2020.

In order to meet the challenges, the teaching staff and the support teaching staff need specific training to be done in a short period of time, in a very practical way. In addition, schools and kindergartens need specialists (psychologists, speech therapists) to meet the needs of children with SEN.
Case study - Drochia district

The drafting of this case study was based on collection of information and data from Drochia district and the interpretation and analysis of these data and information through a mix of social research methods (desk-based research, interviews, focus groups).

The resulting case study has an exploratory character and describes the implementation mechanisms and contexts and evaluates the changes and impact following the actions under the *Programme for development of inclusive education* implemented between 2011-2019. The case study also offers some information on the aspects that contributed to the success of the programme implementation, as well as on the challenges of its implementation. Furthermore, the case study provides evidence regarding the efficiency and impact of the programme on the whole.

In order to adequately capture the context of the intervention, but also to observe the dynamics between the children still institutionalised / child protection system and the (inclusive) educational system and children benefitting in this context, we will embed the data collection activities planned at district level and local level in the case study.

Thus the data collected were contextualised and analysed taking into consideration the status and evolution at district level regarding inclusive education (i.e. how children with SEN were integrated in mass education), as well as in conjunction with the quantitative and qualitative data requested from the parties involved in the implementation of the programme.

Drochia district lies in the North-West of the Republic of Moldova at 167 km distance from the capital city of the republic - Chișinău municipality. The district consists of 40 localities, including 39 villages and the town of Drochia - town – residence of the district. The total area of the district is of 99991.47 ha (999.91 km2). The district population is of 86,800 inhabitants. At the beginning of the study, between 2018-2019, 36 primary and secondary general education institutions were active in Drochia district, including 5 in the town of Drochia.

At Drochia district level the total number of children aged 7-18 who attend primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) is of 7315. Out of these, 235 are children with SEN, 3.2% respectively. Out of the total number of children with SEN enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II), 113 are children with certified disabilities. 5 of the children enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) are children who are provided home-schooling, out of which 3 have certified disabilities.

As for the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) registered by PAS at the end of 2018 in Drochia district the number was of 113 children. Out of these, 42 children had a severe degree of disability, 53 an increased degree, and 18 of them had a moderate disability degree.

---

36 The strategy of social-economic development of Drochia district for 2016 – 2020 http://drochia.md/strategii/
37 The number of primary and secondary general education institutions, MoECR, https://mecc.gov.md/ro/content/reteaia-institutiilor-de-invatamant-general
38 According to PAS data, available on 31 December 2018.
Regarding the inclusion of these children in educational levels, 40 of the children with disabilities were enrolled in primary education and 71 were included in secondary education, level I (gymnasium education). 2 children were included in secondary education, level II (high-school education) at the end of 2018.

In terms of the typology of the degree of disability, out of the 113 children with disabilities included in education institutions, most children (32) have somatic disabilities, 28 have intellectual (mental) disabilities, 20 have neuromotor (physical) disabilities, 13 have hearing disabilities, 12 have psychological disabilities (ASD – autism spectrum disorder), 8 have visual impairment, zero - associated/complex disabilities.

According to PAS, at the end of 2018, at the level of Drochia district, 3 young people with SEN were registered in professional education.

Concerning the number of children with SEN reassessed by PAS in 2018, (children with special educational needs from primary and secondary general education institutions, level I and II), this was of 73 children, all 73 of them being confirmed in the reassessment process. The number of children (from primary, secondary general education institutions) assessed by PAS in 2018 was of 36 children. All 36 children were identified with SEN. Thus, at the end of 2018, 235 children with SEN were registered by PAS. SEN categories are presented in the chart below. Hence, a number of 164 children have learning difficulties, 40 have a mental/intellectual retardation/disability/severe learning difficulties, 1 child has emotional and behaviour deviations, 12 have physical/neuromotor disabilities, 4 have visual impairment, 4 have language disabilities, 10 – hearing disabilities.

---

\[\text{Figure 10. Number of children with disabilities that attend primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) per degree of disability.} \]

Source: Adapted by authors

---

\[\text{According to PAS data, available on 31 December 2018.}\]
The total number of children aged 3-7 that attend the pre-school education institutions is of 3447 children. Out of these a number of 113 children have SEN (registered by PAS), and 11 of these have a certified disability. According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, there were 10 children with disabilities (3 with severe degree of disability, 8 with increased degree, 0 with moderate degree) registered by PAS. In terms of their age, 3 children were aged 3-4, 8 children were aged 5-6.

The SEN categories are the following:

Figure 12. Total number of children with SEN from pre-school education institutions per SEN categories
PAS staff, including the available specialised staff

Drochia district PAS was founded in January 2013 by decision of the Drochia District Council as of 22 December 2012. This was located in a public institution offered by the Local Public Authority, on the premises of the Russian High-school no. 3 in Drochia town, considered available when the service was inaugurated. This location favours the access to services for the benefit from children, parents, but also for the benefit from the teaching staff from the district/municipality localities.

The analysis of the reports regarding the PAS activity for 2018 highlighted the existence of a number of 7 specialists within Drochia PAS. Mention should be made that 1 psychologist unit works through plurality of offices.

In the case of primary and secondary education institutions, at district level there were 27 Resource Centres for Inclusive Education and a number of 41 specialists (32 STS (Specialised Teaching Staff), 7 psychologists, 2 speech therapists). In early education institutions there are 10 Resource Centres for Inclusive Education, where 14 STS work.

1) Relevance

1.1. The most important needs of the stakeholders

The teaching staff of the Theoretical High-school in Pelinia village remember during the interview that when the Programme started to be implemented it was frightening, much different from what it is done today with reference to inclusion. It was difficult to integrate the children with SEN, especially those that had come back from residential institutions, who had many deviant behaviour problems and lack of education, according to high-school TS. Children with SEN coming from families without social problems integrate more easily. Generally, TS of Pelinia high-school stated that for them the Programme meant examinations and supervision, experience exchange, formation as specialists, and as a result they developed, they conducted a lot of work with children with SEN and with parents. One of the necessities mentioned by teachers referred to methodological teaching support regarding children with sensory disabilities.

During the group interview the students from Pelinia high-school expressed their opinion that inclusive education shall start from the premise that everyone has the right and must attend the community school. In support of this premise they gave examples of good relations with their colleagues with SEN, but also of discriminating attitudes. High-school students claim that children with SEN take part in most extracurricular activities. Also, some of their colleagues show an unfriendly behaviour towards those with SEN, through discrimination or by addressing them discouraging words. High-school students consider that in order for everybody to truly understand what inclusion means, they must imagine themselves in the position of children with SEN. Therefore, the interviewed colleagues of the children with SEN mentioned that, if necessary, they would intervene in difficult situations to support their colleagues with SEN and would do everything that is up to them to facilitate the inclusion process.

The interviewed representatives of children kindergarten in Pelinia village talked about the fact that from the 200 children, 12 are children with SEN. An STS works in the kindergarten, dealing with 10 children with SEN. Furthermore, they talked about inclusion as being something

different from other learning practices. They were all worried about how the inclusion process would work. The presence of a teaching professional greatly eased the work of pre-primary school teachers. For consolidating the ability of working with children identified as having SEN, the kindergarten STS expressed the need for the staff to be trained in working with children with language disorder and development delay. The representatives of children kindergarten in Pelinia noted that they know the legal framework regarding the IE regulation and that this one is quite a good one. They know the directions related to: the activity of the Resource Centre, the filling of the registers. Also, they know well the indicators according to which the children are assessed.

The Programme for the Development of Inclusive Education 2011-2020, implemented in the Republic of Moldova is a welcomed one and set the bases of inclusion at national level, as the PAS specialists consider. The PAS manager wanted to mention that the Programme correlates greatly with the activities implemented by the PAS Service. There was a period of time, at the beginning, when there was a lack of correlation and collaboration with social assistance. The PAS specialists talked about how at the beginning there were disturbing factors, resistance, distrust regarding the inclusion of children with SEN. The inclusion process was seen as a project, and some were waiting for the project to be completed. At the same time, as the PAS representatives mention, there were many who declared themselves in favour of institutionalising the children with SEN. During the interview, the PAS representatives stated that more support services for children with special educational needs are available at city level. Regarding the necessities of PAS, from methodological point of view, they need support in working with children who have learning difficulties, intellectual and sensory disabilities. Because of the great volume of work with these children, PAS specialists do not manage to completely cover the work with children suffering from behaviour deviations, autism and rare disorders. The teaching staff require them worksheets adapted to the needs of these types of disabilities. It is the assistive techniques for children with hearing and seeing disabilities that the PAS specialists really need. In this sense they see a solution in the interdivisional collaboration with those from social medicine and assistance. Other reported necessities refer to the development of school infrastructure in terms of accessibility, including the provision of social transport, because roads are in a precarious state and it is difficult to travel in a wheelchair.

The strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova is appreciated by the mayor of Drochia town as a good and sufficiently developed one. In the mayor's opinion the support services for children with special educational needs are available and developed at local level. For this purpose, mention was made of Centres and NGOs (The Association of children with disabilities) which offer services at city level, besides those already provided by state structures. As for the accessibility of school infrastructure for all children, the mayor mentioned that they had been continuously working in this respect, both with local resources and by getting sources from foreign donors. Thus, at city level, the infrastructure is accessible for children with SEN at least in educational institutions.

The manager of the Directorate for Social Assistance mentioned that Drochia district had been facing hard times about inclusion, being assisted by Moldova CCS and MoECR. They consider that the complexity of the situation was not related to children or situation, but more to educators. The services that have been established are good enough, but we must ensure their sustainability through funding. The most serious problem is that the training of OLSDE specialists did not start simultaneously with their specialisation. On this ground there was not a common approach to inclusion in the first years of programme implementation. Now the specialists of the Directorate support inclusive education and promote individualised education.

It is necessary to work on training parents and society in general to accept children with SEN. There are too few STS. Also, not all of these can work as long as it is necessary with a child with
SEN. At the beginning of the process, we faced such situations as when parents of ordinary children used to threaten us with taking their child to another school. Now the degree of tolerance and acceptance has risen, as the mayor of Drochia and the OLSDE manager said.

1.2. *Activities needed to reach the objective of inclusive education, but not yet implemented*

Necessary activities and services, stated by professionals during the interviews:

- Establishment of Resource Centres in early education institutions;
- Endowment with assistive technique and specialized manuals for children with hearing and visual impairment;
- Insufficient number of personal assistants for children with severe disabilities;
- Awareness activities with parents of ordinary children and the whole society to create a positive attitude towards children with SEN and inclusion acceptance;
- Increasing motivation for STS and other specialists involved in the inclusive educational system.

2) **Effectiveness (as per evaluation matrix)**

2.1. *Expected effects at public administration level (in the context of inclusive education, i.e. child protection or health system): what has been achieved compared to what was expected*

The mayor of Drochia town considers that through its actions the City hall is enough involved in implementing and supervising the National Programme of Inclusive Education. Some examples were given in supporting this statement, among which: supporting inclusion in kindergartens by offering 5 STS and 5 speech therapists in pre-school education institutions; attracting projects for making the infrastructure accessible and establishing 5 Resource centres (MISF projects); supporting PAS activity.

During the interview the Social Assistance Department (SAD) manager mentioned that the Directorate under their supervision has a good co-operation with PAS. The PAS manager is also the president of the Committee for Children in difficulty. The representatives of both structures participate together in thematic trainings. The DSA (Department of Social Assistance) manager considers that the result of the IE process will lead to a change of mentality, expressed through a large scale acceptance of children with SEN.

2.2. *Effects expected at PAS level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including development and implementation of individual educational plans)*

During the interview, the PAS representatives appreciate the strategic framework as a good and coherent one, and the most important is that the specialists clearly know how to act. The assessment takes place based on needs, on syllabus. They consider its activity transparent, thus the parents are informed on the procedures, planning and reporting of individual children cases. Few parents take part in the making of the IEP and children rehabilitation plan. All children referred to PAS Drochia are benefitting from services and receive support during rehabilitation and inclusion.

PAS has provided training courses for district educators, on different topics related to the inclusion procedure but also on topics related to assistance for different types of difficulties and development disorders. The knowledge obtained as a result of the training provided by PAS is put into practice, while the courses offered by Universities are not appreciated as being useful from a practical point of view and do not meet the institutions’ needs, say the PAS representatives and teachers from the schools and the kindergarten participating in the focus group. PAS staff state that TS training for school and inclusion shall focus on the following aspects, with a view to the level of initial training and teachers’ abilities in inclusive education:

- Knowing the child development features;
- Practitioners must be involved in trainings;
Revising the training concept: reducing the theoretical part and focusing on the practical one.

According to PAS specialists, Resource Centres operate under Regulation No. 100 as of 25 February 2015. Those from PAS noticed that in schools, children do not usually come to centres in the afternoon. In kindergartens there are no Resource Centres. When children with severe degree come, Resource centres cannot do much, due to lack of materials. PAS specialists consider that children with SEN must spend more time in the classroom. And in the Centre they should go only for specific individual activities, such as recovery, or when their behaviour influences negatively the progress of the lesson.

In their professional activity the PAS specialists use various specialty literature, guides and studies, among which:

- IE guides drafted with the help of Kultur Kontakt;
- IE guides drafted with the help of Lumos Moldova;
- IEP development guide (since 2017);
- The evaluation and assistance of children with SEN.

2.3. Effects expected at school/kindergarten level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including the development and implementation of individual educational plans and the value added of resource centres)

With reference to children coming from disadvantaged families, teachers stated that they deal with behaviour problems. They consider that parents are mainly responsible for children facing behaviour problems.

Between 2015-2016 the teachers of Pelinia kindergarten attended numerous trainings. They also gained much practice at the same time. The kindergarten STS mentioned the satisfaction with their work, because the results are noticeable: children recover and teachers are helped and they are grateful. Children assessment at Pelinia kindergarten is made by both teachers and the Interdisciplinary Methodical Commission. The IMC findings are to be confirmed by PAS, which will then make detailed recommendations. One of the obstacles faced in integrating children with SEN is parents’ misinformation regarding the features of the inclusion process. Through interactive, interesting activities, the staff of Pelinia kindergarten inform all parents (including those of ordinary children) about the benefits of inclusion. Another barrier faced by inclusion refers to the financial resources which are insufficient for work materials and activities development.

2.4. Effects expected at professionals level (including training): what has been achieved compared to what was expected

The representatives of Pelinia kindergarten have taken part in many such events as trainings and instructions carried out at local, national level at Chisinau and region level at Alecu Russo University in Bălți. Those from Pelinia kindergarten mentioned, during the interview, that neglecting individual work in favour of group activities leads to delays in language development. This increases especially when parents do not speak enough with their children.

In their activity, PAS Drochia specialists are involving parents more and more in the educational process, including the preparation of the IEP. It has been a gradual process, because at the beginning of programme implementation parents were quite reserved and not very eager to take part in the individual planning and the whole educational process.

2.5. Factors likely to have a positive influence on the resulting effects

The following factors are considered by the PAS specialists as positive in facilitating inclusion:

- Parents have become aware of the role of inclusion in children education;
- The legal framework included all institutions at national level:
− The PAS and the STS support in class is essential in the integration of children with SEN;
− Professionals have accepted inclusion as a necessity;
− IE budgeting in schools;
− The individualisation of the educational process (IEP) for children with SEN.

2.6. Factors likely to have a negative influence on inclusion

In the opinion of the interviewed specialists the following factors have affected the implementation of planned measures and the current situation of inclusive education in Moldova:

○ The lack of coherence between legislation in the education field and social protection field;
○ Lack of cross-sector mechanisms for implementing the legislation on the protection of child’s rights;
○ Lack of mechanisms for collecting and adjusting statistical data regarding the number and groups of children according to SEN categories, currently excluded from the educational system;
○ Lack of mechanism for budgeting the inclusive education services according to the needs of children with SEN;
○ The differences in terms of access and the quality of educational services between urban and rural areas;
○ Insufficient teaching aids: textbooks, books, equipment, visual and auditory assistance tools, toys, etc.;
○ Insufficiently adapted infrastructure of educational institutions: the lack of access ramps and large exits, lack of elevators, adapted toilets, adequate equipment, etc.

3) Efficiency (as per evaluation matrix)

3.1. Approaches or solutions with high efficiency as related to the generated effects

The PAS specialists wanted to mention that the assistance they offered is much more efficient in the institution, on the spot, rather than at the PAS office. This is due to the fact that, while being in schools they can see more cases and consequently offer more recommendations tailored to the real facts occurring in the institution. In this context they opt for involving more specialists in the assistance process in schools because, unlike the teaching staff, the PAS specialists benefitted from more trainings and most schools do not have such specialists as psychologist teachers, speech therapists. Thus the number of SAP specialists must be revised and related to the number of children with SEN and the need for therapies in the district.

3.2. Measures needed to simplify/reduce the costs incurred for approaches, solutions, activities – to ensure greater efficiency with less input

PAS specialists consider that the 2% of the district budget for inclusive education is not sufficient for work materials, services development. The budget is planned on calendar year (January - December) and not on academic year, while the necessities are more obvious at the beginning of school year. The PAS representatives consider that a state service should be developed for children with autism, e.g. behaviour therapist. PAS specialists consider that the necessary resources for the enforcement of the Service activities, were made available from the funds budgeted for inclusive education. Moreover, it was stated that the planned resources for the Programme for development of inclusive education are insufficient.

The teachers from Pelinia kindergarten consider that the financing formula for inclusion in kindergartens should cover: services, the establishment and operation of the resource centre, materials.
The City hall of Drochia has assigned the necessary resources for the implementation of the inclusive education activities from the local budget, as limited to available funds. The mayor stated that the local councilmen voted each time the proposals for assigning the necessary resources to support and develop inclusion in town. However, sometimes additional resources that are not identified in the local budget are necessary.

4) **Sustainability (as per evaluation matrix)**

4.1. *What activities are to be continued until and beyond 2020 and how will they be developed? (at all levels)*

When talking about sustainability, PAS specialists state that the provision of funds for the continuation and development of inclusive education is among the first needs. They consider this condition as an essential one. Another aspect just as important in providing sustainability consists in the knowledge and instruments developed in the process of developing inclusive practices. The development and sharing of the knowledge will be used firstly by the beneficiaries of inclusion. The capitalization and motivation of human resources is just as important, as the PAS Drochia representatives consider.

In order to ensure sustainability, the DSA manager envisages some actions to be taken, among which:

- Increased financial support for inclusion;
- Training support for professionals;
- Assignment of personal assistant services for children with severe SEN.

The City hall considers the need of empowerment courses for all human resources involved in the process in order to ensure sustainability. The necessity of courses for speech therapists and PAS specialists was especially mentioned.

4.2. *The main risks in continuing the activities and the maintenance/improvement of the obtained effects.*

Among the risks stated by the interviewed participants are the fluctuation of support staff and other specialists involved in the work with children with SEN because of low remuneration and the complexity of the work involved. Another risk refers to the continuity of studies for pupils with SEN after graduating the gymnasium. Vocational education is not sufficiently developed for the integration of these children, a reason why most of them end the educational process after graduating middle school.

5) **Impact (as per evaluation matrix)**

5.1. *Changes at children level, for children with SEN from general mass education*

The students of Pelinia high-school consider that the headmaster is an example to follow regarding her attitude towards children with SEN, because she is more tolerant. The children mentioned that they had started to communicate better with their colleagues with SEN, they defend them when necessary and even enjoy to be of help. On the other hand, some children talked about how some teachers make observations to their colleagues with SEN in a discriminating manner, such as: "...you do nothing, you just sit to get fat".

PAS specialists consider that the level to which a school is friendly with children with SEN depends on the teaching staff. They consider that the level of discrimination is not as high as it was at the beginning and it can be stated that it has dropped by about 40%. They believe that discrimination has been overcome due to information, awareness, initial training and practice gaining.

PAS specialists gave as an example, following their practice gained in the district, various factors that can help to measure the impact of the inclusive process, such as:
- number of children with SEN accepted in extracurricular activities: football, dance, music, painting
- confident parents;
- the decrease of nonacceptance cases (mostly children with autism);
- district and national budget approved for IE;
- a mother who has gradually changed her attitude: she initially did not bring her child to the afternoon performance – now she comes with her child to all such events;
- number of services, number of IEP, PAS interventions.

Teachers from Pelinia high-school consider that the impact of the Local Public Administration involvement in the process would increase especially by covering the requests for personal assistant. The interdivisional collaboration is insufficient: it implies little work with the family doctor and the police officer. More work is done together with the social assistant.

Talking about the impact of inclusion, STS of Pelinia kindergarten said that small children laugh, play, help each other in kindergarten groups. At the same time, parents have become very active. They now ask for more services. As such, the teacher and the STS have permanent contact and talks with parents of children with SEN.

The DSA manager sees the major impact of the personal assistance service in the inclusive education, stating that the services are offered as a priority to children with severe disabilities. The PAS manager gave as an example the worrying statistics stating that in the district about 30% of all children with disabilities are children with severe disorders.

5.2. Attitude changes towards inclusive education

During the group interview PAS representatives stated that positive changes in the attitude towards inclusion process have been noticed. However, they consider that the situation is different from one school to another. They believe that, in terms of the perspective of integration of children with SEN, the situation is good in primary school and satisfactory in kindergarten. In gymnasium the process is more difficult.

According to teachers from Pelinia kindergarten the attitude and behaviour of adults play a decisive role in the example small children will follow. Children copy adults’ behaviour, they will also copy the behaviour and attitude towards children with SEN, respectively, as the kindergarten representatives consider.

During the interview the mayor said that the children with SEN from the institutions of Drochia town are accepted by their ordinary colleagues. In this regard, children with SEN feel equal with the other children. The mayor believes the resistance comes from parents. The best manner chosen by the City hall in forming the attitude towards children with SEN is to prevent discrimination.

6) The short, medium and long-term priorities of stakeholders

The short and medium-term priorities expressed by stakeholders refer to:

- Providing a personal assistant to all children with severe disabilities;
- Establishing Resource centres in kindergartens;
- Integrating all pre-school children with SEN in EEI (Early Education Institution);
- Revising the financing formula of IE;
- Preparing and supplementing the job title list of specialists with speech therapists and psychologists;
- Ensuring the inclusive process from gymnasium to vocational education.
Case study – Basarabeasca District

The drafting of this case study was based on collection of information and data from Basarabeasca district and the interpretation and analysis of these data and information through a mix of social research methods (desk-based research, interviews, focus groups).

The resulting case study has an exploratory character and describes the implementation mechanisms and contexts and evaluates the changes and impact following the actions under the Programme for development of inclusive education implemented between 2011-2019. The case study also offers some information on the aspects that contributed to the success of the programme implementation, as well as on the challenges of its implementation. Furthermore, the case study provides evidence regarding the efficiency and impact of the programme on the whole.

In order to adequately capture the context of the intervention, but also to observe the dynamics between the children still institutionalised / child protection system and the (inclusive) educational system and children benefitting in this context, we will embed the data collection activities planned at district level and local level in the case study.

Thus the data collected were contextualised and analysed taking into consideration the status and evolution at district level regarding inclusive education (i.e. how children with SEN were integrated in mass education), as well as in conjunction with the quantitative and qualitative data requested from the parties involved in the implementation of the programme.

Basarabeasca district lies in the south of the Republic, bordering the Republic of Ukraine, at 100 km away from Chişinău. The total area of the district is of 29 452,98 ha. The population of the district is of 28 139 inhabitants, which represents about 0,8% from the total population of the Republic of Moldova. Out of the total population actively working in the economic field · 3,2 % are employed in such fields as education, health and social assistance. The residence of the district is Basarabeasca town with a population of 11 070, i.e. 39,3 % of the total population of the district. The large localities of the district consist in the villages of Abachia, Başcalia and Sadaclia.41

In Basarabeasca district the total number of children aged 7-18 that attend primary, secondary general education institutions (level I and II) is of 2147 children42. Out of these, 109 are children with SEN, 5,07% respectively. Out of the total number of children with SEN enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II), 48 are children with certified disabilities. 4 of the children enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) are home-schooled children, 3 of whom have certified disabilities.

As for the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in primary, secondary general education institutions (level I and II) registered by PAS at the end of 2018, in Basarabeasca district the number was of 48 children. Out of these, 20 children had a severe degree of disability, 21 an increased degree and 7 of them had a moderate disability degree.

42 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
As for the inclusion of these children in education levels, 21 children with disabilities were enrolled in primary education and 26 were enrolled in secondary education, level I (gymnasium). 1 child was enrolled at the end of 2018 in secondary education, level II (high-school education).

In terms of the typology of the degree of disability, out of the 48 children with disabilities enrolled in education institutions, most children (15) have somatic disabilities, 14 have intellectual (mental) disabilities, 6 have visual impairment, 6 have neuromotor (physical) disabilities, 5 have psychological disabilities (ASD – autism spectrum disorder), 1 has associated /complex disabilities, and 1 – hearing disabilities.

According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, at Basarabeasca district level, 3 young people with SEN were registered in vocational education.

With a view to the number of children with SEN reassessed by PAS in 2018 (children with special educational needs from primary, secondary general education institutions, level I and II), this was of 80 children and 78 of these are children with SEN confirmed in the reassessment process. The number of children (from primary, secondary general education institutions) assessed by PAS in 2018 was of 29 children. Out of these 19 were identified with SEN. Thus, at the end of 2018, 109 children with SEN were registered by PAS. SEN categories are presented in the chart below. Hence, a number of 70 children have learning difficulties, 14 have a mental/intellectual retardation/disability/severe learning difficulties, 12 have emotional and behaviour deviations, 4 have physical/neuromotor disabilities, 4 have visual impairment, 3 have language disorders, 1 – hearing disabilities.

---

43 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
Figure 14. Total number of children with SEN from primary; secondary general education institutions, level I and II (gymnasia and high-schools) per SEN category

The total number of children aged 3-7 that attend pre-school education institutions is of 920 children. Out of these 21 children have SEN (registered by PAS) and 10 children have a certified disability. According to PAS data, at the end of 2018 there were 10 children with disabilities (4 with severe degree of disability, 3 with increased degree and 3 with moderate degree) registered by PAS. As for their age, 4 children were aged 3-4, 3 children were aged 5-6, 3 children were aged 7.

SEN categories are as follows:

Figure 15. Total number of children with SEN from pre-school education institutions per SEN categories
**PAS staff, including the available specialised staff**

The analysis of the reports on PAS activity for 2018 showed the existence of a number of 4 specialists in PAS Basarabeasca, also 1 psychologist teacher vacant position and 1 speech therapist vacant position.

Regarding primary and secondary education institutions, at district level there were 9 Resource Centres for Intensive Education and 14 specialists (11 STS, 3 psychologists, 0 speech therapists). The data presented in the Consolidated report on the activity of district/municipal psychopedagogical assistance services for 2018, show that early education institutions in the district have no Resource Centres for Intensive Education, STS, psychologists or speech therapists.

1) **Relevance**

1.1. *The most important needs of the stakeholders.*

According to students of Alexandr Pușkin High-school, providing access for children with SEN (referring to those with locomotor disabilities) is an issue. However they say that the institution where they study identifies optimal solutions to this end: the class including a student with locomotor disabilities has been moved from an upper floor to the ground floor. To be noted that the students in this high school understand the issue of providing access for children with SEN not only in terms of access ramps or stairs adapted to wheelchairs. Thus, they also talked about their colleagues with sensory disabilities, giving as example the procurement of assistive techniques for a student with visual impairment (closed circuit TV system). Other necessities regarding inclusion are not specified.

Some teachers at Pușkin High-school consider that working with children with SEN means an enormous effort that is added to the instructional-educational process. According to them, in order to be able to work in such conditions one must be motivated. Individualisation services require additional remuneration: although the law on the budget provides as of 2019 an additional remuneration for the teaching staff working overtime, this is insignificant and not motivational. Teachers state that public schools such as mass schools need more services to ensure the normal development of inclusive education process. Serious necessities refer to supplying schools with qualified, flexible and accessible assistive technique. Demands regarding the preparation of methodological materials and Russian language guides in the field are expressed.

PAS specialists talk about the insufficient number of STS. The ones employed are mostly retired people. Educational institutions try to partially cover the small salary, therefore an incentive is added from the school budget. For example, in Basarabeasca district there are 10 STS for 104 children with SEN. Another necessity expressed by PAS specialists refers to the development of specialised inclusive educational services in kindergartens. PAS mentions that the necessary legislation is approved at school level and the methodology has been developed in the last 2-3 years. However, they cannot say the same about early education because the process of inclusion at kindergarten level is not sufficiently regulated.

---

During the interview, pre-primary school teachers say that they have integrated pre-school children with SEN since 2009-2010. Children with multiple disabilities, autism and Down syndrome have been integrated in this kindergarten in the last years. No similar situation is to be found in other kindergartens from the district. According to what PAS representatives stated, about 50% of the children with SEN integrated in kindergartens also have speaking disabilities, that is why kindergartens need speech therapists. Pre-primary school teachers consider that mothers of more severely affected children should be given priority when providing a personal assistant service in order to facilitate the inclusion of children with SEN. This will mean a direct cooperation with the teacher and the child will benefit the most. Mention should be made of the fact that the provision of a personal assistance service is difficult to be achieved currently, due to lack of funds compared to the great number of demands. The DSA manager said that, on the whole, 30 people in the district benefit from personal assistance service, of which only 9 children, including 2 pupils. Moreover, the personal assistance service, which would significantly facilitate educational inclusion, mostly refers to adults confined in bed and less to children. In terms of accessibility, teachers mention a case of a child with locomotor problems that had to be carried to the toilet. At the same time, there are necessities related to equipment, musical toys or other materials specific for children with hearing disabilities.

One of these necessities, expressed by the DSA manager, is the advanced training provided to the employees of Multifunctional Community Day Centres45 in Sadaclia village and Basarabeasca town in assisting children and young people with various special needs. They need specific training on topics related to behaviour and working with teenagers. The DSA manager considers that cooperation with a social service of child protection is important for 2 reasons: ensuring the continuity of children assistance beyond school hours (the specialists of the relevant centres need training to this end); during summer, children with SEN / disabilities can benefit only of the centre services.

During the interview, the DSA manager stated that the existing legal framework is good enough.

1.2. Activities needed to reach the objective of inclusive education, but not yet implemented.

Within the focus group, PAS specialists stated that it is necessary to actively work with parents, the earlier the better, ever since kindergarten, since identifying special needs. Although teachers work with children with SEN, some parents do not accept that their child has special needs. As such, they access other services in Chisinau. Moreover, PAS specialists said that this situation must be overcome in the early identification stage: as claimed, there is a need of clear regulation at the stage of early identification and inclusion in kindergarten. This regulation should stipulate that parents should refer to PAS for recommendation and accessing specialised services.

Talking about other necessities, PAS specialists say that more time is needed for the initial evaluation (observation). The evaluation cannot be successful in only 15 days. Teaching staff should be more cooperative and open because they hardly give information about children with SEN. Sometimes they do not offer any information. There are cases when children with SEN is left in the care of the STS and the involvement of the teaching staff is less obvious.

45 Multifunctional Community Centres provide basic social services for all groups of beneficiaries (including children with disabilities and belonging to the risk group) which would ensure social integration of people of different ages and with different problems. GD No. 1512 as of 31.12.2008, art. 79. http://lex.justice.md/index.php?action=view&view=doc&lang=1&id=330366
In Basarabeasca district there are 2 such centres: „Recunoştinţa” Center in Basarabeasca town and “Speranţa” Centre in Sadaclia village.
The pupils in the 9th grade at Alexandr Puşkin Theoretical High-school in Basarabeasca town consider that common meetings: teachers, parents and older children are more indicated in identifying solutions and preparing recovery plans. These meeting will eventually make family and children aware of the importance of taking action in order to overcome difficulties. Some parents sometimes do not accept children with SEN in school because they consider these children are sick.

The DSA manager states the necessity of other services at district level, such as: emergency fostering service or occupational services. PAS and OLSDE representatives also say that services exist but there is the need for a better cross-sector collaboration with the City hall / social and medical services.

Other necessities expressed by kindergarten teaching staff:

- Revising the budgeting of inclusive education services, especially for children with special needs;
- Necessity for specialized and trained human resources, access to qualified formation services;
- Procurement of and endowment with assistive technical equipment for children with sensory disabilities.

2) Effectiveness (as per evaluation matrix)

2.1 Expected effects at public administration level (inclusive education - specific and context, i.e. child protection, health system): what has been achieved compared to what was expected

The DSA manager considers that they were not sufficiently prepared for deinstitutionalisation, they did not have services enough developed to meet the needs of deinstitutionalised children upon the outset of the reform. For the integration of these children having coming back into community from residential institutions the urgent development of alternative services was necessary. Support was given by NGOs, the DSA manager mentioned Concordia organisation and CCF Moldova, which significantly contributed to the development of family-type homes and of Professional Parental Assistance Services (PPAS). The DSA manager states that in the context of great migratory movement, when many parents go abroad, it is necessary to set up an emergency fostering service for children at risk, of whom there are many having SEN.

In the opinion of the OLSDE representatives, a difficult, but very important stage was that of including institutionalisation at district level: the approval of the operational Regulation and the structure of PAS. District councilmen did not know or they were not aware of the importance of the process, so only 4 specialist units and a driver were approved. The OLSDE representatives consider that not even currently are the district president and councilmen aware of the need for a larger entity of inclusive education and recovery services. In Basarabeasca district there is not included a speech therapist unity in PAS regulation. Although Basarabeasca district is smaller compared to the other districts, OLSDE representatives claim that many cases of children with SEN (including severe ones) are recorded and consequently the above mentioned services are seriously needed. The OLSDE representatives also mentioned that there is not such a big fluctuation of teaching staff in Basarabeasca district.

2.2. Expected effects at PAS level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including preparation and implementation of individual development plans).
Within focus group, PAS representatives mentioned that most part of the infrastructure is inaccessible. Quite few institutions have access ramps. Their managers have undertaken the responsibility of building access ramps. Some institutions manage to attract projects for the fulfilment of this objective. PAS specialists are worried about the fact that classes take place in different classrooms and as such, students with SEN (mostly those with locomotor disabilities) cannot use the stairs. Most toilets/bathrooms are not adapted. 2 institutions in the district have their toilets in the backyard.

PAS specialists consider the legislative framework to be very good and the guidelines and instruments received efficient. They also mention that the IE programme is not yet institutionalised and structured at kindergarten level and kindergartens do not report the number of children with SEN.

PAS specialists stated that parents of children with SEN are very active and increasingly involved. They receive direct assistance from the local PAS, without having to go to specialized institutions in Chisinau, as they used to do not long before. In the process of individualisation of the educational process for children with SEN, parents participate only at more difficult cases. They are also involved in planning and updating IEP.

**Identification of children with severe disabilities by PAS**

*For the registration of the degree of disability by within the qualified body, parents must submit Form no. 5, issued by PAS. By drafting these documents PAS will get to know all children with severe disabilities.*

2.3. Expected effects at school level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including designs and implementation of individual development plans and added value of support centres).

Not all teachers, even at this stage, understand what special needs and inclusion mean. As such, opinions according to which parents do not want to “treat” children were expressed.

The pupils in the 9th grade of Alexandr Puşkin Theoretical High-school in Basarabeasca town say that they have had in their class a colleague with SEN, with intellectual disabilities ever since the 1st grade, but that they have not seen any difference. At the beginning they did not understand why teachers were working with him individually. They say that in the 4th grade they saw how that colleague was taking a different exam and they understood that he had to follow a different curriculum. In their opinion, teachers allow time for students with SEN: when receiving a task, the teacher allows some time and provides further explanations for pupils with SEN, a fact that is appreciated by most children. A school with inclusive practices developed in time (such as the mentioned high-school, in the opinion of the pupils interviewed) is a friendlier and more opened environment for students with SEN.

Teachers from Puşkin High-school said that they are familiar with IEP, with the guidelines and the methodology and consider them as being very good. They appreciated greatly the service, support framework and the work performed within the Resource Centre for Inclusive Education. PAS and OLSDE representatives confirmed this and stated that children enjoy going at the Resource Centre for Inclusive Education because there they find support and understanding.
Pre-primary school teachers greatly appreciate the work of the support specialist. They also want other kindergarten employees to be trained to this end, because the fluctuation of STS is quite important. In other kindergartens where there are no the Resource Centres for Inclusive Education and STS, teachers say that they handle children with SEN by themselves, including those with severe degree but they do not succeed in doing individual activities.

2.4. Expected effects at professionals level (including training courses): what has been achieved compared to what was expected.

PAS specialists consider that the training of teaching staff, including of STS, in the inclusive education has not been provided by the state. In the initial phase, training was generally provided by the NGO in the field. Also, PAS specialists organised a series of conferences on framework processes and procedures, individual planning, reference to PAS services and evaluation, learning process individualisation, speech therapy and psychological teaching assistance, etc.

Currently, PAS representatives are trained according to the necessities they expressed. Basic trainings for PAS specialists are organized at local level (by the NGO the district works with) or by CRAP. Three-week educational trainings at Ion Creangă Pedagogical University in Chisinau are considered to be less useful by PAS specialists. An explanation would be that trainers have no practical experience, hence they sometimes significantly deviate from the topic of inclusion. The situation is not much different in the case of continuous formation courses at SEI. Trainers have no practical experience in the field.

Trainings on specific themes, according to the expectations of PAS specialists, taken at the right moment, were organised by CRAP under UNICEF projects but also by the ONGs in the field. PAS specialists find these trainings useful, efficient, with the attendance of the best local and foreign experts. For example, CCF Moldova, Kultur Kontakt, LUMOS organized several meetings regarding the specific problems local professionals face: assisting children with sensory problems, assisting children with behaviour deviations, assisting children with intellectual disabilities, the specificity of the inclusion of children with severe disabilities, the inclusion of children in technical vocational education (TVE) and others.

The teachers from Puşkin High-school state that the support specialist and a teacher benefitted from national training courses in IE, organized by SEI, but this is not enough. Teachers mostly benefit from trainings provided by local PAS. Some teachers consider that the theoretical educational training at national level is not adapted to the practical reality because trainers cannot give practical recommendations. Thus, the teaching staff of Puşkin High-school believe that qualification courses of universities give very little or almost nothing of what practitioners expect.

OLSDE representatives show that staff fluctuation is continuous. As such, new staff must be continuously trained. PAS representatives are permanently trained at local level, by the Ministry, CRAP, NGOs, then they train training staff at local level. Pre-primary school teachers also find the courses developed by PAS to be very useful. They also mentioned that they had benefitted from trainings on inclusion under the “Step by Step” Educational Programme.

2.5. Factors likely to determine/produce effects.
OLSDE specialists say that when they are involved in monitoring they cooperate with PAS. Generally, there is a good co-operation with PAS on inclusive education, a fact that did not happen 6/7 years ago. Since more inclusive experiences and practices have occurred the OLSDE and PAS have strengthened their relationship with the Local Public Administration.

Teachers believe that many issues about inclusive education were clarified with the establishment of PAS service and with the help of the training they benefitted from. This situation was supported by compliance with the programme and the law.

The DSA manager firmly states that the most important help in developing services and identifying alternative solutions was received from NGOs, especially Concordia and CCF Moldova. They consider alternative services and deinstitutionalisation as factors that produce positive effects in children's educational and social integration.

The compulsion of such documents as Form no. 5 is seen by PAS representatives as a factor positive enough in identifying children with SEN, including children with severe disabilities. Practically, after introducing Form no. 5, they were able to set up the data base with children with disabilities in the district.

Kindergarten teaching staff consider that children integration depends on each group, while the human factor remains decisive. There are many children with development difficulties in kindergartens and not all of them are referred for a PAS evaluation.

2.6. Factors likely to hinder the effects.

Pupils mention that in some classes children have a discriminating attitude towards children with SEN or they are violent. A particular example was that of a girl with vision impairment who sometimes is discriminated by some colleagues, while others defend her. Pupils consider that society on the whole discriminates children with SEN. They want society to see these children as having the same rights. Because they are called disabled, these children greatly underestimate themselves.

Teachers believe that when it comes to the individualised approach of children with SEN they are not sufficiently trained and do not have support from the professional services (especially medical ones), they have difficulties in educating children according to their needs and age. At the same time, they say that there is no efficient cross-sector collaboration (with health, social services). The lack of personal assistants for children with severe degree of disability is seen as one of the great problems they deal with. Teachers consider that parents are not prepared to work with their children (as related to education). Teachers claim that for a better understanding an individual approach with each child and parent is needed because in many cases parents do not know what to do. The lack of specialised services is another factor that hinders inclusion in the teachers’ opinion. Needs for establishing psychologist and doctor units are expressed (in schools with children with severe disabilities). The linguistic problem is another factor that hinders inclusion process. Teachers from Puşkin High-school talk about the limited resources (guides, other materials) in Russian language.

OLSDE representatives talk about the great volume of work compared to insufficient remuneration in inclusive education. They say that all institutions ask for more funding to this end, because the institution must handle an increasing number of such demands.
Some parents do not reveal the situation of children with SEN which prevents children's recovery and their integration in the range of services offered by PAS. PAS specialists state that parents do not understand or do not take action in time. They do not work with their children during kindergarten and it is only at school age that they become aware and sometimes it is too late. At times parents do not reveal their children's situation, they have certificates of invalidity, but do not come to PAS because they want to avoid the disapproving attitude of their neighbours.

Kindergarten teaching staff mentioned that workers coming from the soviet system accepted the inclusion process with greater difficulty. They believe there is a lot of work to be done regarding acceptance and change of mentality. A factor that in the opinion of those interviewed in kindergartens hinders inclusion is the lack of qualified human resources: in the kindergarten there is one teacher and 20-25 children, there is also the position of teaching assistant, but they clean, wash the dishes. According to teachers, they need a support specialist to assist the children with SEN in the group, to always be with them, at least in the mornings. They also think they need an individual program for these children, an individual approach, additional attention, but these ask for an additional teaching specialist or a support specialist.

Other negative factors mentioned by kindergartens representatives:

- Too large groups of children, making it difficult to work with children with SEN;
- Lack of materials in Russian language;
- Much time needed for filling documents and reports;
- Insufficient openness and cooperation between parents and teachers;
- Parents are not open, they do not give complete information about children with SEN. Diagnoses are codified and teachers are not prepared to work with the children.

3) Effectiveness (as per evaluation matrix)

3.1. Especially efficient approaches in terms of efficient costs/solutions.

No efficient approaches in terms of efficient costs/solutions have been reported. On the other hand, the financial condition in terms of salaries is described by PAS specialists as quite complicated. That is why PAS specialists tend to migrate as STS in schools. Besides specialty assistance PAS specialists are also involved in other activities: office work, involvement in other services at district level: evaluation and participation in court sessions, others. Teachers talk about insufficient financial resources (very low salaries). There are more and more voices claiming the need of additional remuneration for the work involved with children with SEN.

3.2. Measures needed to simplify/reduce the costs incurred for approaches, solutions, activities – to ensure greater efficiency with less input.

The DSA manager considers the existing resources to be insufficient, especially the infrastructure, the financial and human ones. PAS specialists declare themselves to be very unsatisfied with their remuneration. They state that after the salary reform they have been included in a lower category. They have been included in the category of pre-primary school teachers, and pre-primary school teachers salaries are low, lower than those of support specialists. At the same time, PAS specialists consider that the volume of work for the 4 units of the Department has increased considerably. As such, the psychologist does not have enough
The time to evaluate the children. They need more time for the initial evaluation: "70% of the evaluation report has to be prepared only by observing the child".

4) Sustainability (as per evaluation matrix)

4.1. What activities are to be continued until and beyond 2020 and how will they be developed? (at all levels)

The DSA representative believes that the process of granting funds at local level depends on local budgeting in the District Council, but also on their political affiliation. The representative sees the budgeting process at local level as a difficult one, that can lead to the lack of funding and services interruption because of political criteria. The representative states his willingness to continue the IE process and efficiently collaborates with other institutions at local level. The DSA manager states that alternative services will continue to develop in the limits of the existing budget.

4.2. The main risks in continuing the activities and maintaining/improving the resulting effects.

In students’ opinion one of the greatest risks refers to the fact that the IE programme has no continuity after the graduation of the 9th grade. They know many children with SEN who have not had the possibility to continue their studies after the 9th grade, and consequently have been staying at home. The TS and PAS specialists share the same fear.

5) Impact (as per evaluation matrix)

5.1. Changes at children level, for children with SEN involved in mass education.

Pupils consider that due to the integration of children with SEN in school they learn to be more tolerant, more understanding. Pupils say that children with SEN are no different, they are like the others. The pupils from Puşkin High-school say that they like their teachers’ attitude because every teacher understands them. They talk about how the support specialist is very good and has an individual attitude towards every child, and they can talk about any problem. Hence, teachers’ attitude is seen as a factor that produces effects, influences the opinion and behaviour of most children. Children stated that in their school teachers take action if some pupils try to offend children with SEN. Other students talked about the fact that children with SEN take part in extracurricular activities. A colleague with SEN that plays basketball was given as an example. Together with the other students, pupils with SEN participate at drawing classes, thematic concerts, etc. In the opinion of the students interviewed the advantages of the programme mainly consist in the fact that children with SEN integrate, make friends, develop in a comfortable environment.

Teachers think that school environment has greatly changed. Cases of discrimination are only isolated. The general opinion of the teaching staff from Puşkin High-school is that children feel better at home that in residential institutions. PAS specialists help teachers a lot. PAS specialists claim that IE advantages consist in the formation of life habits in the case of children with SEN. Thus, society gets used and becomes more tolerant.

5.2. Changes in attitudes towards inclusive education.
At the beginning of the Programme implementation all the staff in OLSDE were involved in promoting inclusion. OLSDE representatives state that the development plan for inclusive education has been implemented, but not completely, because there was no understanding coming from society, it was not clear how it would develop. It was obvious that residential institutions would be closed. At the beginning of the process teachers reacted quite aggressively, they redirected children with SEN to the Resource Centre. There was a time when PAS was seen more as an inspection, a control service, rather than a support service (partner). People from schools wondered if they would still visit them. The situation changed when they saw that PAS continues to help them. The school staff understood that they had enjoyed benefits following inclusive education. The kindergartens staff remained more reserved, as PAS specialists think. There were such situations when PAS developed activities of training and information, but teachers did not promote inclusion in kindergartens. PAS specialists say that teachers already understand rather well the role played by the Resource Centre in inclusion. They know the requirements, when and how children must be at the Resource Centre. PAS specialists mentioned that teachers are no longer reluctant and that they already know very well the registration, reference, organisation and work procedures according to IEP, the methodology of work with children with SEN. Teaching staff cooperate with PAS very well at local level. PAS specialists think that for 2 years now they have had no problem in convincing schools about the necessity of inclusion of children with SEN. They also consider that all teachers in kindergartens know the methodological and legislative framework, they can integrate a child, respectively. There are no obstacles which were common 4 years ago. Now PAS specialists can easily work with teachers.

PAS specialists:

STS are those who see the success of children with SEN every day. Especially in the case of children with severe SEN, the STS is everything – help, assistant and invaluable support.

5) The short, medium and long-term priorities of stakeholders

For the DSA manager a major priority is providing a personal assistant to children with severe SEN. The manager named some cases when even inclusion for children with moderate severe SEN requires personal assistance.

One of the priorities stated by PAS representatives regards the inclusion in pre-school institutions of all children with SEN, younger than 5 years, including the children with severe disabilities.
Case study – Cahul District

The drafting of this case study was based on collection of information and data from Cahul district and the interpretation and analysis of these data and information through a mix of social research methods (desk-based research, interviews, focus groups).

The resulting case study has an exploratory character and describes the implementation mechanisms and contexts and evaluates the changes and impact following the actions under the Programme for development of inclusive education implemented between 2011-2019. The case study also offers some information on the aspects that contributed to the success of the programme implementation, as well as on the challenges of its implementation. Furthermore, the case study provides evidence regarding the efficiency and impact of the programme on the whole.

In order to adequately capture the context of the intervention, but also to observe the dynamics between the children still institutionalised / child protection system and the (inclusive) educational system and children benefitting in this context, we will embed the data collection activities planned at district level and local level in the case study.

Thus the data collected were contextualised and analysed taking into consideration the status and evolution at district level regarding inclusive education (i.e. how children with SEN were integrated in mass education), as well as in conjuction with the quantitative and qualitative data requested from the parties involved in the implementation of the programme.

Cahul district is a territorial-administrative unit lying in the South of the Republic of Moldova with an area of 1.545 sqkm. It consists of 55 localities, including Cahul municipality, 53 localities making up villages (townships), a locality of the municipality. On average a rural locality of the district, it has 1550 inhabitants, live less than 200 inhabitants live in 5 localities (Spicoasa, Greceni, Iasnaia Poleana, Sătuc, Tudoresti) and maximum 6009 inhabitants in Colibaș village.46

At the level of Cahul district the total number of children aged 7-18 attending primary, secondary general education institutions (level I and II) is of 11083 children47. Out of these, 368 are children with SEN, i.e. about 3%. Out of the total number of children with SEN enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II), 105 are children with certified disabilities. 11 of the children enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) are home-schooled children, of whom 10 have certified disabilities.

As for the total number of children with disabilities enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) registered by PAS at the end of 2018 in Cahul district the number was of 105 children. Out of these, 54 children had a severe degree of disability, 32 had an increased degree and 19 had a moderate degree of disability.

47 According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
Regarding the inclusion of these children in educational levels, 51 of the children with disabilities were enrolled in primary education and 52 were enrolled in secondary education, level I (gymnasium). 2 children were included at the end of 2018 in upper-secondary education, level II (high-school education).

As for the typology of the degree of disability, out of the 105 children with disabilities included in educational institutions, most children (37) have intellectual (mental) disabilities, 19 have somatic disabilities, 14 have neuromotor (physical) disabilities, 12 have associated/complex disabilities, 11 have psychological disabilities (ASD – autism spectrum disorder), 9 have visual impairment and 3 have hearing disabilities\textsuperscript{48}.

According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, 14 young people with SEN/disabilities were enrolled in vocational education at the level of Cahul district.

The number of children with SEN reassessed by PAS in 2018 (children with special educational needs from primary and secondary general education institutions, level I and II) was of 154 children, and 146 of them are children with SEN confirmed in the reassessment process. The number of children (from primary, secondary general education institutions) assessed by PAS in 2018 was of 32 children. All 32 children were identified with SEN. Thus, at the end of 2018, 368 children with SEN were registered by PAS. SEN categories are shown in the table below. Hence, a number of 269 children have learning difficulties, 42 have a mental/intellectual retardation/disability, 11 have emotional and behaviour deviations and 0 children have language disabilities\textsuperscript{49}.

\textsuperscript{48} According to PAS data available on 31 December 2018.

\textsuperscript{49} When the interview was conducted (June 2019) PAS specialists mentioned that during the second semester of the school year 2018 about 70 children with language disabilities were identified.
The total number of children aged 3-7 attending pre-school education institutions is of 5771 children. Out of these 40 children have SEN (registered by PAS) and 22 of them have a certified disability. According to PAS data at the end 2018 there were 22 children with disabilities (10 with severe degree of disability, 8 with increased degree and 4 with average degree) registered by PAS. As for their age, 4 children were aged 3-4, 18 were aged 5-6.

SEN categories are the following:
The analysis of the reports regarding the PAS activity for 2018 showed the existence of a number of 7 specialists at PAS Cahul, among which 1 vacant position for primary and secondary general education teacher.

In the case of primary and secondary education institutions, at district level there were 38 Resource Centres for Inclusive Education and 66 specialists (51 STS, 13 psychologists, 2 speech therapists). The data indicated in the Consolidated report on the activity of district/municipal psycho-pedagogical assistance services for 2018, show there are no RCIE, STS and psychologists in early education institutions in the district, only 13 speech therapists activate. During the interview, the PAS manager mentioned that in Cahul municipality, at early education level, out of the total of 8 kindergartens, 7 have speech therapist and 5 have psychological teacher.

1) Relevance

1.1. The most important needs of the stakeholders

The evaluation process performed in Cahul district shows that the needs of children and of the other stakeholders involved in the process are dictated by the experience of the inclusion process in each particular institution. As inclusive practices greatly differ, i.e. the ones at Alexandru Donici Kindergarten-Primary school from those at Dmitrie Cantemir Gymnasium with teaching process in Russian language, in Cahul municipality or at the High-school from Colibaşi village, so do viewpoints and necessities. We find a series of common necessities related to environment adaptations or materials and trainings, as well as specific necessities for overcoming difficulties while working with language disorders, severe mental and sensory disabilities.

Source: Authors adaptations

PAS staff, including the available specialised staff

Figure 18. Total number of children with SEN from pre-school education institutions per SEN categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEN Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children from the risk group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with language disorders</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with learning difficulties</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and behaviour problems</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental/intellectual disorders</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuromotor (physical)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When talking about inclusion on the whole, ordinary pupils from Dmitrie Cantemir Gymnasium say that they know the peculiarities of the process from the information campaigns and video spots about friendly and accessible school for all children. They state that these actions determined them to see their colleagues with SEN as people with plenary rights. The pupils of the High-school from Colibașii village describe some of their colleagues with SEN as “impertinent, lazy or aggressive, laughed at for the way they dress”. By chance or not, similar opinions about students with SEN have been expressed by some of the teaching staff of the High-school. This leads to the conclusion that the position and attitude of the teaching staff of an institution towards children with SEN can influence the attitude of all students in the institution. At the same time it is mentioned that children with SEN are introvert, they feel more comfortable with the STS in the Resource Centre than in the classroom or they avoid taking part in the activities outside the class. As a result of this type of relation development, children with SEN choose isolation. There were also children saying that they help their colleagues with SEN and that they would like to support children with SEN even more. In such a context, children’s greatest necessity is related to the way they are prepared to understand inclusion, diversity acceptance and mostly, the way they are trained to communicate with their colleagues with SEN. Teaching staff and support teaching staff together with pre-primary school teachers ensure the implementation of the inclusive education process and work directly with children with SEN every day. In order to achieve such a goal they need permanent support, expressed under the form of necessities of regulatory, administrative, material and methodological nature (as shown below?).

As for the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education in Moldova, OLSDE representatives consider that it is a good one because it was drafted in a participatory manner. Regulatory projects were consulted and discussed and the institution had the possibility to know and discuss them beforehand. The reason why they could organise deliberations on policies in Cahul was due to the fact that inclusive practices had been gradually developed here by several NGOs with the help of external donors. OLSDE representatives state that the institution has enough informative materials on the implementation of inclusion. Besides internal sources of information and training, OLSDE representatives participate actively at various conferences in Romania. On the other hand, practitioners say they lack many materials, both for the teaching-learning process as well as in terms of rehabilitation and assistance. The OLSDE manager considers that adjustments to the Family Code are needed, especially in terms of a greater responsibility of parents (not only of those who have children with SEN, but of all parents).

Generally, all subjects interviewed agreed that the legal framework for the implementation of inclusive education in Moldova is a satisfactory one. Certain necessities have arisen in the implementation process which can be met by making amendments to regulatory documents. The revision of regulatory documents on STS working activity is among the necessities most often claimed by school professionals. The regulatory document providing 10 children with SEN (moderate degree) or 5 children with increased/severe disabilities for an STS must be revised. Practice shows that there are too many children for one STS, especially since in most educational institutions the STS is the only IE service. The revision would facilitate work both for the STS and for the teacher in the classroom and would ease the educational inclusion of children with SEN. The teachers from Cantemir Gymnasium and Donici school talk about an insufficient number of STS and personal assistants and insufficient time allowed for working with children with severe disabilities. For children with severe disabilities IEP is a document that targets only the educational process, not the development of other habits and abilities for social integration. Methodological material is the common necessity of all teaching staff interviewed. The teaching staff from Donici school and from Cantemir Gymnasium need methodological support and

---

51 The teaching workload for STS is calculated according to GD no. 351 as of 29 May 2012, as follows: 1 position for 10 children with special educational needs (moderate degree of disability); 1 position for 5 children with increased/severe disabilities.
materials with more visual content for children with intellectual and sensory disabilities. They also expressed the need of providing methodological guides for specific disabilities, as well as sensory manuals. In this regard, practitioners appreciated the teaching support very much: The individualisation of the reading and writing process for children with special educational needs, developed by “Verbina” Community Association. The kindergarten in Colibași village is partially equipped with certain guides regarding inclusion. However, teachers say that they have to procure most materials by themselves.

Another set of problems that teachers from Colibași kindergarten must deal with refers to the parents lack of involvement in the inclusion process. This mainly refers to parents from vulnerable families (affected by poverty and alcohol consumption excessively) where education does not represent a value. Parents must be involved in more training courses and meetings in order to learn more about how to communicate and play with children with special needs. The meetings organised so far are not enough.

The common necessity of kindergartens in Cahul district (except the municipality) relates to the establishment of Resource Centres. Generally, at level of early education there is no resolution concerning the Resource Centre, STS and financing formula. Colibași kindergarten is facing great difficulties in integrating children with Down syndrome. This is why the teaching staff consider that the kindergarten teaching staff groups need to be trained in the field of inclusive education (inclusion procedures and processes but also how to respond to children with SEN) in order to have a minimum of knowledge in working with children with SEN.

The PAS manager opinions that there is still work to be done in providing access. In terms of physical access and transport the situation is even more complicated in rural environment. In many rural institutions toilets are in open air and public and social transport is lacking. There are very few or no services for children with severe disabilities. The PAS manager says that services must meet the necessities. The presence of the STS in the classroom is a significant progress in the inclusion process. At the same time, practice shows that this is not enough, institutions must be provided with speech therapists and psychologists.

The necessities identified by LPA (Cahul municipality City hall) mainly refer to:

- extending physical rehabilitation services for children with disabilities;
- identifying the support sources in ensuring the second STS for the classrooms with many children with SEN;
- granting more personal assistant wages for children with severe disabilities.

Another necessity stated by the City hall representatives concerns the lack of specialists for working with children with SEN in kindergartens.

### 1.2. Activities needed to reach the objective of inclusive education, but not yet implemented

A special situation noticed by the teaching staff of Donici school is the continuous growth of the number of children with language disorders. Out of 450 children assessed in the school year 2018-2019, 70 have severe language disorders. The complexity of the situation showed that classical speech assistance is less efficient. This is why practitioners believe (including the teaching staff from Donici school) that an updated training for speech therapists is needed, based on the current needs and context, when children communicate little at home and they interact more with the screen.

In integrating children with severe disabilities at Donici school the biggest problem is the lack of personal assistants. At the moment the lack is covered by parents’ involvement. The problem of diversifying specialised services for children with severe disabilities must be regulated at cross-sector level, at Ministries level, as the ones interviewed in this school consider. They do not see
any co-operation between educational, social and medical services. And this collaboration is absolutely necessary for children with severe disabilities.

Other necessary activities mentioned by the teaching staff of Donici school:

- The need to organize individualised and differentiated activities for the integration of children with SEN
- Organising activities for increasing the awareness for the acceptance of children with SEN by the society
- Organising trainings and awareness activities for ordinary children and parents for an attitude change towards children with SEN
- Avoiding the differentiating attitude of children in gymnasia: they must not be educated to become gold medallists, they must be educated to become adults feeling comfortable with their jobs
- Revising materials and adjusting the curriculum for the formation of speech therapists and focusing on acquiring practical experience in the work with children with SEN
- Delivering differentiated social services
- Training the support teaching staff to support children with SEN
- Cooperating with parents in organising the school program of children with SEN
- Returning to the emotional side of the learning process with less stress on techniques and processes
- Organising frequent activities for children with SEN in order for them to maintain the acquired abilities during the summer holiday

Another issue is the fluctuation of STS. Because of the low salary do not keep one job for too much time. Hence, the need to motivate STS, not only with money, but also with status – a distinct professional category should be offered.

2) Effectiveness

2.1. Expected effects at public administration level (inclusive education - specific and context, i.e. child protection, health system): what has been achieved compared to what was expected.

LPA representatives say that until the implementation of the Programme of inclusive education children had been separated from parents in residential institutions. Even after children have returned to their families, parents turn to the City hall asking for reintegration support, claiming to be facing difficulties. However, there are also parents who consider that it was better in specialised institutions, as the City hall representatives mentioned. It is cases of children from vulnerable families that the City hall of Cahul faces more often. In this regard they work for extending the range of social services. When facing cases of children with SEN, the staff in the City hall ask for the services of the school psychologist, PAS or of the psychologist from Youth Friendly Centres. The Local Public Administration of LPA believes they are also involved in the national or international co-operation for the development of inclusive education. For this purpose, co-operation with specialists in the field from Galați municipality in Romania was facilitated. Also, the City hall supports the inclusion according to their jurisdiction and possibilities. During the interview LPA representatives mentioned expressly that it must be clear for the beneficiaries of the inclusive education programme that the services are free of charge and are covered by central authorities and the local budget.

The DSA manager in Cahul mentioned that great difficulties were faced in the process of integration of children with mental and sensory disabilities, among whom children with ASD and hearing disabilities. The DSA representative believes that in the case of children with autism it is most recommended for the mother to become personal assistant. This way she will be able to closely monitor the integration process.
2.2. Expected effects at PAS level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including preparation and implementation of individual development plans)

The PAS manager in Cahul considers that after several years of activity the conclusion is that training is still needed. The programme for the development of inclusive education is somehow completed with public policies, but there is need for adjustments, especially in terms of funding or amendments of regulatory documents. Regarding the strategic and legal framework for inclusive education, the PAS manager says that a good legal framework was elaborated. In Cahul district support services for children with SEN are accessible mainly in terms of STS and Resource Centre activities. Otherwise, the situation greatly differs from municipality to villages. In Cahul, Donici school has become a model and a reference point in inclusive education and at the level of early education, out of the total of 8 kindergartens, 7 have speech therapist and 5 have psychologist teacher. At PAS Cahul they work for updating the methodological set of classic speech therapy to the current language disorder cases specialists deal with. The decision of assigning 2% of the district education budget for inclusive education ensured the resources available for the implementation of the programme. However, 2% is insufficient to cover the needs of all children with SEN. The PAS manager said that these resources cover the salaries of the STS. There are no resources left for the development of other specific services.

The PAS manager considers that a new regulation framework on the work with children with disorders from autism spectrum is necessary. The current legislation and methodology do not meet the realities they deal with: services are not carried out according to needs, but to possibilities. The PAS representative considers that, at the same time, the inclusion of children with sensory disabilities was made especially through physical presence rather than qualitatively, at service level.

Although schools manage by themselves, they do not have the possibility to contribute to service individualisation. The PAS manager opinions that the personal assistance service should be seen not only in terms of social inclusion services but also in terms of school inclusion. Thus, in the case of children with severe disabilities the personal assistant will ensure an inclusive process as successfully as possible. Social assistance services must be directed towards the development of self-support abilities of children with SEN.

The PAS representative said that a lot of work is done to channel the efforts of implementing inclusion on cross-sector segment. The result of this co-operation should be materialised in a clear mechanism of determining the inclusive process of children with severe disabilities (determining the disability, referring to services, clear tasks of the services regarding children assistance). According to the PAS manager, at the moment, doctors recommend home training (a practice inherited from the soviet system), while PAS, based on recent regulations, see another type of inclusion. The collection of data regarding children with severe disabilities by PAS is still difficult enough. The physician is the first to notice the case of severe disability. The PAS representative considers that the physician should communicate with social assistance and with the representatives of the educational system to inform them about the needs of a child with disabilities. The problem is that in many cases the severe disability is connected to the vulnerability of the family, and here the intervention of the social assistant is required. Also, there are cases when parents do not admit the problem or do not reveal it and children cannot be registered by educational and social services. The PAS manager stated that Form no. 5 has been introduced, issued by PAS and necessary for confirming the degree of disability, the institution is able to know the data on the number and types of disabilities at district level. Data on severe disabilities are not exchanged at cross-sector level. Physicians do not provide the information referring to the law on the protection of personal data.

2.3. Expected effects at school level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including the preparation and implementation of individual development plans and added value of support centres).
According to the teachers from Donici school, an institution representing a reference point in inclusion education at district level, they have managed to implement the change in their school. However, they believe that the progress in IE is not as noticeable in many other educational institutions in Cahul municipality and district. The activity of the Resource Centre is very much appreciated at Donici school and the staff consider that it has evolved a lot. Teachers mention that the Centre has a very important role in offering support to children with SEN. This is also confirmed by the fact that a speech therapist and a psychologist work within the Resource centre of this school.

Generally, according to the opinions expressed by the teaching staff from Dmitrie Cantemir gymnasium, the inclusion of children with severe disabilities has its issues. The staff say that some children, for example those with behaviour deviations, show increased aggressivity and spontaneous conducts. As such, there are parents who consider that children with severe disabilities are a danger to the class. Also, during the focus group, there were teachers who mentioned that the inclusion of children with mental disabilities in the programme of inclusive education in school is a danger for these children themselves and for the other children because they often become aggressive, therefore the teachers consider that it would be more effective to diversify the services of the Resource Centre so the children can learn more practical, self-support activities. Hence, additional financial resources are needed in order to endow a small kitchen, workshops for the involvement of children with SEN in practical activities.

For the teachers at Colibaş kindergarten, the integration of children with SEN is still quite difficult. A great problem is the lack of parents’ co-operation and recognition of the issue. The teachers believe that the sooner parents ask for evaluation to determine the special needs of their children the easier the child’ inclusion process will be. As for children with Down syndrome the teachers think that they should be placed in special centres/or assisted by means of additional assistance services. As for facilitating the inclusion of children with SEN coming from vulnerable families, the teachers consider the involvement of the City hall appropriate.

The great number of children with SEN (including severe disabilities) connected to the insufficient training of educators and the lack of necessary infrastructure leads to a very difficult inclusion process at Colibaş kindergarten. Some teachers say that children with disabilities are admitted to kindergarten because the legal framework provides as such “...because we have to”. Actually, they admit that they do not have abilities for working with more complicated cases.

Teachers of Colibaş High-school consider that educational inclusion is a relatively new process for education in Moldova and everything new is assimilated with more difficulty. It is more difficult from psychological point of view. The first STS was hired at Colibaş in 2014. Seen in the light of importance and advantages, inclusion, in the opinion of the teaching staff from Colibaş is a success mainly for children with moderate disabilities. They tend to believe that children with severe disabilities do not integrate, they should rather attend a different type of school. The teachers from Colibaş mention that in some cases SEN has become a stigma. As such, found in the situation of defending themselves, children with SEN become aggressive. For this reason the teachers from Colibaş High-school believe that the number of children with multiple difficulties should be reduced in classes.

2.4. Expected effects at professionals level (including formation): what has been accomplished compared to what was expected

In the process of inclusive education implementation, OLSDE Cahul benefitted a lot of the support provided by the District Council and it has a good collaboration with PAS. During the interview, OLSDE representatives mentioned that once the importance of inclusive education for society has been stressed, all clerks, including OLSDE employees, support and agree to inclusion. As for OLSDE, special attention was given to the training of the staff. In order to achieve this
goal they attracted different projects, focused on meeting the needs of the staff. The OLSDE manager in Cahul considers that the institution has succeeded in this process.

Most teaching staff and PAS representatives talked about several trainings they have benefitted from in the last years. In their opinion the most efficient ones were those developed at local level by PAS and specialised NGO (Partnerships for Every Children, “Speranța” Centre, “AZI: Centre”)

2.5. Factors likely to have a positive influence on the resulting effects

The following factors influence positively the development of inclusive education in Cahul municipality and district:

- The development of positive inclusive practices at Alexandru Donici kindergarten-primary school in Cahul municipality;
- The awareness and involvement of local authorities in supporting and developing inclusive education in Cahul;
- Specialised services developed in the kindergartens from Cahul municipality: out of the total of 8 kindergartens, 7 have speech therapist and 5 have psychological teacher;
- The assignment of 2% of the education district budget for the development of inclusive education;
- The professional activity of PAS specialists;
- The active co-operation between OLSDE, PAS, LPA in developing support services for inclusive education;
- The establishment and activity of Resource Centres and STS in educational institutions where children with SEN are integrated.

2.6. Factors likely to have a negative influence on the resulting effects

Regulatory factors:

- The lack of a conceptual regulatory framework on the regulation of inclusive education in early education;
- Lack of coherence in the cross-sector co-operation between education-medicine-social protection on topics regarding social assistance, the identification and early referral of cases of severe disability;
- The lack of mechanisms for collecting and adjusting the statistical data available on the number and categories of children, young people and adults currently excluded from the education system;

Social and economic factors:

- Parents are not sufficiently informed about the education opportunities for teenagers and young people regarding vocational education;
- Insufficient and ineffective use of assigned budget resources – the assigned resources can only cover STS payment. There are no resources for materials, assistive technique, development of specific services;

Pedagogic factors:

- Excessive, inflexible curriculum, that does not focus on the potential of each child, young person, adult, textbooks are adjusted to meet special education needs;
- The evaluation system is not adjusted to the individual educational requirements;
- Lack or insufficiency of psychological, psychologic teaching, speech therapy services in educational institutions;
- Poor co-operation between educational institutions at various levels and stages, between general and special education, between school and family, family and community;

Institutional factors:

- Insufficient teaching aids: textbooks, books, equipment, visual aids, toys, etc.;
The large number of children in classes and children with SEN;
- Lack of autonomy of educational institutions in managing financial resources according to the educational needs of different categories of children;
- Lack of cooperation between public institutions and social services, between governmental sector and the non-governmental one regarding the development and implementation of inclusive education;
- A lot of time is wasted on filling documents. The teaching staff from Donici school want to have more time to spend with children rather than for filling papers.

3) Efficiency

3.1. Approaches or solutions with high efficiency as related to the generated effects

Raising the awareness of local authorities by attracting and involving them in the development of support services and ensuring the inclusive educational process is worth to be mentioned as an approach that has generated positive inclusive practices in Cahul municipality. This is reflected in the condition of kindergartens in the municipality, institutions managed by the LPA level I. Thus, out of the total number of 8 kindergartens, 7 have speech specialist and 5 have psychologist teacher. Thanks to local authorities, Cahul district collaborates with IE specialists from Galați county, Romania. Therefore, specialists from Galați are invited to Cahul for the settlement of difficult and extremely difficult cases.

At Alexandru Donici kindergarten-primary school in Cahul town, inclusive education was implemented even before the outset of the Programme for the development of inclusive education. Due to the parents who had promoted inclusion in Donici school long before it was implemented at a large scale in the country and had contributed to the development of positive inclusive practices, several NGOs and representatives of educational institutions came in study visits organized with the help of UNICEF, Partnerships for Every Child, CCF Moldova, MoECR, etc.

Also, the interviews taken in Cahul district showed that the efficiency of PAS specialists activity is very appreciated. In administrative terms, at local level, PAS is a subdivision of OLSDE. CRAP (in Chișinău) is the methodological centre for all PAS. OLSDE representatives say that they have a good collaboration with PAS, and PAS specialists are receptive to any problem that occurs in the schools of the district. Every time they travel on-site and solve difficult situations. School psychologists, with PAS support, offer the necessary services when it is about behaviour deviations. PAS is supported by OLSDE when attending all district trainings. When necessary, transport is ensured. The teachers from Donici school said that when children who are about to be enrolled in the first grade are evaluated beforehand by PAS and included in recovery programmes, they come more prepared to school. The establishment of a legal framework contributed even more to the implementation of inclusion at Donici school. The teachers of this school consider the legal framework to be quite good.

OLSDE representatives consider that the existence of partnerships between the institutions with responsibilities in the field (OLSDE, PAS, CRAP, DSA, educational institutions, LPA, NGOs) facilitates the process of inclusive education especially in small fields: inclusion of children with autism, Down syndrome, behaviour deviations. For this, it is efficient to access external information resources. The existence of various services such as children’s transport to day centres on a 20 km distance, psychological teaching, school teaching, etc. is also efficient.

3.2. Measures needed to simplify/reduce the costs incurred for approaches, solutions, activities – to ensure greater efficiency with less input

It is too soon to discuss about lower costs that would ensure greater efficiency since a series of components to ensure the inclusive process are still uncovered (mental, sensory disabilities, personal assistance to be seen not only from the social services perspective but as part of all
activities, including ensuring the inclusion of children with severe disabilities). Therefore, at this stage of inclusion implementation in Moldova expenses are expected only to increase.

OLSDE representatives consider the unequal assignment of funds for IE to be an issue. While schools benefit from financial support per child with SEN from the state budget, kindergartens are in the LPA management and they do not have access to the same funds for inclusive education. The budget funds assigned to inclusive education are insufficient. During the interview the OLSDE manager said that the budget for the inclusive education represents 2% of the district budget for education.

At LPA level there are no clear instructions regarding funds assignment for inclusive education at pre-school level. At the moment things are decided at City hall and local council level. But if authorities are not aware about this issue pre-school children have no access to necessary resources. The education code stipulates the right of all children to education, but at early education level there is no clear methodology for budgeting and service development. Thus, in some localities, funds were identified due to a number of people who managed to make the City hall and the local councilmen aware of this issue. For example, in Cahul municipality out of the total of 8 kindergartens, 7 have speech therapist and 5 have psychologist teacher. These positions, as well as the entire early education, are budgeted by the state but managed by LPA.

Also, we find situations in which local authorities identify financial resources for service development but there are no specialists willing to get employed. Reasons concern the great volume of work compared to a rather small salary. The given situation is not unique and must be correlated with the process of planning the number of specialists that are to be trained in specialised educational institutions.

4) **Sustainability** (as per evaluation matrix)

4.1. *What activities are to be continued until and beyond 2020 and how will they be developed*? (at all levels)?

The teachers from Dmitrie Cantemir gymnasium consider that inclusive education will be a current issue for a long time from now on. To ensure inclusion sustainability it is necessary to ensure the development of independent life abilities for children with SEN (all children), to ensure that children with severe disabilities can be accompanied by personal assistants, that parents are more involved, RCIEs are appropriately equipped.

4.2. *The main risks in continuing the activities and the maintenance/improvement of the obtained effects*

The instability and fluctuation of the teaching staff, especially of the STS, is a major risk stated by the participants at interviews and focus groups. It already affects negatively the functioning of the educational process.

Currently, the path of children with SEN begins with early education, where the process still needs regulation and continues in the primary and secondary educational cycles. The interviewed parts talk about many children who stopped their inclusive educational process after graduating gymnasium because they could not afford to enrol in high-school or vocational education. In such a context there is a high risk that affects the maintenance of positive effects of inclusion achieved in primary and secondary educational stages.

Another risk concerns the evolution of some forms of inclusion that can lead to a hidden form of segregation of children with SEN. Due to the lack of specialised services for children with severe sensory and mental disabilities, specialised day centres are established in gymnasia and tend to replace school for children with SEN. Mass education and communication with ordinary colleagues are prerequisites for the development of inclusion.
5) **Impact**

5.1. **Changes at children level, for children with SEN from general mass education**

Within the focus group, the teachers from Donici school say that all children with SEN who asked to be enrolled in the institution have adjusted so far. This is why lately many parents have come to enroll their children with SEN at Donici school, which became known as having one of the best inclusive practices in Cahul. School management states that they do not manage to enroll all children, therefore those who live in the local area of the school have priority.

The OLSDE manager opinions that school environment is friendly with children with SEN, it also being ensured by the presence of the support teaching staff. Hence, ensuring the presence of the support teaching staff is necessary. Moreover, 1 STS unit for 10 children is not enough, the regulation should be revised.

Teaching staff say that children with SEN are generally accepted. On the other hand, they also mention that some children with SEN remain isolated, they most often sit alone in their desk. All these make us think that school environment from some educational institutions is not sufficiently open and friendly with children with SEN.

5.2. **Attitude changes towards inclusive education**

The teaching staff from Donici school consider that there is still work to be done concerning acceptance coming from parents of ordinary students. The parents of ordinary children have understood that the inclusion is legally regulated and it is not just an option. At the same time, the parents of children with SEN have become more open, they gained courage to talk about their children disability and about necessities.

In the case of Colibași kindergarten, teachers said that initially parents were very reserved. They did not reveal the problem, tried not to talk about the deviations of their children. It took a lot of effort in this aspect. Educators benefitted from support and formations from PAS Cahul. At the same time, teachers have begun to identify the children with special needs and namely: speech disorders, interaction of hyperactive children and others.

OLSDE representatives stated that parents are becoming more and more active concerning their involvement in children inclusion process. OLSDE believe that this significantly contributes to get rid of prejudices. As for the IEP framing, problems still exist because not all parents get involved in the process.
Case study – Nisporeni District

The drafting of this case study was based on collection of information and data from Nisporendistrict and the interpretation and analysis of these data and information through a mix of social research methods (desk-based research, interviews, focus groups).

The resulting case study has an exploratory character and describes the implementation mechanisms and contexts and evaluates the changes and impact following the actions under the Programme for development of inclusive education implemented between 2011-2019. The case study also offers some information on the aspects that contributed to the success of the programme implementation, as well as on the challenges of its implementation. Furthermore, the case study provides evidence regarding the efficiency and impact of the programme on the whole.

A defining element of the educational inclusion process in the district regards the integration of Roma children. Vulcănești village in Cioroști township is known as the rural locality with the largest proportion of Roma population in Moldova (86.36%). In 2010 the village school–kindergarten was renovated with the help of foreign donors, UNICEF and LPA. A significant support in the educational and social integration of children from Vulcănești is provided by UNICEF Moldova. National NGOs for the promotion of Roma people rights in Moldova, among which DACIA Resource Centre for Young People or the TĂRNĂ ROM Union of Young Roma people from the Republic of Moldova also provide support in the educational integration of children from Vulcănești.

Thus the data collected were contextualised and analysed taking into consideration the status and evolution at district level regarding inclusive education (i.e. how children with SEN were integrated in mass education), as well as in conjunction with the quantitative and qualitative data requested from the parties involved in the implementation of the programme.

Nisporeni district is an administrative-territorial unit lying in the central part of the Republic of Moldova with an area of 629 km² and a population of 65,400 inhabitants. The district includes 23 City halls with 39 localities assigned. The district residence is Nisporeni town.

At the level of Nisporeni district the total number of children aged 7-18 that attend primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) is of 5858 children. Out of these, 207 are children with SEN, i.e. about 3.5%. Out of the total number of children with SEN enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II), 49 are children with certified disabilities. 4 of the children enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) are home-schooled, all 4 have certified disabilities.

The total number of children with disabilities enrolled in primary and secondary general education institutions (level I and II) registered by PAS at the end of 2018 in Nisporeni district was of 49. Out of these, 31 children had a sever degree of disability, 11 had an increased degree and 7 had a moderate degree of disability.

52 According the PAS data available on 31 December 2018.
Regarding the inclusion of these children in educational levels, 8 of the children with disabilities were enrolled in primary education and 40 were enrolled in secondary education, level I (gymnasium). 1 child was enrolled at the end of 2018 in upper-secondary education, level II (high-school education).

Concerning the typology of the degree of disability, out of the 49 children with disabilities included in educational institutions, most of them (29) have intellectual (mental) disabilities, 12 have associated/complex disabilities, 8 have neuromotor (physical) disabilities, 0 somatic disabilities, 0 psychological disabilities (ASD – autism spectrum disorder), 0 visual impairment, 0 hearing disabilities.

According to PAS data, at the end of 2018, at the level of Nisporeni district, 17 young people with SEN were enrolled in vocational education, out of whom 5 with certified disabilities. Related to the total number of children aged 7-18 that attend primary, secondary general education institutions (level I and II) we determine a relatively great number of young people with SEN registered in vocational education compared to the other districts evaluated.

As for the number of children with SEN reassessed by PAS in 2018 (children with special educational needs from primary, secondary general education institutions, level I and II), this was of 185 children and 173 of these are children with SEN were confirmed in the reassessment programme. The number of children (from primary, secondary general education institutions) assessed by PAS in 2018 was of 37 children, out of which 34 were identified with SEN. Thus, at the end of 2018, 207 children with SEN were registered by PAS. SEN are shown in the chart below.

Hence, a number of 175 children have learning difficulties, 23 have mental/intellectual delay/disability/severe learning difficulties, 8 have physical/neuromotor disabilities, 1 has

---
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emotional and behaviour deviations and 0 children have language disorders, hearing and visual impairment.

Figure 20. Total number of children with SEN from primary; secondary general education institutions, level I and II (gymnasia and high-schoo...
The analysis of the reports concerning PAS activities for 2018 revealed the existence of a number of 5 specialists at PAS Nisporeni, among which one kinetotherapy specialist as well as 1 vacant position of teacher for primary and secondary general education.

In primary and secondary general education institutions there were 19 RCIE and a number of 21 specialists (19 STS, 2 psychologists) at district level. In early education institutions, an RCIE is established and it is functional where 2 specialists work (1 STS and 1 kinetotherapy specialist).

1) Relevance

1.1. The most important needs of the stakeholders

The children from Valeriu Dumbraș Gymnasium in Ciocăieni village see inclusive education as a situation when all children are at school, no matter their ethnicity or religion. They consider that the school they study at is accessible to every child, irrespective of religion, as long as they attend it.

The colleagues of children with SEN from Ciocăieni Gymnasium believe that once integrated in school, these children have the possibility to know new things and even to become happier. At the same time there were pupils who estimated that about 15% of their colleagues would not accept inclusive education in school. Generally, this situation refers to the acceptance of Roma children. The children mentioned that the colleagues who do not accept Roma children in the class consider themselves to be superior. The colleagues of the 2 Roma children in the class talked about the fact that they interact with Roma colleagues and help them when they need. On the other hand, Roma children mentioned that some colleagues do not really understand them, they contradict each other and conflicts occur.

Source: Adapted by authors

Ministry of Education, Culture and Research, Consolidated report regarding the activity of district/municipal psycho-pedagogical assistance services for 2018, March 2019.
The teaching staff from Valeriu Dumbravă Gymnasium in Cioarești village (the township with the same name) mentioned during the interview that at the beginning of programme implementation they had difficulties in terms of IEP drafting, the establishment of the Interdisciplinary Methodical Commission and other issues. They also mentioned that the inclusion began later in the kindergarten. Currently, the gymnasium has 277 children, 22 TS, including an STS. 14 children with SEN were enrolled in school in 2018-2019, out of whom 12 studied according to the modified curriculum. As the TS mentioned, there were years when the number of children with SEN was of 18, but the number of STS remained the same.

The necessities of the teaching staff include the needs of specialists and teaching aids for working with children with SEN. The teachers from Cioarești Gymnasium said that they collaborate with PAS actively in this respect. However, one speech therapist within the PAS for all district institutions is not enough. A solution would be one speech therapist for two school and pre-school institutions in neighbouring localities (excepting the towns) and a school psychologist, as the interviewed TS stated. Teachers say that they need more support materials in working with children with SEN. To this end, 2000 lei per year are assigned for the institution budget. The teachers interviewed consider that in working with children with specific SEN they need more materials than what can be procured from the available resources of the middle-school.

The OLSDE manager stated that instances of inclusion had also occurred in the educational institutions in the district, before the Programme for the development of inclusive education, but the staff did not work based on IEP. All the activities for the implementation of the Programme (especially in the initial stage) were done in coordination with MoECR and MoHWSP. At the same time, the OLSDE manager said that the overcoming of many difficulties, related to the integration of children with SEN in the general education, such as residential education reform, depended on the local authorities. Among the most important needs stated by OLSDE are:

- Greater number of STS in the district institutions;
- Endowment of institutions and Resource Centres with specialised equipment;
- More psychologist and speech therapists for enrolment centres.

On the whole, PAS representatives claimed the same necessities, firstly the need of more psychologists and speech therapists. At district level they need to develop and make accessible the services for children with SEN. The interviewed professionals claimed the need of providing services for children with autism and with Down syndrome.

Teachers see Cioarești kindergarten as being accessible to inclusion. They say that certain conditions for the integration of children with SEN are created in the institution. At the moment, out of the 120 children from the kindergarten, only one child has SEN. In terms of necessities, the teachers from Cioarești kindergarten said they need more space for establishing a Resource Centre and especially to provide the appropriate conditions for the speech therapist to conduct his/her activity. Other needs stated by the teaching staff consist of teaching aids, assistive technique and trainings provided for working with the children with SEN.

The DSA manager considers that in Nisporeni district the inclusion process is facilitated by the services established in this regard, especially PAS and the presence of the STS in the classroom. The manager stated that several children with disabilities from the district are to be deinstitutionalised in the following period of time, they will have to be reintegrated in families and educational community services, respectively. According to the DSA manager among them there are children with hearing disabilities, language disorders, mental disabilities.

1.2. Activities needed to reach the objective of inclusive education, but not yet implemented

Other necessary activities mentioned by the parties interviewed

- Support provided in working with children with mental disabilities;
- Guidelines on specific disabilities;
- PAS materials and support in working with children with autism.
- The necessity of organising individualised and differentiated activities for the integration of children with SEN
- Organizing increasing awareness activities for the acceptance of children with SEN by the society
- Organising trainings and increasing awareness activities for ordinary parents and children to change their attitude towards children with SEN
- Delivery of differentiated social services.

2) **Effectiveness**

2.1. *Expected effects at public administration level (in the context of inclusive education, i.e child protection or health system): what has been achieved compared to what was expected*

The OLSDE manager mentioned that out of the 33 school institutions plus 28 kindergartens and 1 auxiliary school (35 children) 4 schools are endowed with access ramps and elevator. The others have adapted ramps and toilets. Also, “Poveste” kindergarten in Nisporeni town is very well equipped in terms of ensuring access, due to a project implemented in this regard. The representative added that a lucrative partnership with CRAP is confirmed.

During the interview, the OLSDE manager declared that the IE methodology for early education institution has been approved in the district. However, things still need improvement in this matter. The OLSDE manager gave the example of “Poveste” kindergarten in Nisporeni town. Following the implementation of the project ”Ajută-l să crească om mare” (Let’s help them grow), the institution has become to be known as one with inclusive status. The kindergarten is endowed with equipment and they also have a minibus.

At the end of school year 2017-2018 in Vulcănești village, 70 out of 85 Roma children attended school and had good academic results due to a project implemented by UNICEF Moldova in partnership with Dacia Youth Resource Centre. The project started in 2017 and it was aimed at changing the situation in Vulcănești. In 2017 only 7 children from the village attended school.

A year later (June 2019) it seemed that the situation was partly similar to the one in 2017. According to the OLSDE manager the problem of school-kindergarten attendance by Roma children is still current and has not been settled. The OLSDE manager mentioned that at the end of school year (May 2019) only 11 children attended school and 6 children attended kindergarten. Communication between Ciioarești and Vulcănești villages in the community of Ciioarești township is difficult, according to the professionals interviewed. Because of this, children from Vulcănești village (mostly inhabited by Roma population) do not want to attend Ciioarești school. Only a small number of Roma children from Vulcănești (14) use social transport for travelling to Ciioarești school. The professionals interviewed consider that at the Ciioarești school the situation is good, while in Vulcănești village the kindergarten-school is not much attended by Roma children.

According to the statement of the OLSDE manager, UNICEF was very much involved in settling the problem of providing access to Roma children (particularly Vulcănești village) to education. Also, various NGOs for the promotion of the rights of Roma people offered support, among which: Dacia Centre in Soroca town, Tarna Rom. A result mentioned by all professionals interviewed is that the effort made by all stakeholders has led to the fact that all Roma children in the community have learnt to write and read, i.e. they have acquired more knowledge.

Following the interview with the DSA manager we can ascertain that, in terms of inclusion, there is a good institutional co-operation at the level of child protection structures which include: PAS, The Committee for children in difficulty, the multidisciplinary team. The DSA manager said that

---

https://revista.un.md/copii-romi-din-vulc%C4%83ne%C8%99ti-nisporeni-merg-la-%C8%99coal%C4%83-datorit%C4%83-unui-proiect-unicef-238bcd15521
DSA collaborates with PAS especially in terms of requirements on children evaluation. Referring to specialised services, the DSA Nisporeni manager mentioned that all 7 children (June 2019) with severe disabilities receive personal assistance service, while their mother or father are the assistants. According to the DSA manager, they also provide personal assistance services for children with severe disabilities in the district, when such children are enrolled in kindergarten or school. During the interview it was also mentioned that DSA actively co-operates with the NGO "Parteneriate pentru fiecare copil" (Partnerships for every child) in the project: *Familie puternică pentru fiecare copil* (A strong family for every child). 35 children have been assisted and integrated under this project since 2016.

2.2 Effects expected at PAS level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including development and implementation of individual educational plans)

A speech therapist and a psychologist work in the service. During the interview, PAS specialists said that a great challenge they deal with refers to the work with children with autism. In their opinion, this happens because there have been no thorough trainings on working with these children. A solution would be the work with children with autism according to Makaton method\(^56\), but, according to PAS representatives, parents do not accept working according to this method. Also, PAS representatives showed the need of training in in behaviour therapy. All the above, according to PAS specialists, can be achieved by means of a closer collaboration with the NGO “SOS Autism”, the best known organisation offering support to autistic children. When discussing about rare cases of disability, PAS specialists mentioned they had to train themselves at in order to be able to work with children with Down syndrome.

The following methodological materials were required by PAS for empowerment:

- Portage
- Mellowtherapy
- Makaton
- Pauda

Regarding the inclusion of Roma children, PAS representatives talked about the fact that generally, working with children from Roma families is not complicated. PAS often go to Vulcănești village, inhabited completely by Roma people. Some Roma parents prefer to come to PAS. PAS specialists said that Roma children showed they have learning skills and abilities. At the same time, according to PAS representatives, some educators show resistance.

2.3 Effects expected at school/kindergarten level: what has been achieved compared to what was expected (including the development and implementation of individual educational plans and the value added of resource centres)

The teaching staff from Ciorești Gymnasium said that at the beginning of the Programme implementation they had to deal with the drafting of the modified curriculum, IEP, but have handled it to the end. At this stage, most TS (about 90%) discussed about inclusion. Teaching staff working in multiple educational institutions (part-time) were not interested in the individualisation of the educational process for children with SEN. The situation has now changed for better, teaching staff know the peculiarities of the inclusion: they draft the modified/adapted curriculum, they know how to work with children with SEN.

The teachers at Ciorești Gymnasium think that the STS is involved at the most and manages very well. Practically, the STS ensures the success of children with SEN, as the teachers from the gymnasium consider. In school year 2018-2019 there were 14 children with SEN, including 12 who studied according to the modified curriculum. According to what has been said, there

---

\(^{56}\) Makaton is a unique linguistic programme that provides a structured, multimodal approach of teaching communication, language and literature skills for people with language and learning difficulties (source: [www.makaton.org](http://www.makaton.org)).
seems not to be any children with severe disabilities at the middle-school, the children with SEN from this school know to read and write. Actually, the regulatory document providing that a STS can work with up to 10 children with SEN or with 5 children with severe disabilities is not observed. The teaching staff said that children with SEN like going to the Resource Centre very much. This is because at the centre the staff work with them individually and it is easier. A special schedule has been decided for the Resource Centre. Children enjoy coming here. The STS also works with children after classes, as the interviewed teachers from Ciurești Gymnasium mentioned.

According to the TS from Ciurești most parents of children with SEN belong to category of vulnerable families. They do not show too much interest in the educational process of the children and do not want to come to school. Only few parents respond to the requirements of the school and children. Teachers think that the social assistance provided to such families should be conditioned, so that they co-operate with the school. The situation also gets worse because some parents work abroad and children are living with their grandparents. In fact, these children are mostly in the school care, as the teachers interviewed state.

The representatives of Ciurești kindergarten consider that inclusion would be beneficial for both children with SEN and for the rest of the children. The former will always stay in the family (instead of a specialised residential institution) will be able to attend the community kindergarten, while the latter will become more receptive, tolerant and understanding.

According to what was said during the interview, there are 5 Roma children enrolled in kindergarten, of whom 2 are temporarily living with their parents in Russia. Teachers say that Roma children are very much helped by Dacia Centre: they procure all that is necessary for school, kindergarten costs are borne by the centre. Teachers believe that the problem is not the lack of money or of other type of necessary support but rather the negligence of Roma children parents. It is quite complicated to work with Roma families, the pre-primary school teachers say. In order to involve parents in the educational process, the kindergarten headmaster, together with a police officer sometimes have to visit the children at home for discussing, to making parents aware, because they do not come to kindergarten.

During the interview the teachers talked about the fact that before inclusion started to be implemented, Roma families and their children had been isolated from the rest of community. Now they have the chance to integrate and the others have the chance to closely know them and become more tolerant.

2.4. Effects expected at professionals level (including training): what has been achieved compared to what was expected

Most of the professionals interviewed admitted that things have started to improve after PAS establishment and involvement in the process. Still, the OLSDE manager also mentioned some ambiguous situations in the initial stage: initially, PAS regulation led to confusions as if it was an institution separated from OLSDE, the manager states. Now there is a good collaboration, as the OLSDE manager claims. Similarly, the OLSDE manager considers that the good training of PAS specialists is very beneficial for inclusion in their district. As a consequence individualisation could be implemented.

As for the availability of trainings and resources for helping teachers acquire adequate qualifications, the OLSDE manager said that it is all up to the individual. Generally, the manager mentions, local seminars, organised by PAS, are very useful, because they are able to discuss on IEP and on subjects based on actual cases from the district. The OLSDE manager showed less familiarisation with the content and effectiveness of the courses organised by the County School Inspectorate.
The teaching staff from Ciorești Gymnasium stated that PAS frequently ask them about training necessities. According to TS, the seminars organised by PAS are provided at local level and are very accessible and useful for teachers.

In 2017 DACIA Youth Resource Centre provided training courses for all the teachers at Ciorești kindergarten, for a week. In 2018 the teachers attended advanced training courses delivered by lecturers from the University of Tiraspol headquartered in Chisinau, organised by PAS in the district centre, Nisporeni.

2.5. Factors likely to have a positive influence on the resulting effects

The following factors influence positively the development of inclusive education in Nisporeni district:

- PAS establishment in the district and the introduction of STS position in the classroom;
- The significant support and contribution of UNICEF Moldova for the social and educational integration of Roma children from Vulcănești village, Ciorești township;
- The active co-operation between OLSDE, PAS, LPA in developing support services for inclusive education;
- The establishment and activity of Resource Centres and STS in educational institutions where children with SEN are integrated.

2.6. Factors likely to have a negative influence on the resulting effects

- The low attendance of Roma children in school and kindergarten;
- The lack of a conceptual regulatory framework regarding inclusive education regulation at level of early education – the lack of Resource Centres and STS in kindergartens;
- Insufficient parent informing about educational opportunities for teenagers and young people related to vocational education;
- Insufficient budget resources assigned – the resources assigned only cover the payment of STS salaries. There are no resources for materials, assistive technique, specific services development;
- Insufficient speech therapy services in education institutions;
- Insufficient teaching aids: text books, books, equipment, visual aids, toys, etc.;

3) Efficiency

3.1. Approaches or solutions with high efficiency as related to the generated effects

According to the OLSDE manager the work done by the PAS specialists can be characterised as very efficient and likely to determine results in inclusive education.

A significant effort was made for the inclusion of Roma children in Nisporeni district. Results could be seen. However, solutions with high efficiency are difficult to identify. The educational institution in Vulcănești village is financially supported by the local authorities of Ciorești township. The OLSDE manager mentioned that in February 2015 the kindergarten was closed due to lack of financing. Moreover, the manager talked about how teachers working at Vulcănești school are more financially motivated than their colleagues from other schools: they receive a salary of about 10.000 lei, plus 2000 lei for transport. UNICEF finances private lessons.

3.2. Measures needed to simplify/reduce the costs incurred for approaches, solutions, activities – to ensure greater efficiency with less input

The topic of budgeting and costs associated to educational inclusion was discussed during individual and group interviews in terms of: "insufficient" and "partial coverage". As such, the solutions for a greater efficiency identified by the stakeholders also involved a greater input.
According to PAS representatives inclusive education is insufficiently financed. 2% of the education district budget is not enough for salaries or Resource Centres. During the group interview, PAS specialists stated that salaries are lower compared to the workload and complexity and the pressure they face. Thus, the specialists consider that the current remuneration covers the workload to a ration of about 70%.

The OLSDE manager believes that resources and services should be budgeted altogether with school resources. In the manager’s opinion the 2% fund barely covers the STS and the Resource Centres needs.

4) **Sustainability** (as per evaluation matrix)

4.1. *What activities are to be continued until and beyond 2020 and how will they be developed? (at all levels)?*

According to the teachers from Ciorești Gymnasium sustainability can only be ensured by connecting the inclusive educational process in middle-school with the one in vocational education. Vocational orientation must be actively included during middle-school and optimal conditions for children with SEN should be created in order for them to attend vocational school, as teachers consider.

4.2. *The main risks in continuing the activities and the maintainance/improvement of the obtained effects.*

Generally, the parties interviewed talked about the risks regarding teaching staff and STS fluctuation. The weak financial motivation and insufficient methodological support and specialised equipment could affect the good functioning of the educational process.

Another risk refers to the educational and social integration of Roma children from Vulcănești village, Ciorești township. On the one hand, the very good educational infrastructure in Vulcănești village runs the risk of not being efficiently used. A part of the children already commute to Ciorești Gymnasium. There are rumours coming from the civil society (NGOs for the promotion of Roma rights) claiming that a school set up only for Roma children (Vulcăneși case) is segregative. On the other hand, parents negligence leads to their children’s poor attendance and consequently to poor results in their educational inclusion.

5) **Impact**

5.1. *Changes at children level, for children with SEN from general mass education*

One Roma child attending Ciorești Gymnasium said during the interview that for 9 years at school he managed to make friends who showed a lot of support and they helped each other. Children consider there is no difference between ethnicities – they are all humans. And this must not prevent anyone’s access to education. The integration of Roma children in school, their colleagues believe, represented a great opportunity to better know each other and to remove communication barriers.

During the interview they also mentioned that although they are involved in the organisation of cultural events, the two Roma children do not get involved. Children consider that this happens because their Roma colleagues do not believe in themselves, they feel inferior (as they are sometimes labelled). Otherwise, children said that the Students Council is a platform opened for all students and their colleagues with SEN, including Roma children, speak up and they are listened to.

The DSA manager in Nisporeni district said that at the beginning of inclusion the parents of ordinary children were against enrolling children with SEN in classes. Now, a few years later, the situation has changed and parents have accepted the idea that everybody has the right to education.
According to the teaching staff from Ciorești Gymnasium making a difference between children is out of question. Children with SEN, they say, receive help from their classmates. If someone refers to their mates by using the “SEN” phrase, they do not have bad intentions, as the teachers interviewed consider. The teachers stated that most of the methodological and awareness increasing activities at Ciorești Gymnasium are organised around the concept of SEN.

5.2. Attitude changes regarding inclusive education

According to PAS specialists, parents are quite involved. There is a change in the manner they see, understand the process. However, Roma families still respect their traditions of not attending school, because they do not see the purpose of education, PAS specialists mentioned.

Professionals attending the interview said that it is quite difficult to change a situation existing for centuries, regarding the Roma traditions of not enrolling their children in the educational process. The OLSDE manager said that one of the leaders of the Roma civil society in Moldova, Marin Ala, considers that the school in Vulcănești village, Nisporeni district, is the only school in Moldova segregated on ethnicity principles.
Annex 8. Discussion topics for the experts panel

Expert panel – Theory of Change validation

Introduction
- Short presentation of the moderator and topic of discussion
- Presentation of the Theory of Change
- Handouts with the Theory of Change presentation, including the visual schema of the ToC will be sent in advance to participants and presented during the event

Topics for discussions
1. Is there any important element of the Programme missing from the Theory of Change presentation?
2. Are the logical links described in the theory of change correct?
3. To what extent factors identified as problems and needs in 2010-2011 when the programme was designed have been identified correctly and to what extent they continued to be present/relevant for the educational system in Moldova in the last 18 years?
4. To what extent the general objectives could be reached with the planned intervention? Can you think of other interventions needed?
5. To what extent the outcomes and impact could be achieved with the planned activities? Can you think of other activities needed?
6. To what extent positive and negative factors, risks and bottlenecks have been considered in programme design?
7. Was the programme timeframe appropriate, considering the starting point and outcomes and impact envisaged?
8. Have been the resources allocated appropriate, considering the starting point and outcomes and impact envisaged?
9. Has been the programme management system appropriate, considering all programme elements?

Annex 9. Topics for discussion for the results validation workshop and its outcomes

Annex 9. Workshop – Evaluation results validation and results of the workshop and experts panel combined

Introduction
- Short presentation of the moderator and topic of discussion
- Presentation of the Theory of Change
- Handouts with the Theory of Change presentation, including the visual schema of the ToC will be sent in advance to participants and presented during the event
- Summary of evaluation results will be sent in advance to participants and presented during the event

Topics for discussion
Presentation of the preliminary findings and conclusions related to each question, followed by 3 questions:
1. To what extent are findings and conclusions in line with the evidences known to the workshop participants?
2. Is any evidence / information known that should determine the evaluation team to re-assess findings and conclusions?

3. What are the main recommendations to be presented to national, district level and local stakeholders, generated by the findings and conclusions?

List of participants in the validation workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution / Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Trofin Laura</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>QURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lefter Mădălina</td>
<td>Evaluation expert</td>
<td>QURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Irina Lonean</td>
<td>Evaluation expert</td>
<td>QURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Irina Ciumac</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>IPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Viorica Cojocaru</td>
<td>Evaluation expert</td>
<td>CCF Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Anastol Gremalschi</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>IPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gheorghe Trofin</td>
<td>Child Protection Officer</td>
<td>UNICEF Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Hangan Virgiliu</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>PPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Bulat Galina</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>Lumos Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Marț Viorica</td>
<td>Main consultant</td>
<td>MoECR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Liliana Rotaru</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>CCF Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Crudu Valentin</td>
<td>Chief Directorate</td>
<td>MoECR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Chicu Valentina</td>
<td>State Secretary</td>
<td>MoECR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Guitu Valentina</td>
<td>Senior consultant</td>
<td>DÎPT, MoECR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Rusu Ana</td>
<td>Senior consultant</td>
<td>Legal Direction, MoECR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Lichii Dana</td>
<td>Head of PAS Bălți</td>
<td>PAS Bălți</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Dubițkaia Tatiana</td>
<td>Head of DITS Bălți</td>
<td>DÎTS, Primaria Mun. Bălți</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Golovatii Ecaterina</td>
<td>Head of deinstitutionalization and development of social services</td>
<td>Keystone Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Larisa Vârtosu</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>UNICEF Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Cazacu Ina</td>
<td>Coordination of inclusive education programs</td>
<td>Association “Woman and Child · Protection and Support”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Budan Mariana</td>
<td>Head of PAS</td>
<td>PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Baban Valeriu</td>
<td>Head of Cahul</td>
<td>Cahul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Cojocaru Tudor</td>
<td>Head of DtM</td>
<td>MoECR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Sincavici Angela</td>
<td>Head of PAS Ialoveni</td>
<td>PAS Ialoveni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Rusnac Virginia</td>
<td>Director of CRAP</td>
<td>CRAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of the validation workshop and experts panel combined

The main points discussed during and after presenting the evaluation report are:

• The aspect of inclusive education in vocational and technical education is important, in order to ensure the complete course of children with SEN. Although the vocational and technical education has not been evaluated, the report presents and analyzes the information collected for this educational level, both from the perspective of the school environment (access infrastructure) and from the perspective of the sustainability of the effects already registered and the measures recently taken by KulturKontakt.

• The results of the evaluation are important for the formulation of the elaboration of the next Strategy in the field of education and the related action plan. In this regard it is important to emphasize in recommendations aspects related to early education, early intervention and institutional cooperation. It is very important that the assessment should refer to Objective 4 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, (the implementation of which was committed to by the Government of the Republic of Moldova), an objective aimed at access to education (from early education to adult education).

• Recommendations could be grouped into areas such as: strategic educational policies and programs, in relation to national and international documents, quality and relevance (human / material resources etc., teacher training, cooperation between parents and kindergarten / school / community), monitoring and evaluation, sustainability (including financial coverage and efficient use of resources).

• Financing inclusive education was a widely debated topic in the workshop. The participants consider important the development of the financing mechanism for pre-school education and the revision of the financing mechanism for general education, as well as financing inclusive education based on needs, which implies changing the current funding model (2% of education budget at raion level). A new financing model, based on needs, by applying coefficients for children with CES, which would provide the necessary resources (including for CREI), based on the number of children with CES in the district and not the total number of children, was supported by all participants. Some have presented evidence that the cost of education doubles for a child with different abilities than other children. At the same time, there were contrary opinions regarding the sufficiency of the resources needed at this time. A large part of the participants supported the findings of the evaluation in this regard - the fact that the resources reach the limit for the support teacher and (not in all cases) for the functioning of CREI, but other necessary resources (for example for speech therapists, psychologists according to SAP Cahul) not available. Changing the funding method does not necessarily have to increase the cost of inclusive education, but first it will balance their availability at the rational level - where needs are higher, larger budgets will be available. The evaluation team will review the extent to which the existing financial resources are completely consumed at district level or inefficiencies are recorded from this perspective.

• The participants confirmed the findings regarding the CDS, and the implementation with priority of measures for the stability of this key resource in the educational system. If the financing of the position itself should take into account the need for CDS and the services provided, the participants agreed that the level of pay is not adequate.

• The finding regarding the target groups provided by the program, but not covered by the planned interventions / activities, was clarified. The program has proposed various target groups (Article 58), but they have not been taken up at the level of the action plans. (Children from other vulnerable groups at risk of poverty due to poverty, for example, or children from language minorities were mentioned as target groups in the program but have not been planned and therefore actions for them have not been planned and implemented; consequently, the desired effects at the level of these target groups cannot be manifested.

• The importance of cross-sectoral collaboration was emphasized by all participants, especially from the perspective of early intervention and from the perspective of identifying their needs and funding, which also pertains to the funds of social assistance, medical, not only educational ones. It is not always necessary to create alternative centers for schools, schools can serve as platforms for providing recovery, support, etc. services.
Indeed, it is necessary to calibrate SAP personnel and ensure their efficiency and effectiveness. These two goals - efficiency and effectiveness can be achieved (in the context of cross-sectoral cooperation) by setting up mobile teams. But these must come to complement the activity of the mobile teams in the social system (from the component of the teams is part psychologist, doctor, physiotherapist, social worker). In this context, the delimitation of social services from educational ones is very important.

• Better clarification, concretization and prioritization of recommendations are needed.
• Discussions on the evaluation report should be continued on a large scale, with the participation of SAPs from districts and other relevant actors, especially in order to establish the details of the new financing method. The participants pointed out that studies in this regard have been carried out and other analyzes are being prepared for the needs of children with SEN. The results can be made available to the MoERC.
**Annex 10. Relevance**

Table 10.1. Internal coherence of the Programme, including the analysis of the available action plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES MENTIONED IN THE PROGRAMME FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES MENTIONED IN ACTION PLANS (operational objectives)</th>
<th>ACTIONS AND SUB-ACTIONS MENTIONED IN ACTION PLANS for 2015-2017 and 2018-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>promoting inclusive education as an educational priority in order to avoid the exclusion and / or marginalization of children, young people and adults, in line with regulatory factors</td>
<td>1. Preparing and promoting the policies for inclusive education implementation in the national education system</td>
<td>Preparing and approving an action plan for implementing the Programme for the development of inclusive education</td>
<td>Ensuring equal opportunities for quality education for every child, young person, adult, at all levels and levels of the education system</td>
<td>Reconsidering the concept of inclusive education in the Republic of Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing the database on human resources (scientists, teachers, non-governmental organizations, etc.) and the material resources available to support the implementation of inclusive education</td>
<td>Assessing the needs in the field</td>
<td>Organizing the Panel Meeting for presenting the results of Inclusive education models piloting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continually developing the regulatory and methodological framework to ensure the quality and sustainability of inclusive education</td>
<td>Continually developing the regulatory and methodological framework to ensure the quality and sustainability of inclusive education</td>
<td>Organizing the International Conference for presenting the outcomes following the implementation of the Program for the development of inclusive education in the Republic of Moldova for 2011-2020 and informing the public on future commitments and strategies in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting inclusive education models validated in the national education system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing cross-sector strategies for promoting inclusive education</td>
<td>Initiating and carrying out special studies for assessing the outcomes of the &quot;Education for All&quot; Strategy and connecting them to the objectives of inclusive education. The establishment of an advisory body for the coordination at national level of the development of inclusive education. Integrating the inclusive education objectives into current social policies.</td>
<td>Forming an inclusive culture and society in order to include children and young people with special educational needs in the community.</td>
<td>Adjusting the regulations for the organization and functioning of institutions providing services for disabled individuals for being in line with the requirements of inclusive education. Providing cross-sector mechanisms for establishing and providing support services for children, young people with special educational requirements. Ensuring the exchange of data and information between institutions and authorities regarding the provision of educational, social and medical services and their beneficiaries. Revising the mechanism of cross-sector coordination of admissions/acceptances in residential institutions. Continually monitoring the situation of deinstitutionalized children (family reintegration, placement in alternative forms of family type, school inclusion). Examining, during the sessions of the Advisory Board for the implementation of the Programme for the development of inclusive education in the Republic of Moldova, the outcomes following the monitoring / evaluation of situation concerning the deinstitutionalized children, with the identification of the aspects that need improvement. Organizing the half-yearly meetings of the Advisory Board for implementing the Programme for the development of inclusive education in the Republic of Moldova.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reviewing and developing adequate financing mechanisms</td>
<td>Carrying out exclusion and inclusion studies (types of existing inclusive policies, programmes, projects and budgets allocated to government, civil society, international agencies, donors, etc.) for this purpose.</td>
<td>Assessing the needs in the field Continually developing the regulatory and methodological framework to ensure the quality and sustainability of inclusive education</td>
<td>Developing the concept of integrated services and the cross-sector mechanism for financing them Developing the financing formula per child in pre-school education, with adjustment coefficients for the inclusion of disabled children Preparing the adjustment coefficients of the financing formula per child, in order to ensure the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the general school education Preparing the amendments / additions to the legislation in force to financially support the integrated services provided for the inclusion of children with severe disabilities in the general education system Analysing the establishment and allocation of the Inclusive Education Fund within districts / municipalities, in order to determine the level of efficiency and appropriate use, as necessary Ensuring the redirection of the financial and material resources of residential institutions undergoing the process of reorganization / transformation towards socio-educational services Assessing the implementation level of the Programme for the development of inclusive education in the Republic of Moldova between 2011-2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Monitoring the process of implementation of inclusive practices in the educational system</strong></td>
<td>Coordinating and monitoring, at national level, the implementation of inclusive education developing mechanisms for collecting, monitoring, synthesizing data on children’s rates of participation in education (by age, sex, disability, ethnicity, region, income, etc.) Setting up the methodological framework for evaluating the activity of general education institutions in terms of inclusive education Participatory evaluation of the inclusive education process (the involvement of parents, children, experts, teachers, representatives of civil society, etc.)</td>
<td>Ensuring the quality and efficiency of IE structures and services Carrying out fundamental and applied research in the field of inclusive education, in order to improve and monitor the implementation process Delimitating, within the research institutions, the structures / subdivisions in charge with the theme of inclusive education Designing and implementing applied research to ensure continuous development and consolidation of inclusive education Evaluating the quality and efficiency of IE services established during 2011-2017 Evaluating the models / practices of educational inclusion of children with hearing disabilities reintegrated into general education institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Harmonizing the national regulatory and methodological framework for promoting and ensuring the implementation of inclusive education, in</strong></td>
<td>Preparing/harmonizing the regulatory framework in terms of inclusive education</td>
<td>Ensuring equal opportunities for quality education to every child, young person, adult, at all levels and cycles of the educational system Preparing and approving regulatory documents for regulating the activity of services in order to ensure the educational inclusion of children and young people with special educational needs Analyzing the situation on ensuring the development of inclusive education with the appropriate regulatory and methodological documents. Identifying the areas not covered in terms of regulations and preparing the list of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having the MoECR (Ministry of Education, Culture and Research) College examine the inclusive education models developed between 2011-2020, in view of their validation/invalidation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance with the regulatory, pedagogical and institutional factors</th>
<th>Developing mechanisms for collecting, monitoring, synthesizing data on children’s rates of participation in education (by age, sex, disability, ethnicity, region, income, etc.)</th>
<th>Setting up and developing the framework for quality assurance in inclusive education</th>
<th>Developing standard service packages for different groups of children and young people, as well as estimating their costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child, young person and adult</td>
<td>Setting up the methodological framework for evaluating the activity of general education institutions in terms of inclusive education. Participatory evaluation of the inclusive education process (the involvement of parents, children, experts, teachers, representatives of civil society, etc.)</td>
<td>Ensuring the quality and efficiency of IE structures and services</td>
<td>Developing and revising quality standards for different types of institutions and organizations providing inclusive education services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Preparing and implementing a system of standards for inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementing quality standards in inclusive education by: (a) Evaluating the level at which the educational institutions comply with the quality standards for educational institutions in terms of child-friendly school; (b) Preparing the mechanisms and tools for accrediting the providers of psycho-educational abilitation/rehabilitation services for children with special educational needs (non-governmental organizations, educational institutions) (c) Evaluating and accrediting training services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Providers in the field of inclusive education (initial and lifelong training institutions, non-governmental organizations, educational institutions, etc.)
Drafting the **Indicators on assessing the quality of inclusive education implementation at the educational institution (on levels of education)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. strengthening the institutional capacity and developing support services for excluded and/or marginalized children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piloting inclusive education models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the institution’s plan in terms of inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized assistance for implementing the inclusive education from central institutions (CRAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the institutional capacity at all levels of education by ensuring the access, relevance and quality of inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting models to ensure access to education of children with multiple, associated or severe disabilities, with sensory disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the capacity school of managers for the efficient planning and management of the financial resources allocated to inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing methodological consultative centres based on institutions with inclusive practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the Regulation on the organization and functioning of the Interdisciplinary Methodical Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting the amendments/completions to the Framework Regulation on the organization and functioning of the district / municipal Psycho-pedagogical assistance service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning methodological centre in the field of inclusive education, based on the results obtained after monitoring/assessing general education (school and pre-school) institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. reorganizing the general / special education, optimizing the network of institutions for inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. reconsider the mechanisms for identifying, evaluating, determining special educational needs, diagnosing the psychophysical development of children, young people and adults for adapting education programs and forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. developing the means and forms of integration in accordance with the possibilities of the children and with the special educational requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex assessment of the residential institutions under the subordination of the MOECR which have left since 2017 and preparing the reorganisation plans for each institution

Developing and piloting models to ensure access to vocational training to young people with special educational needs

Developing counseling and career guidance programs for children and young people with special educational needs

Drafting the Methodological guide *Working strategies for the classes including children with SEN*
| 11. adapting/implementing the inclusive curriculum whose main characteristic is flexibility | Preparing the Methodological guide on including children with severe disabilities in the general education  
Preparing the Methodological guide on including children with SEN in the technical vocational education  
Preparing the Methodological guidelines on developing/adapting teaching aids for working with children with SEN  
Preparing the Guide on professional guidance and career guidance for young people with SEN  
Preparing learning aids according to the needs of children and young people with severe deficiencies  
Developing practical guides for teachers according to fields  
Preparing support materials for the teachers from pre-school, pre-university and university educational institutions, as well as for the parents / persons in whose care the children with special educational needs are assigned  
Creating a digital library for teachers and parents of children, young people with special educational needs  
Preparing the Curriculum on long-life training in the field of inclusive education for university teachers |
| 12. developing/implementing the flexible evaluation system, in terms of reconsidering the principles and methodology of child assessment and reforming child development assessment structures |
| Building a friendly, accessible educational environment, capable of meeting the special expectations and requirements of the beneficiaries, as well as the pedagogical and institutional factors | 13. initial and long-life training, in terms of inclusive education, human resources in the field of education and related fields | Strengthening institutional capacities at all levels of education to ensure access, relevance and quality of inclusive education
Ensuring the quality of initial and long-life training in inclusive education | Consolidating and developing the professional skills of the specialists within the Republican Centre for Psycho-pedagogical Assistance and within psycho-pedagogical assistance services in specific fields
Initial and long-life training of teachers and managers at all levels of education in order to ensure the educational inclusion of children and young people with special needs and to reduce the number of out-of-school children and school dropouts.
Revising and introducing the training modules in inclusive education in initial and long-life training programmes for the managers of the preschool and pre-university educational institutions, teachers, support teachers
Strengthening the capacities of cross-sector teams (made up of pre-primary school teachers, social workers and health workers), established in 926 rural localities, to promote inclusive education and social inclusion of children with special educational needs
Organising long-life training courses of the teaching staff, tenures of the Inclusive Education course, implemented as mandatory in the initial training of the teaching staff at university level |
|---|---|---|---|
| inclusive education | establishing school environment (school administration, children, teachers, parents)
informing and providing support to teachers in terms of inclusive education (directions, methods, techniques, practical activities, etc.)
training the staff on matters related to inclusive education
evaluating and accrediting services and certifying teachers at national level
informing, training and supporting the teaching staff, social, medical, legal staff, etc. in matters related to inclusive education, at district level | | |
| 14. early identification of special educational needs and ensuring appropriate qualified intervention | 15. individual approach, according to the individual pace of development of each child (initial evaluation, applying the new means of teaching activity and reconsidering the teacher-child relations, the curricular and teaching-methodical adjustment, the adjustment of the infrastructure, etc.) | Organizing training courses in the field of inclusive education for teachers in technical vocational education  
Ensuring the inclusion of the modules / units of content related to inclusive education in the curricula for long-life training of managers and teachers in general and technical vocational education  
Developing modules / programmes for training the specific skills needed by teachers in working with children with sensory deficiencies, autism spectrum disorders, severe disabilities and complex needs  
Developing support services for children with special educational needs in educational institutions  
Complex, multidisciplinary assessment of the situation of children placed in residential institutions subordinated to MOECR and preparing individualized plans for reintegration / assistance  
Evidence of the dynamics of the quota of children in residential institutions subordinated to MOECR  
Developing and piloting the models of including children with sensory disabilities, currently institutionalized, in the general education |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>individual educational plan, continuous monitoring and evaluation, final evaluation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. implementing educational, information, communication technologies and equipment suitable for inclusive education</td>
<td>support services: support teacher, personal assistant, assistive technologies, sign interpretation services, etc. ensured at community level</td>
<td>Strengthening institutional capacities at all levels of education to ensure access, relevance and quality of inclusive education</td>
<td>Ensuring access to information and the means of communication, including information and communication technologies and systems, to children and young people with disabilities in educational institutions (Braille alphabet, sign language, etc.) Providing special educational institutions with the necessary equipment to facilitate the learning of children and young people with sensory and locomotor disabilities Preparing the list of minimum facilities for the general education institution in order to ensure access and inclusion of children with SEN (by type of SEN) Providing general education institutions with specific facilities (equipment, technologies, etc.) in order to ensure the access and inclusion of children with SEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. making educational and training institutions accessible by implementing</td>
<td>transport, travel and accessibility services provided at district and community level</td>
<td>Making infrastructure accessible in educational institutions of all levels for children and young people with disabilities Regulating the conditions for purchasing transport units for transporting children to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building an inclusive culture and society, in line with the socio-economic factors</td>
<td>Assistive techniques and technological innovation</td>
<td>Establishing national cooperation and support networks for the implementation of inclusive education</td>
<td>Ensuring collaboration and transparency while implementing the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. consolidating the capacities and making families and the community more responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting up the coordination and information group in inclusive education</td>
<td>Building an inclusive culture and society for the inclusion of children and young people with special educational needs in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involving children in promoting inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring the participation of children with the SEN in the decision-making process, decisions which are actually related to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. building partnerships between governmental structures, local authorities, civil society and family,</td>
<td>Involving parents' and teachers' associations, branch unions in the implementation / promotion of inclusive education at district, community, school, class level etc.</td>
<td>Including parents of children with special educational needs as members of the Advisory Board on restructuring the residential care system and developing inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing regular consultative meetings with the participation of non-governmental organizations and parent groups on matters related to inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drafting the recommendations for educational institutions of all levels regarding the involvement of children and young people in promoting inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring the fact that the children with SEN are represented in school self-government bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping of structures, organizations, institutions providing educational and support services for children and young people with special educational needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>to ensure inclusion in the community and access to the integrated social services system</strong></td>
<td><strong>Building partnerships with civil society for the development of services related to inclusive education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. raising awareness of the society and building the public opinion in terms of inclusive education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Continuous development of public-private partnerships, including with associative sector representatives, in promoting inclusive education and children’s rights in general</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiating and carrying out public awareness campaigns on inclusive education, promoting good practices</td>
<td>Organizing media coverage campaigns and raising social awareness campaigns for promoting inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raising awareness of community public opinion in order to promote inclusive education</td>
<td>Preparing and publishing informative materials for the promotion of inclusive education: for children, parents, pre-primary school teachers, teachers, social assistants and medical staff (nurses), representatives of local public administration authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting and disseminating inclusive education and practices at national, district and community level</td>
<td>Organizing public events (scientific sessions, national and international conferences, symposia, seminars, round tables, etc.), radio and TV shows that address the issue of educational and social inclusion of children and young people with special educational needs and promote successful cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing informative materials (leaflets, posters, prospects), including an easy-to-read (understandable) format on the essence and importance of children’s participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing media coverage campaigns and raising social awareness campaigns for the lifelong development and improvement of inclusive education quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 11. Effectiveness

Effectiveness

Table 11.1. List of regulatory documents and methodological documents on inclusive education

1. Regulation on the organization and functioning of the Republican Centre for Psychopedagogical Assistance (approved by GD no.732 as of 16.09.2013).


3. Regulation on the redistribution of financial resources in the process of restructuring residential institutions (approved by GD no.351 as of 29.05.2012).

4. Regulations on the salary of the support teachers (supplements to the GD no.381 as of 13.04.2006, operated by GD no.791 as of 23.10.2013).

5. The standard-cost funding per pupil of primary and secondary general education institutions under the subordination of the second level Local Public Administration (approved by GD no.868 as of 08.10.2014).


7. Methodology on the organization and functioning of the Resource Centre for Inclusive Education (approved by ME Order no. 100 as of 26.02.2015).

8. Guideline on the organization of home schooling (approved by ME Order no. 98 as of 26.02.2015).

9. Guideline on the specific procedures for examining pupils with special educational needs (approved by ME Order no. 156 as of 20.03.2015).

10. Specific regulations and conditions for the final evaluation and certification of pupils with special educational needs enrolled in institutions providing compulsory general education, who have studied according to an individualized educational plan, based on a modified curriculum (approved by ME Order no.311 as of 05.05.2015).

11. Model structure and the Guide on the implementation of the individualized educational Plan (approved by ME Order no. 952 as of 06.12.2011).

12. Methodological Guide "Curricular adaptations and assessment of school progress in the context of inclusive education" (approved by the decision of the National Council for Curriculum as of 09.02.2012, ME Order no.139 as of 15.03.2012).

13. Methodological Guide "Assessment of child development" (approved by the decision of the National Council for Curriculum as of 30.01.2015, ME Order no.158 as of 23.03.2015).

14. Methodological Guide "Educational support. Assistance of children with special educational needs" (approved by the decision of the National Council for Curriculum as of 30.01.2015, ME Order no.158 as of 23.03.2015).

15. Course unit Inclusive education. Compulsory module for implementation in the initial training of teachers at level I in higher-education (approved by ME Order no. 125 as of 07.03.2012).

16. Curriculum on long-life training in inclusive education (approved by the Scientific and Didactic Council within the County School Inspectorate, report no.8 as of June 26, 2014).
17. Guide on the implementation of the Individualized Educational Plan, revised edition (approved by the decision of the National Council for the Curriculum as of 06.07.2017).

18. Methodological Guide "Individualizing the educational process by means of curricular adaptations" (approved by the decision of the National Council for Curriculum as of 06.07.2017), revised version.


20. Order no. 1430 as of September 25, 2018, on the approval of the Methodological benchmarks on inclusive education in technical vocational education.

21. Law on social inclusion of people with disabilities nr. 60 din 30.03.2012

22. EDUCATION CODE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA, No. 152 as of 17.07.2014

23. DECISION No. 434 as of 10.06.2014 on the approval of the Strategy for child's protection for 2014-2020


26. Specific regulations and procedures on the final evaluation and certification of children with special educational needs, enrolled in institutions providing compulsory general education, Order of ME no. 145 as of 24.04.2012

27. Regulation on the activity of the support teacher, Order of ME no. 209 as of 25.09.2018

28. Regulations on the development of inclusive education in the technical vocational education, ME Order no. 1430 as of 27.02.2018

29. Standard structure and Methodological guidelines on the drafting and implementation of the individualized educational plan in early education institutions, ME Order no. 1780 as of 03.12.2018

Figure 11.2. Total number of kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova

![Graph showing the total number of kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova from 2013 to 2018.]

Figure 11.3. Total number of kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova benefitting from support staff

![Graph showing the total number of kindergartens benefitting from support staff (support teacher, psychologist, speech therapist) from 2013 to 2018.]

Figure 11.4. Total number of kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova benefitting from arranged places

![Bar chart showing the total number of kindergartens benefitting from arranged places for disabled children from 2013 to 2018.](image)

**Figure 11.5. Total number of disabled children attending kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova**

![Bar chart showing the total number of disabled children attending kindergartens from 2013 to 2018.](image)
Figure 11.5. Distribution of disabled children attending kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova – per age categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-2 years</th>
<th>3-4 years</th>
<th>5-6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of which: total number of disabled children aged 0-2 years
Out of which: total number of disabled children aged 3-4 years
Out of which: total number of disabled children aged 5-6 years
Figure 11.6. Evolution of kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova 2013-2018 – per district
Figure 11.7. Evolution of kindergartens in the Republic of Moldova 2013-2018 – per district, with support staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comrat</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telenesti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straseni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Voda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldanesti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riscani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisporeni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialoveni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hincesti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floresti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falesti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinet</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubasari</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donduzeni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criulei</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimișlia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisinau</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauzeni</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldarasi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basarabeasca</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balti</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anenii Noi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of kindergartens benefitting from support staff (support teacher, psychologist, speech therapist)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.8. Analysis of external evaluation reports ANACEC- higher education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher education bachelor degree programme 0114.12 Music, full-time learning and part-time learning – State run university of Comrat, 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recruitment and admission of students belonging to disadvantaged groups is carried out in strict line with the regulatory documents in force. The granting of the degree and the issuing of the diploma, the diploma supplement and the academic certificates is in strict compliance with the regulatory requirements. The Music Programme does not include any students belonging to disadvantaged groups. The institution includes educational and research spaces adequately equipped that fully ensures the achievement of the study programme objectives - but only refers to the necessary facilities for typical children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Relations full-time learning and part-time learning – State run university of Moldova, 2018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recruitment and admission of students to the study programme is carried out in accordance with the regulatory documents in force, with some non-essential deviations. Admission to the International Relations programme for disadvantaged groups, including those with special educational needs is organized in compliance with the regulatory documents in force and the institutional ones. In order to facilitate the access of the disadvantaged groups to studies, the State run university of Moldova includes the support centre &quot;FĂRĂ BARIERE&quot; operating for the students with visual impairment and the Medical Centre &quot;Universitatea&quot;. While visiting the educational spaces it was found that these subdivisions are active, functional. Following the interviews with the coordinators of the study programme we found out that during the period evaluated a student with special educational needs completed his studies within the programme subject to evaluation. There are no access ramps in the building for people with special educational needs. All the educational spaces (lecture rooms, seminar rooms, reading rooms, laboratories are provided with internet connection, but they are partially accessible, because the building is not provided with an access ramp, as well as other access facilities for people with disabilities. The requirements for graduating the Bachelor's degree programme are met. The award of the degree and the issuing of the diploma, the diploma supplement and the academic certificates is in strict compliance with the regulatory requirements - it is not clear to what extent adapted exam methods are applied to students with SEN. In the year 2017-2018, they reserved places in dormitory no. 4 for all students with special needs at the State run university of Moldova, but 1 student with special needs was enrolled with the Internal Relations programme, who was accommodated in dormitory no. 10 on the first floor, ensuring him better mobility conditions. The dormitories comply with the hygienic-sanitary standards, they have fire-prevention and sanitary authorization, but some of them need to be renovated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied decorative arts, general field 021 Arts, 240 ECTS credits, full-time education, the State Pedagogical University &quot;Ion Creangă&quot;, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and admission of individuals belonging to disadvantaged groups, including students with SEN, to the bachelor study programme was carried out in accordance with the regulatory documents in force. Adequate access conditions are provided in the building meant for studying, in dormitories, etc. for people with special educational needs. Currently, no student with disabilities is enrolled in the study programme. After having visited the places meant for students studying and living, we found that they are provided with what is strictly needed. Access into the institution is arranged for people with disabilities, with small deviations. Currently no students with locomotor disabilities are enrolled at the Decorative Arts programme of study. Should students with special needs / conditions enrol, the dormitories and other educational spaces of the faculty itself do not comply with the Building Regulations: CP C.01.02-2014 (Design of buildings and constructions in terms of accessibility for people with disabilities) and NCM C.01.06-2014 (General security requirements for constructions in view of being used by and accessible to people with disabilities). The faculty should provide conditions for the enrollment of future students with locomotor disabilities in the educational process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public administration, full-time education and part-time education, State run university „Alecu Russo” in Bălți, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission to the bachelor study programme of people belonging to disadvantaged groups, including people with special educational needs, is carried out in compliance with the regulations provided in the reference documents referred to, within the limit of the 15% quota established from the total number of budget places. According to data provided, during the reference period, 6 students from disadvantaged groups were enrolled. Evidence: The list of students enrolled, belonging to disadvantaged groups, as well as the evidence regarding the assignment to such categories of people that can apply under the conditions of paragraph 4 of the Regulation, approved by ME Order no. 748 as of 12.07.2013. Ways of promoting inclusive education are carried out at the institution level * (USARB). The award of the degree and the issuing of the diploma are performed in compliance with the regulatory requirements, based on the completion of the study programme* (following the scoring of at least 175 credits) and taking the bachelor degree final examination. Thus, it is found that the material basis is relevant and sufficient for the training of students enrolled in the programme of study, including students with special needs. In 2015-2016, 9 students (with SEN) were studying at the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, out of whom 5 were in the Public Administration study programme, full-time courses. The institution provided an access ramp (ramp to the 1st floor, building V) for students with locomotor disabilities, visual impairment etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The facilities for students with special needs are provided in the Admission Regulation, within the limit of the 15% quota established from the total number of budget places. Students with special needs (with disabilities, coming from disadvantaged families, etc.) enrolled in the study programme are provided places in dormitories and are accommodated on the first floor while orphan students are accommodated in dormitories for free (without paying the accommodation fee). Recommendation: Providing dormitories with access ramp, protection rail to facilitate access for students with special needs, when necessary.

Table 11.9. The provision of RCIE and specialists at district level in 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crt. no.</th>
<th>District/municipal service of psychological assistance</th>
<th>Specialists Early education institutions</th>
<th>Primary and secondary general education institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of RCIE</td>
<td>Number of STS</td>
<td>Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anenii-Noi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bălți</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Basarabeasca</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Călăraşi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Căuşeni</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chişinău</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Cimişlia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Criuleni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Donduşeni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dubăsari</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Edineţ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Făleşti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Floreşti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Gălăeni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Hînceşti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Hînceştii</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Nisporenii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ocniţa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Rişcani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Şoldăneşti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ștefan-Vodă</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Strășeni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Taracă</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Telenesti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>UTAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 87 113 148 6 845 1077 432 106

Table 11.10. Teaching staff in the Republic of Moldova
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crt. no.</th>
<th>District/municipal service of psycho-pedagogical assistance</th>
<th>Number of RCIE</th>
<th>Number of STS</th>
<th>Psychologists</th>
<th>Speech therapist</th>
<th>Kinetotherapy specialist</th>
<th>Total number of children with SEN in pre-school educational institutions</th>
<th>Ratio STS/children with SEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anenii-Noi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bălţi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Basarabeasca</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Călăraşi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Căuşeni</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chişinău</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Cimişlia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Criuleni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Donduşeni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dubăsari</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Edineț</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Făleşti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Florești</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Hîncești</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ialoveni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Nisporeni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Rișcani</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Șoldănești</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Ștefan-Vodă</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Strășeni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Telenești</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>UTAG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1807</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.99</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.12. STS coverage in primary and secondary general education. RCIE coverage degree at this level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No./o</th>
<th>District/Municipality</th>
<th>Data on primary and secondary general education institutions, level I and II, per number of specialists, arranged places</th>
<th>Total number of children with SEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total number: primary and secondary general education institutions, level I and II in the district/municipality</td>
<td>RCIE coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of primary and secondary general education institutions, level I and II benefitting from support staff (number of institutions and number of specialists)</td>
<td>Number of primary and secondary general education institutions, level I and II benefitting from arranged places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support teaching staff</td>
<td>Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anenii-Noi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bălți</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Basarabeasca</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Călărași</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Căușeni</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chișinău</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cimișlia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criuleni</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dondușeni</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dubăsari</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edineț</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Făleşti</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florești</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hâncești</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ialoveni</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nisporen</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Râșcani</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Sângerei</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Şoldăneşti</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Ştefan-Vodă</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Străşeni</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Teleneşti</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>UTAG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>103</th>
<th>167</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>339</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>69</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>127</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9503</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.13. Specialists' availability as per number of children with SEN, district level, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAS</th>
<th>Total number of children with SEN</th>
<th>No. of specialists</th>
<th>Children/specialists ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anenii-Noi</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bălți</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basarabeasca</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Călărași</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Câșcașni</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chișinău</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>108.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimișlia</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criuleni</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dondușeni</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubășari</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edineț</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fălești</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florești</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hîncești</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialoveni</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisporeni</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocnita</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rîșcani</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Șoldănești</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ștefan-Vodă</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strășeni</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telenești</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAG</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9503</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>39.7615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 12. Efficiency

Table 12.1 Budget execution for inclusive education 2015-2018 and the approved budget for 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Measure unit</th>
<th>executed 2015</th>
<th>executed 2016</th>
<th>executed 2017</th>
<th>executed 2018</th>
<th>approved 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total educational institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with SEN who have been ensured inclusive education services</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>10092</td>
<td>10483</td>
<td>9874</td>
<td>9945</td>
<td>9859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure for inclusive education</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>57,861.70</td>
<td>60,556.37</td>
<td>65,346.14</td>
<td>70,206.80</td>
<td>67,453.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost incurred for inclusive education/child with SEN</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/support teacher</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/Resource Centre</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support teaching staff:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff units (positions)</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>832.63</td>
<td>923.71</td>
<td>931.41</td>
<td>971.26</td>
<td>989.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff salary expenditure</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>42565.5</td>
<td>47513.94</td>
<td>55383.59</td>
<td>64145.3</td>
<td>64650.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource centres:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of centres</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses incurred for the establishment, equipment and</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>14013</td>
<td>11781.74</td>
<td>8694.85</td>
<td>6061.5</td>
<td>2802.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance of centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses incurred for other inclusive education services</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>1283.2</td>
<td>1260.69</td>
<td>1267.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early education institutions (00199)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with SEN who have been ensured inclusive education services</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure for inclusive education</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>1,835.40</td>
<td>3,387.40</td>
<td>4,240.40</td>
<td>5,341.00</td>
<td>6,450.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost incurred for inclusive education/child with SEN</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/support teacher</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/Resource Centre</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>20.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Measure unit</th>
<th>executed 2015</th>
<th>executed 2016</th>
<th>executed 2017</th>
<th>executed 2018</th>
<th>approved 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support teaching staff:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff units (positions)</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>69.87</td>
<td>83.19</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff salary expenditure</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>1708.0</td>
<td>3129.2</td>
<td>4215.6</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>6450.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource centres:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of centres</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses incurred for the establishment, equipment and</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>127.4</td>
<td>258.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance of centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses incurred for other inclusive education services</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Primary education institutions (00200)**                          |              |               |               |               |               |               |
| **Children with SEN who have been ensured inclusive education       | unit         | 311           | 248           | 186           | 160           | 162           |
| services**                                                          |              |               |               |               |               |               |
| Total expenditure for inclusive education                            | thousand lei | 1,612.20      | 2,654.25      | 2,105.63      | 1,469.50      | 1,294.40      |
| Average cost incurred for inclusive education/child with SEN        | thousand lei | 5.18          | 10.70         | 11.32         | 9.18          | 7.99          |
| Average number of children with SEN/support teacher                 | unit         | 10.79         | 9.10          | 7.87          | 7.28          | 7.20          |
| Average number of children with SEN/Resource Centre                 | unit         | 19.44         | 10.78         | 8.45          | 8.00          | 7.71          |

| **Support teaching staff:**                                         |              |               |               |               |               |               |
| Total number of staff units (positions)                              | unit         | 28.83         | 27.24         | 23.62         | 21.98         | 22.5          |
| Staff salary expenditure                                            | thousand lei | 1356.7        | 1501.1        | 1466.7        | 1403.1        | 1245.7        |

| **Resource centres:**                                               |              |               |               |               |               |               |
| Total number of centres                                             | unit         | 16.0          | 23.0          | 22.0          | 20            | 21            |
| Total expenses incurred for the establishment, equipment and        | thousand lei | 255.5         | 1150.3        | 597.7         | 66.4          | 48.7          |
| maintenance of centres                                             |              |               |               |               |               |               |
| Expenses incurred for other inclusive education services            | thousand lei | 2.9           | 41.2          |               |               |               |

<p>| <strong>Gymnasia (00201)</strong>                                               |              |               |               |               |               |               |
| <strong>Children with SEN who have been ensured inclusive education       | unit         | 5703          | 5898          | 5785          | 5781          | 5628          |
| services</strong>                                                          |              |               |               |               |               |               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Measure unit</th>
<th>executed 2015</th>
<th>executed 2016</th>
<th>executed 2017</th>
<th>executed 2018</th>
<th>approved 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure for inclusive education</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>31,477.90</td>
<td>32,797.82</td>
<td>37,547.88</td>
<td>41,356.64</td>
<td>38,778.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost incurred for inclusive education/child with SEN</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/support teacher</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/Resource Centre</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support teaching staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unit</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff units (positions)</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>465.48</td>
<td>524.27</td>
<td>541.62</td>
<td>565.67</td>
<td>558.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff salary expenditure</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>24258.5</td>
<td>26265.3</td>
<td>32365.81</td>
<td>37294.7</td>
<td>37197.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resource centres:**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of centres</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>438.0</td>
<td>482.0</td>
<td>518.0</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses incurred for the establishment, equipment and maintenance of centres</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>6343.3</td>
<td>5914.9</td>
<td>4365.3</td>
<td>4061.94</td>
<td>1580.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses incurred for other inclusive education services</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>876.1</td>
<td>617.6</td>
<td>816.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upper-secondary education institutions (00203)**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children with SEN who have been ensured inclusive education services</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>3308</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>3211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure for inclusive education</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>22,936.20</td>
<td>21,709.81</td>
<td>21,452.23</td>
<td>22,039.66</td>
<td>20,929.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost incurred for inclusive education/child with SEN</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/support teacher</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children with SEN/Resource Centre</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support teaching staff:**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff units (positions)</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>302.42</td>
<td>307.05</td>
<td>296.30</td>
<td>300.42</td>
<td>318.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff salary expenditure</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>15242.30</td>
<td>16618.34</td>
<td>17335.48</td>
<td>20170.5</td>
<td>19756.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resource centres:**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of centres</td>
<td>unit</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses incurred for the establishment,</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>7286.8</td>
<td>4458.37</td>
<td>3707.05</td>
<td>1869.16</td>
<td>1173.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expenses incurred for other inclusive education services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Measure unit</th>
<th>executed 2015</th>
<th>executed 2016</th>
<th>executed 2017</th>
<th>executed 2018</th>
<th>approved 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>equipment and maintenance of centres</td>
<td>thousand lei</td>
<td>407.1</td>
<td>633.1</td>
<td>409.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ministry of Public Finance and authors’ processing*

Table 12.2. Average number of children with SEN/support teacher according to budget execution for inclusive education 2015-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>executed 2015</th>
<th>executed 2016</th>
<th>executed 2017</th>
<th>executed 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florești</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bălți</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimișlia</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Făleşti</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chișinău</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strășeni</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialoveni</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hincești</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Călărași</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisporeni</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>14.31</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA Găgăuzia</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brăceni</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>10.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dondușeni</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basarabeasca</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telenesti</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anenii Noi</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edineț</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>11.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râșcani</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criulenii</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Câșușeni</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ștefan-Vodă</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldănești</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudășari</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>15.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ministry of Public Finance and authors’ processing*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>executed 2015</th>
<th>executed 2016</th>
<th>executed 2017</th>
<th>executed 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criuleni</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ștefan-Vodă</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basaraboeasca</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldănești</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialoveni</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Căușeni</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudăsari</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodești</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dondușeni</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edineț</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anenii Noi</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Călărași</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rișcani</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strășeni</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hincești</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chișinău</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telenești</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimișlia</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisporeni</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bălți</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>9.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA Gâgăuzia</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Făleşti</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>11.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florești</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>18.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Public Finance and authors’ processing
Table 12.4. Reconstruction of the activities performed for the Action plan 2015-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Sub-actions</th>
<th>Responsible institutions</th>
<th>Time limits</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1. Ensurance of equal chances to quality education for each child, young person, adult, to all levels and cycles of the education system</td>
<td>Consolidation of the national regulatory framework in terms of providing access to education and equality of opportunities in education field for each child, young person, adult</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Updated inclusive education concept</td>
<td>According to the MoECR report for 2016, the concept of inclusive education development was updated by the Ministry of Education with the support of UNICEF and the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Reassessment of the inclusive education concept in the Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Updated inclusive education concept</td>
<td>According to the MoECR report for 2016, the concept of inclusive education development was updated by the Ministry of Education with the support of UNICEF and the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Adjustment of regulations regarding the organisation and functioning of institutions that provide services for people with disabilities to the requirements of inclusive education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Health</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>5 reviewed and approved regulations</td>
<td>According to the MoECR report for 2015, in the 3rd quarter (2015) the adjustment of Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of Boarding Schools for Orphan Children and Children without Parental Care to the context of gradual transition/reorganisation period was done, in the context of establishment/reorganisation of structures, forms, staff units, etc., to ensure the psycho pedagogic assistance necessary to the development of children with SEN. According to the MoECR report for 2016, for the purpose of conceptualizing the psycho pedagogic, speech therapy, psycho logistic assistance services and of the support teaching staff, the following were revised/drafted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Regulation on psycho pedagogic service,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Regulation on speech therapy service,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The regulation on psychologist service and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Regulation on support teaching staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the same period of time the Standard Regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

57 According to the List of materials (policies, regulatory acts and methodological documents) elaborated by/with the support of Lumos Foundation.
on the Organisation and Functioning of Special Education Institutions was also approved, its implementation ensures the enhancement of the quality of educational, social and medical services for children with special educational needs (children and students with sensory and/or severe learning difficulties).

1.3. Elaboration and approval of regulatory acts for regulating service activity in order to ensure the educational inclusion of children and young people with special educational needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry of Education,</th>
<th>2015-2017</th>
<th>Regulatory acts drafted and approved for the established structures and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Labour,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Protection and Family,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the information presented in the List of materials drafted by/with the support of Lumos Foundation, between 2015-2017 The Methodology on the Evaluation of Child Development (MEO no.99 as of 26.02.2015), The Methodology on the Organisation and Functioning of the Resource Centre for Inclusive Education (MEO no.100 as of 26.02.2015) were elaborated.

Although according to the MoECR report for 2016, The Regulation on Support Teaching Staff was drafted during 2016, the available information shows that The Methodological References Regarding the Activity of the Support Teaching Staff in General Education Institutions was approved by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research of the Republic of Moldova Order no. 209 as of 27 February 2018, and The Regulation on the Activity of the Support Teaching Staff in General Education Institutions was approved on 20.06.2018, therefore with a certain delay.

According to the information presented by Lumos Foundation, The Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of Early Education Institutions – aspects specific to the development of inclusive education was approved by MEO no.254 as of 11.10.2017.

The Standard Structure and Methodological Notes on

58 https://chisinauedu.md/sites/default/files/files/regulament_activitate_cadru_didactic_sprijin_0.pdf
the Preparation and Implementation of the Individualised Educational Plan were also approved by MEO no.1780 as of 03.12.2018.

Moreover, although the Intra-school Multidisciplinary Committees have been established since 2013 in order to ensure the specialised assistance of children with disabilities in general education institutions, according to interviews conducted during the evaluation, The Regulation on the Intra-school Multidisciplinary Committee was approved in the first half of 2019, by Order no. 683 as of 03 June 2019\(^5\), respectively.

| 1.4. Re-evaluation and adjustment of regulations on the organisation and functioning of education institutions of all levels to the necessities of children and young people with disabilities |
| Ministry of Education | 2015-2016 | 5 reviewed and approved regulations |

The Standard Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of Primary and Secondary Education Institutions, Cycle I and II was approved by the Ministry of Education Order no.235 as of 25.03.2016\(^6\);

The Framework Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of Special Education Institutions was approved by the Ministry of Education Order no.58 as of 29.01.2016;

The Standard Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of Special Education Institutions, which ensured the enhancement of the quality of educational, social and medical services for children with special educational needs (children and students with sensory and/or severe learning difficulties) was approved by Order No. 187 as of 28.09.2017\(^7\).

According to the annual report for 2016, The Standard Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of Early Education Institutions was

---

1.5. Drafting and approval of the regulatory acts regarding the regulation on the activity of technical vocational, pre-university (colleges) and higher education with the purpose of ensuring access to vocational education or re-qualification of people with disabilities who look for a workplace and for those who, because of their health condition, cannot have a job or develop the work activity according to the qualification they have


The consolidation of the regulatory framework regarding the regulation on the organisation and functioning of technical vocational education institutions was developed and approved.

According to the information obtained from Lumos Foundation (see the List of materials drafted by/with the support of LUMOS), some regulations regarding the development of inclusive education in technical vocational education were adopted by MEO no.1430 as of 27.02.2018, therefore much later compared to the time such activities had been provided.

Also, according to the annual MoECR activity report for 2018, in the 3rd quarter 3 (2018), by Order no. 1430 as of 25 September 2018,

*The Methodological References on Inclusive Education in Technical Vocational education* were approved.

The Regulation for the establishment and operation of the National Agency for the Assurance of Quality in Vocational education was approved by Government Decision no.191 as of 22.04.2015. the priority of the National Agency for the Assurance of Quality in Vocational education is the authorisation of the development of evaluation instruments for the temporary functioning or accreditation for all 3 cycles, but also for the curricula in the technical vocational education.

According to the MoECR report for 2016 The Regulation on the Organisation of Postsecondary Technical Vocational and Postsecondary Nontertiary
**Education** was approved by the Ministry of Education Order no.234 as of 25.03.2016 based on the European Credit Transfer System.

For the improvement of the regulatory and policy framework referring to higher education, according to the MoECR report in 2016, for the young people from socially vulnerable families (children with disabilities, orphans, Roma, etc.), the Ministry of Education assigned a different number of places: about 15% of the total number of budget places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment of the regulatory framework in terms of financing services for children and young people with special educational needs</th>
<th>2.1. The development of standard services packages for different groups of children and young people, as well their cost estimation</th>
<th>Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Finance</th>
<th>2015-2017</th>
<th>Standard packages of specifically designed services, Estimated costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Considering that the *Programme Implementation Plan* 2018-2020 states among the activities:

- The elaboration of financing formula per child in pre-school education, with adjustment parameters for the inclusion of children with disabilities,
- The development of adjustment parameters of the financing formula per child, in order to ensure the inclusion of children with SEN in general school education

The activity of standard service packages development was not performed in 2015-2020, being postponed for the 1st and 2nd quarters in 2019.

Moreover, according to the annual activity report of MoECR for 2018 Government Decision no. 868/2014 referring to financing based on the standard cost per child of primary and secondary general institutions assigned to second level public authorities was modified by Government Decision no. 862 as of 05.09.2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment of the system of structures, organisations,</th>
<th>3.1. Evaluation of structures, organisations,</th>
<th>Ministry of Education,</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Elaborated data base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

According to the annual activity report of MoECR for 2014, during 2014 the complex data base referring to...
structures, institutions necessary to ensure the access to education of all categories of children and young people with special educational needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions that deliver educational and support services for children and young people with special educational needs</th>
<th>Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Health</th>
<th>children with special educational needs, deinstitutionalised children, graduates of middle-school cycle, who study according to an individualised educational plan, the psycho pedagogic assistance was elaborated and tested. Therefore, this activity was performed earlier than it was initially established.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Promotion of the regulatory framework in order to create pre-school education institutions, inclusive education services necessary to ensure the educational inclusion of children with special educational needs</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015 - 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Developing and piloting models for ensuring access to vocational education of young people with special educational needs</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015 - 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
report of MoECR for 2018, in the 3rd quarter of 2018
Order no. 1430 as of 25 September 2018, referring to
the approval of the Methodological References Regarding Inclusive Education in Technical Vocational education was approved.

Hence, according to the interviews conducted, between July 2018-2020 inclusive education will be piloted in the vocational education. This measure will be piloted starting with September 2019, therefore, with delay.

Objective 2. The building of an inclusive culture and society to include children and young people with special educational needs in society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutionalisation of cross-sector co-operation mechanisms in the implementation of inclusive education</th>
<th>4.1. Legalisation of cross-sector mechanisms for establishing and ensuring transport services for children, young people with special educational needs</th>
<th>Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Youth and Sport</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>Legalised cross-sector mechanisms</th>
<th>We do not understand what it means. Perhaps the Intra-school Multidisciplinary Committees? If it does, the standard planning of the Intra-school Multidisciplinary Committee activity was approved by MEO no.158 as of 23.03.2015.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Ensurance of data and information exchange between institutions and authorities regarding the educational, social and medical service delivery and their beneficiaries</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Youth and Sport</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Authentic data base</td>
<td>Clear evidence regarding the existence of a data base for ensuring data and information exchange between institutions and authorities referring to educational, social and medical service delivery and their beneficiaries has not been identified. It could be about the Extension of the Information System of the Ministry of Education to Ensure Data Collection from Pre-school, Technical Vocational and Higher education which is mentioned in the report regarding the division strategy in 201762.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

62 PRIM continued to support the consolidation of the Information Education Management System (IEMS), which includes primary and secondary general education, as well as the inclusion of the new early education model. According to the regulation regarding the evaluation system of primary and middle schools and high schools, approved by Government Decision no. 899 as of 27.10.2014, which states the collection of data in IEMS twice a year, school data are permanently collected and introduced in the system and the system can generate school level data. Based on the data available in IEMS, the school record sheet for school year 2015-2016 was filled in. School record sheets were uploaded on web pagehttp://sime.md:8080/ and all schools were asked to print their sheets and post it publicly. The school record sheet was drafted
4.3. The development of integrated services concept and of the cross-sector mechanism for their funding

| Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Youth and Sport | 2017 | Elaborated integrated services concept, Elaborated cross-sector financing mechanism | According to the annual activity report of MoECR for 2018, new models of integrated services for the inclusion of children with special educational needs (SEN) were conducted in Cahul, Nisporenii, Călărași, Ungheni, Fălești and Ialoveni districts and methodological supports for the inclusion of children with autism spectrum disorders and with seeing impairments/disabilities were elaborated. |

4.4. Establishment of a partnerships with civil society to develop services in inclusive education field

| Ministry of Education (The Republican Centre of Psycho pedagogic Assistance), Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family | 2015-2017 | 5 partnerships developed | During 2015-2017, the Ministry of Education had an efficient collaboration with several donors and international organisations for the implementation of projects in education:
- Kultur Kontakt Moldova
- CCF Moldova
- Lumos
- UNICEF
- Partnerships for every child |

Development of inclusive culture

| Ministry of Education (The Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance), Ministry | 2015-2017 | 5 media institutions that reflect objectively the inclusive | According to the annual activity report of MoECR for 2015, during 2015, the “Come with me, school is also for you” campaign of promotion and mobilisation regarding educational inclusion, launched in 2013 to |

and approved by Ministry of Education Order no. 1073 as of 16 October 2014, which makes education institution activity more obvious and allows the beneficiaries to state their civic opinion about the education institution management. Moreover, the school record sheet allows the Ministry of Education to supervise school withdrawal according to gender and withdrawal reason. In collaboration with Cristalion -Plus IT Company work is done for the elaboration of the system of automatic generation of school record sheet in order to ease the process for the system administrators. School record sheet for school year 2016/2017 are to be uploaded on web page http://sime.md:8080/ in February-March 2018. Also, the system of supervision of the number of people visualizing the school record sheet for each district per institution has been implemented on web portal sime.md:8080. It must be mentioned that the World Bank offered a grant of USD 365 thousand, meant for the consolidation of IEMS capacities, an efficient instrument of data collection in the educational system. The goal of this project consisted in improving the quality and transparency and the use of statistics in educational field in order to better inform on the educational reforms implemented in the Republic of Moldova. The grant agreement was signed and approved by the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova on 3 March 2016 and came into effect on 4 April 2016. The project was implemented by the Ministry of Education with the help of a consultant team from PRIM who were responsible with the financial and acquisition management.
5.2. Elaboration and publication of informative materials to promote inclusive education: for children, parents, kindergarten teachers, teaching staff, social assistants and physicians, representatives of local public administration institutions

| Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance), Ministry of Health | 10 types of informative materials drafted and published, 50 000 beneficiaries | According to the activity reports of MoECR a series of informative materials was elaborated and published between 2015-2016. For example, during 2015, the “Come with me, school is also for you” campaign for promoting educational inclusion, launched in 2013 in order to promote educational inclusion and increase the awareness of the public on the right of children to equal chances of education and to enjoy a friendly education system, continued. During the campaign audio and video materials were broadcast, posters were distributed, seminars and group talks were organised to promote dialogue at local and national |
level about the importance and advantages of inclusion.

According to PAS report for 2016, information and raising awareness activities were developed for parents/legal representatives, a number of 2961 activities, with 4640 parents participating.

Workshops with the teaching staff from education institutions were also developed, a number of 2396 activities, with 6839 teaching staff participating.

For the Support Teaching Staff (STS) various activities were developed (seminars, workshops, etc), a total of 2324 activities, with 6877 STS participating.

Another target group, for which information and training activities in inclusive education were developed were kindergarten teachers, with 1403 activities organised and 2611 teachers participating.

For school managers 2636 activities were organised, with a number of 3419 participants.

For pre-school institutions managers, 1743 activities were developed, with a number of 2418 participants.

LPA representatives benefited from trainings on various topics, a total of 281 activities were developed, with 462 specialists attending.

Information/training activities were also developed with other specialists in the child protection field (social assistants, representatives of Youth Friendly Health Centres), a total of 607 activities, with 768 participants.

For the good development of training activities, PAS specialists drafted information support, teaching aids.

- 118 methodical support materials drafted by a team, distributed during work visits and activities
organised by the PAS Cantemir specialists.
• elaborating individualised intervention programmes for children with intellectual disabilities
• Individual and group work sheets, flyers, evaluation questionnaires, video support
• Complex intervention programme in correcting dyslexia, dysgraphia, paronyms worksheets, set of exercises for development, evaluation sheets
• Power Point presentations
• Informative flyers

| 5.3. Organisation of public events (scientific sessions, national and international conferences, symposiums, seminars, round tables, etc.), radio and TV shows which present the subject of educational and social inclusion of children and young people with special educational needs and promotion of successful cases | Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance), Ministry of Health | 2015-2017 | 25 events organised, 3 500 participants | According to the PAS report for 2015 referring to mass media communication, TV, radio communications and publications were performed in 2015. Considering mass media communication: TV, radio, 16 activities were performed; Publications – 10. On the whole, the District/municipality services of psycho pedagogic assistance developed 30 activities.

Regarding public information/communication/raising awareness a total of: 54 activities were performed, among which: training seminars for the IMC president; education institutions managers; STS; DS; parents; round tables with parents of children with SEN, STS; work sessions with headmasters of preschool and pre-university institutions; LPA.

4 activities were performed in terms of Good practices dissemination: seminars, round tables, trainings, focus groups, workshops, experience exchange: |

| 5.4. Ensurance of access to information and communication means, including to informatics and communication | Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance) | 2015-2017 | 100 % children and young people informed | According to the MoECR report for 2016, during 2016 the endowment of schools with special equipment, necessary for the instruction of people with disabilities was taken into account. |
In such a context, the Action Plan for the Informatisation of General Education, 2016-2020 was approved (Ministry of Education Order no.541 as of 07.06.2016).

At the end of 2016, the process of developing a webpage in the field of inclusive education (incluziune.edu.gov.md), managed by the Republican Centre for Psycho-pedagogic Assistance started. The site is accessible to all stakeholders involved in the educational process, includes useful information about the education of children with special educational needs, accessible teaching aids, including the organisation of thematic webinars for the teaching staff. The webpage will offer access to people with sensory disabilities.

Objective 3. The socio-educational re-integration of children from residential institutions, to reduce, by 2017, the number of children from these institutions by 40% and reorganise at least 25% of the residential educational institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reorganisation of special education system</th>
<th>Reorganisation of special education system</th>
<th>Reorganisation of special education system</th>
<th>Reorganisation of special education system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Complex evaluation of all boarding schools for orphan children and children without parental care (boarding middle-schools) and special education institutions</td>
<td>Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho-pedagogic Assistance)</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Evaluation reports approved for each institution, Planning documents on the reorganisation of each institution approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Changing boarding schools for orphan children and children without parental care in social services, according to needs</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>100% of the children from boarding schools for orphan children or children without parental care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>According to the MoECR report 2015, starting with 01.09.2015 all children from residential schools attend local schools (except IR in Bender town).</td>
<td>According to the MoECR report 2015, the following changes were made in the reference year regarding the changes of boarding schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attend local schools, 80% of the institutions changed

- 1 reorganised institution: Boarding middle-school no. 2 was reorganised in a gymnasium education institution (Chişinău MC decision as of 19.05.2015).
- 4 institutions closed:

  Auxiliary boarding school in Răzălăi village, Singerei district (Singerei DC decision as of 19.03.2015).

  Auxiliary boarding school in Nisporeni town (Nisporeni DC decision no. 8/6 as of 17.09.2015).

  Auxiliary boarding school in Visoca village, Soroca district (GD no. 824 as of 20.11.15).

  Auxiliary boarding school in Străşeni town (Străşeni DC decision no. 7/32 as of 27.11.2015).

At the end of 2015, the residential and special education system subordinated to the Ministry of Education consisted of 30 institutions, out of which 19 subordinated to CPA and 8 subordinated to LPA, where 1573 children were institutionalised, including: 21 children from a foster house, 564 in 8 boarding schools for orphan children and children without parental care, 439 children in 6 special schools and 549 children in 14 auxiliary boarding schools.

According to the activity report of MoECR for 2016, at the end of 2016, as a consequence of the deinstitutionalisation process, there were no children in 9 residential and special education institutions. The respective institutions were to be closed down.

However, the report mentions that in the 21 residential and special education institutions subordinated to the Ministry of Education and to
**6.3. Reconsideration of special education institutions for children with sensory disabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>The Republican Recuperation Educational Centre for children with sensory disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local public authorities of second level there are 1365 children.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be said that in 2018, the deinstitutionalisation process continued and by Government Decision no.86 as of 24 January 2018 regarding some residential institutions, it was decided to close down the orphanage in Bălți municipality; the boarding school for orphan children and children without parental care in Bălți municipality; the auxiliary boarding school in Corten village, Taraclia district; the auxiliary boarding school in Grinăuți-Moldova village, Ocnița district:

| Connecting the form of organizing education for children and young people with disabilities to their special educational requirements |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **7.1. Establishing of forms of education services and support for children and young people with special educational needs, multiple, associated or severe disabilities** |
| Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance), Ministry of Health | 2016-2017 | Forms of education and support services set |
| **It is not clear what it refers to. In 2015 they performed the analysis of the number of children with severe disabilities, the offer and demand of educational and social services for the respective child category as well as the analysis of the regulatory framework in terms of providing access to education of all children/students with severe disabilities, but there are no pieces of evidence regarding the forms of the education and support services that have been established.** |

<p>| <strong>7.2. Piloting models likely to ensure access to education of children with multiple, associated or</strong> |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ministry of Education | 2016-2017 | Piloted models |
| <strong>The piloting of models was done with a certain delay. According to the annual activity report of MoECR for 2018, new models of integrated services for the inclusion of children with special educational needs (SEN) were piloted in Cahul,</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4. The elaboration and development of the framework for quality assurance in terms of inclusive education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of inclusive education quality in the standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1. Elaboration and revision of quality standards for various types of institutions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the Evaluation Methodology for general education institutions of the National Agency for the Assurance of Quality in Vocational education a series of standards were adopted as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.3. Preparing teaching auxiliaries according to the needs of children and young people with severe deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information collected from various sources identify the teaching aids, but they are not called teaching auxiliaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.4. Developing programmes for career counselling and guiding for children and young people with special educational needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance), Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Youth and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sources identify that at the end of 2015 the Guide for Orientation and Counselling of Students from Technical Vocational Education was not elaborated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the MoECR report from 2016 the Personal Development and Career Planning Module (for grades V-XII) was elaborated, approved and implemented by Ministry of Education Order no.859 as of 04.10.2016, but it is not addressed to children and young people with special educational needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus, the 3 career counselling and guidance programmes for children and young people with special educational needs were not developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality systems for institutions, services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The quality standards for primary and secondary general education institutions in terms of child friendly school, approved by Ministry of Education Order no. 970 as of 11.10.2013;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The competence standards for general education management staff, approved by Ministry of Education, Culture and Research Order no. 1124 as of 20.07.2018;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The professional competence standards for general education teaching staff, approved by Ministry of Education, Culture and Research Order no. 1124 as of 20.07.2018;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The minimal endowment standards for school laboratories in secondary general education institutions, approved by Ministry of Education, Culture and Research Order no. 193 as of 26.02.2019;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The minimal endowment standards of early education institutions, approved by Ministry of Education, Culture and Research Order no. 253 as of 11.10.2017;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The minimal operational standards for primary and secondary general education institutions, approved by Ministry of Education, Culture and Research Order nr. 61 as of 10.02.2015;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2. Conducting fundamental and applied research in inclusive education field in order to improve and supervise Ministry of Education, Science of Education Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such research was postponed for 2018-2020. (See section 4.2. Design and implementation of applied researches to ensure the continuous development and consolidation of inclusive education from the plan for 2018-2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of quality standards in inclusive education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1. Evaluation of the level of correlation between education institutions and quality standards for education institutions in terms of child friendly school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2. The development of mechanisms and instruments for accreditation of providers of psycho pedagogic habilitation/rehabilitation of children with special educational needs (non-governmental organisations, education institutions, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 5. The consolidation of institutional capacities at all education levels to ensure the access, relevance and quality of inclusive education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment of education institutions infrastructure to the needs of children and young people with special educational needs</th>
<th>Ministry of Education</th>
<th>2015-2017</th>
<th>According to PAS report for 2017, the total number of CREI in districts/municipalities is of 915. Moreover, at the end of 2017, 41 psychologist teachers worked at PAS, out of whom 4 psychologist teachers at PAS Rîşcani, PAS Cimişlia, PAS Anenii-­Noi, PAS Hinceşti were on maternal leave and 2 specialists at PAS Edineţ, PAS Făleşti worked by plurality of offices. In the district/municipality psycho pedagogic assistance services a number of 42 speech therapists were employed, of whom the speech therapist in PAS Hinceşti worked by plurality of offices. In addition, as for the number of specialists in institutions providing services in CREI, at the end of 2017 there were 68 speech therapists at early education institutions and 98 at primary and secondary general education institutions. As for the number of Support Teaching Staff, in education institutions in the Republic, at the end of 2017 a total of 966,65 units were active out of which 1214 STS working in 998 education institutions. In 116 early education institutions 100,15 STS units activated, consisting of 121 people. As a total, in the districts/municipalities in the Republic, 866,5 STS units were active, with 1093 STS working in 882 primary and secondary general education institutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1. Development of support services for children with special educational needs in education institutions</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>150 institutions have Resource Centres, 150 institutions where psychologist teachers work, 150 institutions where speech therapists work, 500 institutions where support teaching staff work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.2. Making infrastructure accessible in education institutions of all levels for children | Ministry of Education | 2015-2017 | 100 % of the institutions have made their infrastructure accessible, Accordi }
and young people with disabilities and young people with disabilities according to needs continued in the following years as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.3. Endowing special education institutions with equipment necessary for facilitating the education of children and young people with sensory and locomotor disabilities</th>
<th>Ministry of Education</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>80% of the institutions endowed with necessary equipment</th>
<th>One of the recommendations of the PAS report for 2016 and 2017 refers to the ensurance of access to the physical environment for all children and young people with disabilities, endowment with materials and technical means for children with neurosensory disabilities, an aspect confirming that the activity was implemented in the following years (2017, 2018 and even 2019) as well.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.4. Regulation on the conditions for the procurement of transport units for the transportation of children to education institutions, the necessities of children with special educational needs also being taken into consideration</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>Requirements set forth for the procurement of transport for education institutions</td>
<td>In 2018 the updated project of the regulation on children transportation was elaborated, according to the MoECR report for 2018. The report was drafted at the end of the 1st quarter, systemized at national level in terms of students transportation and the needs regarding transportation at OLSDE level. Government Decision no.751 as of 25.07.2018 for the approval of law project regarding the import of means of transport:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1. Consolidation and development of professional competences of the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance specialties and of psycho pedagogic assistance services in specific fields</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>250 employees benefited from formations</td>
<td>During the reference period of time a series of events for the development of professional competences of CRAP and PAS specialists on specific domains were organised. Among these, there were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 workshops with the participation of representatives from 11 psychological assistance services (Ministry of Education Order no.525 as of 04.11.2016);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 6 consultancy activities for about 240 specialists from psychological assistance services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and OLSDE (Ministry of Education Order no.240 as of 02.06.2016 and no.447 as of 23.09.2016):

- 4 methodical seminars referring to individualised approach in connection with the intervention context (psychological, psycho pedagogic, speech therapy, pedagogic) for 247 specialists from psychological assistance services (Ministry of Education Order no.87 as of 04.03.2016):

- 8 methodological seminars regarding the education of autistic children, children with hearing and seeing impairments, developed in partnership with KulturKontakt Austria for about 160 specialists from psychological assistance services and the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance (Ministry of Education Orders no.162 as of 15.04.2016, no.219 as of 23.05.2016, no.311 as of 12.07.2016, no.515 as of 28.10.2016, no. 638 as of 29.11.2016):

- 5 practical workshops referring to educational inclusion of children with neuromotor disabilities organised for 59 specialists from education institutions and psychological assistance services (Ministry of Education Order no.185 as of 23.09. 2016):

- 6 workshops regarding education of children with hearing deficiencies organised for 76 teaching staff and specialists from 16 psychological assistance services (Ministry of Education Order no.526 as of 04.11.2016):

- 4 training modules concerning the organisation of the educational process and assistance of children with special educational needs developed in Orhei and Sângerei districts for 70
11.2. Initial and long-life training of the teaching and management staff at all educational levels to ensure educational inclusion of children and young people with special needs and reduction of the number of children not attending school or children likely to drop out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry of Education</th>
<th>2015-2017</th>
<th>2,500 teaching staff received initial and continuous formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the reference period of time a series of activities of long-life training of the teaching and management staff at all education levels were developed. In such a context, according to the annual activity report of MoECR for 2015, with the help of civil society (FCPS, LUMOS, Keyston, Step by Step) a training process of the teaching and management staff from early education institutions regarding inclusive education was initiated, with the following results:

- 361 teaching staff, kindergarten managers, early education specialists from OLSDE were trained;
- 180 teaching and management staff were trained in 2 mentorship modules (18 seminars of 32 days);
- 2 training projects in early education field were negotiated with the Embassy of the Czech Republic, during which the training of 750 teaching and management staff from early education institutions was planned for 2016-2017.
- In order to streamline the process of implementing TIC skills in education, according to IntelTeach programme, 200 teaching staff of various school subjects were trained.

The process of long-life training of the teaching staff continued during 2016. Thus, according to
the annual activity report of MoECR, in the reference year there were organised:

- 4 training modules regarding the organisation of the educational process and assistance of children with special educational needs developed in Orhei and Sângerei districts for 70 teaching staff and presidents of intra-school multidisciplinary committees (Ministry of Education Order no.24 as of 02.02.2016).

Hence, although there is no clear statistic evidence of the number of teaching staff trained for 2017, the training process continued in 2018. According to the annual activity report of MoECR for 2018, about 18 thousand teaching staff received free of charge continuous training:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.3. Revising and introducing in initial and long-life training programmes training modules in inclusive education of pre-school and pre-university education institutions managers, teaching staff, support teaching staff</th>
<th>Ministry of Education</th>
<th>2015-2017</th>
<th>Modules of formation in inclusive education revised and introduced in formation programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to the MoECR activity report for 2015, during the reference year the implementation of inclusive education in the curricula pedagogic specialities. However, the activity concerning the introduction of inclusive education modules in programmes of continuous formation of managers and teaching staff from general and technical vocational education was postponed for 2018-2020, according to the plan of implementation of the programme for 2018-2020.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.4. Strengthening the capacities of cross-sector teams (made up of kindergarten teachers, social assistants and nurses), developed in 926</th>
<th>Ministry of Education, 2015-2017</th>
<th>100 % cross-sector teams reinforced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to ensure the access to inclusive education, during 2015-2017 the elaboration and revision of the general concept of inclusive education, educational inclusion of children with severe disabilities and educational inclusion of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural localities, to promote inclusive education and social inclusion of children with special educational needs</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and Family, Ministry of Health</td>
<td>children with sensory disabilities were taken into consideration. The updated concepts include the complete educational process of the child, determine the manner of cross-sector cooperation in the process of ensuring the right to education, establishing support services, as well as identifying the barriers met in ensuring education. Although the interviews conducted during the current evaluation confirmed that there are cross-sector teams at district level, the consulted documents do not present such structures and it is difficult to state if in all 926 rural localities such teams were created in the estimated time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5. Developing school managers capacities of planning and efficiently managing financial resources assigned to inclusive education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsible Body</td>
<td>Start-End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6. Development of methodical advisory centres based on institutions with inclusive practices</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12.1. The development of practical guides for teaching staff on specific domains | Ministry of Education (the Republican Centre for Psycho pedagogic Assistance)        | 2016-2017        | 2 publications per year A series of guides was planned in the action plan for implementation of the Programme for 2018-2020. Among these was 1.1.  
  - Developing the methodological guide Working strategies in classes including children with SEN  
  - Preparing the Methodological guide on the inclusion of children with severe disabilities in general education.  
  - Preparing the Methodological guide on inclusion of children with SEN in technical vocational education  
  - Developing the methodological references regarding the drafting /adaptation of teaching aids for children with SEN  
  - Developing the Guide regarding professional orientation and career guiding for children with SEN  
Considering the materials consulted there is no evidence related to practical guides drafted between 2016-2017. |
### Objective 6. The assurance of collaboration and transparency in the process of programme implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of mechanisms of collaboration, consultancy and information exchange with non-governmental organisations and parents in the process of programme implementation</th>
<th>13.1. Inclusion of parents of children with special educational needs as members of the Advisory Board regarding the establishment of the residential care and development of inclusive education system</th>
<th>Ministry of Education</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>5 parents included</th>
<th>There was no evidence regarding parents inclusion as members of the Advisory Board.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.2. Organisation of periodical consultative meetings with the participation of non-governmental organisations and parent</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>10 consultative meetings organised</td>
<td>According to PAS reports, in the set interval a series of work meetings with various institutions, including NGOs was developed. For example, in 2017, 118 meetings with NGOs took place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups regarding inclusive education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 13 Impact

Table 13.1. The dynamics of the population aged between 15 and 18 years in relation to the overall population
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.T.A. Gagauzia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan voda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calarasi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anenii noi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riscani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telenesti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mun. Balti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinamica populaţiei la nivelul judeţului</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anum: 2011-2018

#### Dinamica populației la nivelul județului

**Ambele sexe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbati</td>
<td>18,34%</td>
<td>16,47%</td>
<td>15,93%</td>
<td>15,19%</td>
<td>14,97%</td>
<td>14,82%</td>
<td>14,71%</td>
<td>14,57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femei</td>
<td>84,87%</td>
<td>85,38%</td>
<td>85,55%</td>
<td>85,56%</td>
<td>85,71%</td>
<td>85,85%</td>
<td>85,97%</td>
<td>85,94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Var: Barbati**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbati</td>
<td>18,34%</td>
<td>16,47%</td>
<td>15,93%</td>
<td>15,19%</td>
<td>14,97%</td>
<td>14,82%</td>
<td>14,71%</td>
<td>14,57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femei</td>
<td>84,87%</td>
<td>85,38%</td>
<td>85,55%</td>
<td>85,56%</td>
<td>85,71%</td>
<td>85,85%</td>
<td>85,97%</td>
<td>85,94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Var: Femei**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbati</td>
<td>18,34%</td>
<td>16,47%</td>
<td>15,93%</td>
<td>15,19%</td>
<td>14,97%</td>
<td>14,82%</td>
<td>14,71%</td>
<td>14,57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femei</td>
<td>84,87%</td>
<td>85,38%</td>
<td>85,55%</td>
<td>85,56%</td>
<td>85,71%</td>
<td>85,85%</td>
<td>85,97%</td>
<td>85,94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13.2. Children with disabilities up to 18 years old as registered (at the end of the year) per 1000 children of that age according to Districts/Regions and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children with disabilities up to 18 years old as registered (at the end of the year) per 1000 children of that age according to Districts/Regions and Age</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total for the country</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>90.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisinau Municipality</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>94.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>88.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Balti Municipality</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>85.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Briceni</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>81.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Donduseni</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>107.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Drochia</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>82.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Edinet</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>72.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Falesti</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>92.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Floresti</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>83.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Glodeni</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>87.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Ocnita</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>108.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Riscani</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>58.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Singerei</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>97.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Soroca</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>83.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centru</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>91.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Anenii Noi</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>84.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Calarasi</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>84.85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Criuleni</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>75.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Dubasari</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>63.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Hincesti</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>124.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Ialoveni</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>85.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Nisporenii</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>106.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Orhei</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>87.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Rezina</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>90.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Straseni</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>99.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Soldanesti</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>84.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Telenesti</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>88.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Ungheni</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>107.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sud</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>91.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Bassarabeasca</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>74.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Cahul</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>84.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Cantemir</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>88.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Causeni</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>141.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Cimislia</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>93.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Leova</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Stefan Voda</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>87.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Taraclia</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>94.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.T.A Gagauzia</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>88.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13.3.  Pupils in primary and secondary education as per districts, regions, years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regiunea</th>
<th>Elevi - total</th>
<th>Elevi la 10000 locuitori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total pe tara</td>
<td>352053</td>
<td>339936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntenia</td>
<td>78807</td>
<td>79405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regiunea Nord</td>
<td>93529</td>
<td>89222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Muntenia</td>
<td>13555</td>
<td>13292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Bacau</td>
<td>7256</td>
<td>6814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Dobrogea</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>3607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Teleorman</td>
<td>8173</td>
<td>7809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Teleorman</td>
<td>7605</td>
<td>7189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...S resumes</td>
<td>9267</td>
<td>8854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Alba</td>
<td>8625</td>
<td>8177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Sud</td>
<td>6164</td>
<td>5718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Bacau</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>3921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Bacau</td>
<td>6362</td>
<td>6061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Ialomita</td>
<td>9921</td>
<td>9470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Soroca</td>
<td>8774</td>
<td>8310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Soroca</td>
<td>108143</td>
<td>104141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Anemii Noi</td>
<td>8156</td>
<td>7846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Caras-Severin</td>
<td>7133</td>
<td>6936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Ciureni</td>
<td>7927</td>
<td>7676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Costesti</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>3085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Cricova</td>
<td>12302</td>
<td>11726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Longin</td>
<td>10701</td>
<td>10442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Nisporeni</td>
<td>7098</td>
<td>6737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Olt</td>
<td>11770</td>
<td>11558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Rezina</td>
<td>5097</td>
<td>4940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...S. Enescu</td>
<td>9553</td>
<td>9228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...S. Densus</td>
<td>4636</td>
<td>4390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Telenesti</td>
<td>7684</td>
<td>7248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Ungureni</td>
<td>12744</td>
<td>12369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Vama</td>
<td>53956</td>
<td>50892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Buzau</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>2402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Cahul</td>
<td>12828</td>
<td>12207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Cahul</td>
<td>6525</td>
<td>6183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Causeni</td>
<td>9545</td>
<td>9129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Cimislia</td>
<td>5730</td>
<td>5219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Leova</td>
<td>5343</td>
<td>5051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Moldovita</td>
<td>7351</td>
<td>6877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Taraclia</td>
<td>4058</td>
<td>3824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.T.A Gagauzia</td>
<td>16151</td>
<td>14959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pupils in primary and secondary education as per districts, regions, years |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Regiunea | Elevi - total | Elevi la 10000 locuitori |
| Total pe tara | 352053 | 339936 |
| Muntenia | 78807 | 79405 |
| Regiunea Nord | 93529 | 89222 |
| ...Muntenia | 13555 | 13292 |
| ...Bacau | 7256 | 6814 |
| ...Dobrogea | 3697 | 3607 |
| ...Teleorman | 8173 | 7809 |
| ...Teleorman | 7605 | 7189 |
| ...S resumes | 9267 | 8854 |
| ...Alba | 8625 | 8177 |
| ...Sud | 6164 | 5718 |
| ...Bacau | 4130 | 3921 |
| ...Bacau | 6362 | 6061 |
| ...Ialomita | 9921 | 9470 |
| ...Soroca | 8774 | 8310 |
| ...Soroca | 108143 | 104141 |
| ...Anemii Noi | 8156 | 7846 |
| ...Caras-Severin | 7133 | 6936 |
| ...Ciureni | 7927 | 7676 |
| ...Costesti | 3297 | 3085 |
| ...Cricova | 12302 | 11726 |
| ...Longin | 10701 | 10442 |
| ...Nisporeni | 7098 | 6737 |
| ...Olt | 11770 | 11558 |
| ...Rezina | 5097 | 4940 |
| ...S. Enescu | 9553 | 9228 |
| ...S. Densus | 4636 | 4390 |
| ...Telenesti | 7684 | 7248 |
| ...Ungureni | 12744 | 12369 |
| ...Vama | 53956 | 50892 |
| ...Buzau | 2576 | 2402 |
| ...Cahul | 12828 | 12207 |
| ...Cahul | 6525 | 6183 |
| ...Causeni | 9545 | 9129 |
| ...Cimislia | 5730 | 5219 |
| ...Leova | 5343 | 5051 |
| ...Moldovita | 7351 | 6877 |
| ...Taraclia | 4058 | 3824 |
| U.T.A Gagauzia | 16151 | 14959 |
Table 13.4. Coverage ration in education levels according to gender, 2010/11-2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Both genders</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>Both genders</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Final/First</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-school education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>112.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>112.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fete</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>112.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neta</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>112.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>112.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fete</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>112.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>96.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>96.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>97.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>98.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>97.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>98.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>98.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>98.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>98.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>98.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>98.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 13.5. Children in early education institutions according to Districts/Regions, Age groups and years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Up to 3 years</th>
<th>Older than 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for the country</td>
<td>Nord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>Balti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edinet</td>
<td>Falesti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floresti</td>
<td>Glodeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>Riscani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>Soroca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anenii Noi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018/2021</td>
<td>2018/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 7 8 9</td>
<td>6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 9 10</td>
<td>8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in early education institutions according to Districts/Regions, Age groups and years</th>
<th>2018/2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total for the country</td>
<td>85.1% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>91.6% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balti</td>
<td>92.6% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinet</td>
<td>914.8% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falesti</td>
<td>962.0% 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floresti</td>
<td>951.6% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>931.0% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>99.0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riscani</td>
<td>93.3% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>93.9% 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>99.1% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anenii Noi</td>
<td>89.3% 31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in early education institutions according to Districts/Regions, Age groups and years</th>
<th>2018/2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total for the country</td>
<td>102.18% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>101.16% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balti</td>
<td>92.16% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinet</td>
<td>97.3% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falesti</td>
<td>96.3% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floresti</td>
<td>97.7% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>99.4% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>96.0% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riscani</td>
<td>93.9% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singerei</td>
<td>93.9% 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>99.1% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anenii Noi</td>
<td>89.3% 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Calarasi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Criuleni</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Dubasari</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Hincesti</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Ialoveni</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Nisporeni</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Orhei</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Rezina</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Straseni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Soldati</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Telenesti</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Ungheni</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Sud</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Basarabasca</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Cahul</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Cantemir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Causeni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Cimislia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Leova</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Stefan Voda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..Taracia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13.6. Distribution of disabilities types, 2010
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Figure 13.6. Distribution of disabilities types, 2018
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Figure 13.6. Distribution of disability types, 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No d/o</th>
<th>District/Municipality</th>
<th>Total number of children with SEN in primary, general secondary education institutions, level I and II (Gymnasia and high-schools) per SEN category, UNESCO, 1995 (the evidence of children in December 2018 – PAS records)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children with emotional and behavioral disorders</td>
<td>Total number of children with language disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anenii-Noi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bălți</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Basarabeasca</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Briceni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cahul</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cantemir</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Călărași</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Căușeni</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chișinău</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Cimișlia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Criuleni</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dondușeni</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No d/o</td>
<td>District/Municipality</td>
<td>Total number of children with SEN in primary, general secondary education institutions, level I and II (Gymnasia and high-schools) per SEN category, UNESCO, 1995 (the evidence of children in December 2018 – PAS records)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children with emotional and behavioral disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Drochia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dubăsari</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Edineț</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Făleşti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Florești</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Glodeni</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Hâncești</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ialoveni</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Leova</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Nisporeni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ocnița</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Orhei</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Rezina</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No d/o</td>
<td>District/Municipality</td>
<td>Total number of children with SEN in primary, general secondary education institutions, level I and II (Gymnasia and high-schools) per SEN category, UNESCO, 1995 (the evidence of children in December 2018 – PAS records)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children with emotional and behavioral disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Râșcani</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Sângerei</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Șoldănești</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Soroca</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Ștefan-Vodă</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Strășeni</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Taraclia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Telenești</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Ungheni</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>UTAG</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CRAP data on the number of children with special needs in primary, general secondary education institutions, level I and II (gymnasia and high-schools) as of 31 December 2018
Dear Mr. Xavier R. Sire,

Hereby, regarding your request by e-mail dated 13.11.2019, we inform you that the Draft report of the study “Joint evaluation of the implementation of the Programme for development of inclusive education 2011 - 2020, including application of child-friendly school’s standards” organized by UNICEF Moldova and approved by NCEECT under No. 664 on 29.05.2019, was analyzed by the National Committee for Ethical Expertise of Clinical Trial of the Republic of Moldova.

NCEECT decision: The development of the respective study and the final draft report formulation have taken place in accordance with the ethical standards and rules.

President of the NCEECT of the Republic of Moldova

Prof. Sergiu Mateiowschi