

Evaluation of
"Development of a School for All"
Nordic - Baltic Cooperation in Special
Needs Education 2000 - 2004

Evaluation of "Development of a School for All" Nordic - Baltic Cooperation in Special Needs Education 2000 - 2004

Nils Öström
Stockholm Group for Development Studies

ANP 2004:737

Evaluation of "Development of a School for All" Nordic - Baltic Cooperation in Special Needs Education 2000 - 2004

ANP 2004:737

© Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen 2004

Print: Ekspresen Tryk & Kopicenter

Copies: 200

Printed on paper approved by the Nordic Environmental Labelling.

This publication may be purchased from any of the sales agents listed on the last page.

Nordic Council of Ministers

Store Strandstræde 18
DK-1255 Copenhagen K
Phone (+45) 3396 0200
Fax (+45) 3396 0202

Nordic Council

Store Strandstræde 18
DK-1255 Copenhagen K
Phone (+45) 3396 0400
Fax (+45) 3311 1870

www.norden.org

The Nordic Council of Ministers

was established in 1971. It submits proposals on co-operation between the governments of the five Nordic countries to the Nordic Council, implements the Council's recommendations and reports on results, while directing the work carried out in the targeted areas. The Prime Ministers of the five Nordic countries assume overall responsibility for the co-operation measures, which are co-ordinated by the ministers for co-operation and the Nordic Co-operation committee. The composition of the Council of Ministers varies, depending on the nature of the issue to be treated.

The Nordic Council

was formed in 1952 to promote co-operation between the parliaments and governments of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Finland joined in 1955. At the sessions held by the Council, representatives from the Faroe Islands and Greenland form part of the Danish delegation, while Åland is represented on the Finnish delegation. The Council consists of 87 elected members - all of whom are members of parliament. The Nordic Council takes initiatives, acts in a consultative capacity and monitors co-operation measures. The Council operates via its institutions: the Plenary Assembly, the Presidium and standing committees.

Table of contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
1. INTRODUCTION	9
2. METHODOLOGY	11
3. THE CONTEXT OF THE COOPERATION	13
3.1 General about Special and Inclusive Education in the Baltic countries	13
3.2 General background of the cooperation	14
3.3 Objectives of the cooperation	15
3.4 Organisation and implementation of activities	16
3.5 Summary of Midterm evaluation	16
4. FINDINGS PER COUNTRY	19
4.1 Estonia	19
4.2 Latvia	21
4.3 Lithuania	23
5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS PER TYPE OF PROJECT	27
5.1 Transition projects	27
5.2 Teacher Training projects	27
5.3 Cooperation projects	28
6. CONCLUSIONS	29
6.1 Achievement of objectives	29
6.2 Impact and sustainability	29
6.3 Project management and costs	30
6.4 Relevance of objectives and project design	31
6.5 Follow up of recommendation of the Midterm evaluation	33
6.6 Recommendations for possible future support	33
Annex 1 - Terms of Reference	35
Annex 2 – Evaluation questions	36
Annex 3 - Persons met and answering questions	37
Annex 4 - List of documents	40

Executive summary

The Nordic Council of Ministers has been funding a cooperation project in the field of Special Education in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania 2000 – 2004, with the objective to support competence development at different levels in order to increase the possibilities for pupils in need of special support to receive education within the ordinary school system. In February 2004, the Nordic Council of Ministers commissioned an evaluation of the cooperation.

The cooperation has been designed as an umbrella project with subprojects implemented in three areas in each country. 1) Transition - facilitating the inclusive transition of students with special educational needs from basic school to vocational school. 2) Teacher Training - preparing teachers for work with children with special needs in ordinary and special schools. 3) Cooperation - development of a model for regional cooperation in special education.

The conclusions of the evaluation are that the overall objective of competence development has been fulfilled in all projects of the cooperation. The transition projects have achieved transition of students from ordinary and special schools to vocational schools and in some cases to the labour market. The cooperation projects have managed to involve municipal and regional authorities and create support functions for special education in ordinary schools. The teacher training projects have succeeded in introducing team work and analytical methods and have also made contributions to new content and curricula for teacher training.

The main impact of the cooperation has been on the attitudes and work in schools participating in the different projects. Through the cooperation projects there is also an impact on both attitudes and work of local authorities, support services for special education and the assessment of children's special needs at the regional and municipal levels. The impact of the cooperation on schoolchildren with different kind of special needs has been most visible with regard to children with light and moderate disabilities, whereas the effects for children with more severe disabilities is still more limited. At the national level, the cooperation has had some impact on policies and regulations, as well as on curricula for teacher training in special education. However, national models for in-service training are still to come.

The evaluation recommends that possible future Nordic-Baltic cooperation should be focused on systematic dissemination of methodologies and experiences from the present cooperation at the national level in the Baltic countries; the establishment and implementation of national in-service teacher training models and curricula regarding education of students with special needs in ordinary schools; and further adaptation of laws and regulations to facilitate the implementation of inclusive education.

1. Introduction

The Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) has been funding a project entitled “Development of A School for All – Nordic-Baltic Co-operation in Special Needs Education” (in the rest of this evaluation report referred to as the cooperation). The overall objective of the project has been to support competence development at different levels, with a view to increase the possibilities for pupils in need of special support to receive a high quality education within the ordinary school system in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The Nordic Council of Ministers has provided 9,1 million DKK for the program. The Baltic countries would provide have provided contributions in terms of salaries, materials and other local costs.

In early 2002, NCM contracted a Midterm Evaluation of the program performed by Ulla Andrén from the Stockholm Group for Development Studies AB (see report dated 2002-04-15 and summary of conclusions and recommendations under 3.5 below). In February 2004 NCM contracted Nils Öström, also from the Stockholm Group for Development Studies AB, to perform the Final Evaluation of the program (see Terms of Reference in Annex 1).

2. Methodology

The final evaluation has been performed through direct contacts with a selection of stakeholders in the Baltic countries. Nils Öström visited each country for a week during February 2004 (Latvia 9-14/2, Estonia 16-21/2 and Lithuania 23-28/2). A general set of questions (see Annex 2) was sent in advance to the project coordinators in each Baltic country. These questions were then translated and distributed to the participants of the different projects. In several projects also participants not met with sent written answers to the questions through the Baltic or Nordic project coordinators (see List of Persons met and answering questions in Annex 3).

The same questions were also sent to the Nordic coordinators for each of the projects. In some cases these Nordic coordinators were also present in the Baltic countries during the evaluator's visit there. On 1 March 2004 the evaluator met in Stockholm with representatives of the Nordic Steering Group. The main documentation reviewed for the evaluation is presented in Annex 4.

The following sections of this report present the general context and organisation of the cooperation (section 3), the findings of the evaluation per country (section 4), and also per type of project (section 5), conclusions regarding achievement of objectives, impact and sustainability, management and costs, relevance of objectives and designs, recommendation for possible future support (section 6).

3. The context of the cooperation

3.1 General about Special and Inclusive Education in the Baltic countries

Since the independence of the Baltic countries was re-established in the early 1990-ties, all three countries have initiated substantial reforms of their education sectors. These reforms have been further promoted by the preparation process for entering the European Union in May 2004. The general aspects of the reforms, as well as the general situation regarding inclusive education and special needs education, were well summarised in the Midterm. In this report important changes of policies etc. that has occurred since the beginning of 2002 are noted under the respective countries.

All three Baltic countries have introduced legislation in support of inclusive education and the right of every child to receive education in the general education system. This also includes the right of the parents to decide in which school the child should get the education. During the two last years this legislation, that was approved in the 1990-ties, has started to be revised in the light of experiences gained, international contacts and the upcoming membership of EU.

The practical implementation of the laws and the adaptation of secondary legislation and regulations is a gradual process of transition from a system of special education and care based on specialised institutions, to a system of integration and inclusion. This transition is closely related to the introduction of new knowledge, gaining of experiences and the change of attitudes and behaviour, both within the education system and in the society in general. As will be further outlined in the sections below, the cooperation with the Nordic countries during the last four years has supported and helped to speed up this gradual process.

It should also be noted that the time for this transition process is still short. This is evident when compared with the time it has taken to change attitudes and approaches in the Nordic countries, in order to arrive at present policies and practices with regard to inclusive education. Therefore, it is not surprising that aspects of the old system and attitudes still prevail in the Baltic countries, such as a number separate boarding institutions for both education and care of children with special needs. Few of the special schools have been closed, but some of them are gradually changing their roles towards being resource centres and advisors for special education in ordinary schools.

The system of assessment of special needs is also still influenced by the old medical correction model. However, the systems and methods for assessment are gradually starting to change with responsibilities being delegated to schools and local authorities. Attitudes within the society and the education system in general are also slowly changing towards the right of children with special needs to access and participation in ordinary school settings. The number of students with special needs that attend ordinary schools is gradually increasing, although these are still mainly students with light disabilities or only general learning or behavioural difficulties. Children with more severe disabilities still attend special boarding schools or in some cases no school at all.

It is also evident that the resources available to schools and local authorities, as well as the system for financing of education in ordinary and special schools, are factors limiting the speed of the transition process. Adaptation of school facilities and transportation are necessary

in order for schools to be able to receive students with more severe disabilities. In the ministries of education the staff responsible for promoting and developing special education is also very limited. In each country there are only a few dedicated persons, who are overloaded with work. The rate of change in laws and regulations is also influenced by the fact that ministers have been frequently changed in some of the countries.

Another limiting factor for inclusive education is that the prevailing standards for graduating from ordinary schools put high demands on the academic knowledge of the student, but little demands on other aspects of education for a life in today's society. Furthermore, the birth rates in Baltic countries is very low (below 1,4), which means that the number of pupils starting school is less and less every year. This fact makes it necessary to reorganise and restructure the school system. A possible effect of this restructuring could, however, be that it facilitates the transition towards inclusive education in ordinary schools.

3.2 General background of the cooperation

As a part of the educational reform efforts the Ministers of Education in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania expressed in 1997 their interest in cooperating with the Nordic Council of Ministers within the field of Special Needs Education. A memorandum entitled "The Right of All Children and Young People to a Good Education in a Unified School for All Pupils" was elaborated. It was agreed that the document should constitute the policy basis for the cooperation and that it should be implemented in accordance with the principles outlined in the memorandum.

A project group was formed to plan and elaborate a project proposal and the Baltic countries were presented ideas for the cooperation. These suggestions covered a number of activities in many fields. After discussions in the Baltic-Nordic Coordination Group in 1999, the ideas were condensed and prioritised into three main areas.

- Transition - facilitating the inclusive transition of students with special educational needs from basic school to vocational school.
- Teacher Training - preparing teachers for work with children with special needs in ordinary and special schools.
- Cooperation - development of a model for regional cooperation in special education.

The cooperation has been designed as an umbrella program to be implemented during the period 2000-2002, under the guidance of a Nordic Steering Group. There is a basic program component for coordination, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and three main projects implemented in accordance with the three main areas chosen. The main Transition Project has been implemented in Estonia, the main Teacher Training Project in Latvia and the main Cooperation Project in Lithuania. In addition two minor projects have been elaborated in each country, on the themes not chosen for the main project in the respective country. That means that three projects have been implemented in each of the three countries.

In the beginning of 2000, the Baltic countries formally agreed with the Nordic Council of Ministers to undertake the cooperation. Estonia initiated contacts with partners already known in Denmark and Finland for elaborating the Transition project. In Lithuania contacts were developed with Swedish and Danish partners, to whom links earlier had been established. As for Latvia the Nordic Steering Group recommended that partners in Norway and Iceland should be approached. Project plans were then developed where details of activities and responsibilities were worked out. As the Baltic countries proved to have difficulties in

preparing the plans for the minor projects it was decided in early 2001 to prolong the project period up to mid 2004. The main Nordic partners in each project are presented in the table under 3.3 below.

3.3 Objectives of the cooperation

The overall objective of cooperation has been “to support competence development at different levels, with a view to increase the possibilities for pupils in need of special support to receive a high quality education within the ordinary school system in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania” (Project Description 1999). The objectives for the respective main and minor projects (as presented in recent annual reports 2002, 2003) are shown in the following table.

	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania
Transition project	(MAIN) Promote inclusive education so that students with special educational needs would be able to join ordinary schools, followed by education in vocational school and be able to enter the labour market.	(Minor started 2001) Facilitate the transition from special schools to vocational schools for students with special needs.	(Minor started 2003) Promote inclusive education so that students with special educational needs studying in ordinary schools would be able to participate in vocational education.
Nordic partner	Jyväskylä Vocational Teachers Education College, Finland and Rönback School, Denmark	Idnskolin, Iceland	Jyväskylä Vocational Teachers Education College, Finland
Teacher training	(Minor started 2001) Development of participants knowledge and competence in special needs education, including analytical model. Development of teacher training institutions' competence for in-service training and school development.	(MAIN) Development of participants knowledge and competence in special needs education, including analytical model. Development of model for in-service training. Development of special schools' advisory services to ordinary schools.	(Minor started 2002) Improve basic and in-service training of teachers for inclusive classroom teaching of pupils with special needs. To distribute material on inclusive classroom teaching to teachers and teacher trainers.
Nordic partner	Support System and Resource Centre, Norway	Support System and University of Oslo, Norway, University of Educ, Iceland	Viborg County, Denmark
Co-operation project	(Minor started 2003) Establish a regional Pedagogical Psychological Counselling service to secure teachers assistance in individual planning of education for students with special needs in ordinary schools.	(Minor started 2001) Establish Pedagogical Psychological Support Team in Rezekne region and city. Development of participants knowledge and competence in special needs education, team building and school development.	(MAIN) Create a model to ensure admission of all children to adapted education in a feasible setting based on individual evaluation. Create a structure for early identification of children with special needs.
Nordic partner	Viborg County, Denmark	Support System for Special Education and Board of Education, Norway	Viborg County, Denmark and Special Pedagogical Institute, Sweden

3.4 Organisation and implementation of activities

A Nordic Steering Group has been empowered by the Nordic Council of Ministers to take financial decisions regarding the projects. The Nordic Steering Group consists of representatives from the five Nordic Ministries of Education and the Secretariat for the cooperation. The Norwegian Support System for Special Education has fulfilled this role since mid 2001. The Baltic-Nordic Coordination Group consists of the members of the Nordic Steering Group and the Baltic project coordinators. The Steering Group and the Coordination Group have held 2-4 meetings per year. During 2003 the two groups had their two meetings together (Bergen, Riga).

The total budget for the cooperation (9 100 000 DKK) has been distributed with equal shares for each country of 2 460 000 DKK. Of this amount 1 500 000 DKK had been used for each main project and 480 000 DKK for each minor project. The rest of the budget has been used for the joint basic component (1 310 000 DKK) and evaluations (350 000 DKK).

The Secretariat has signed formal agreements with each Nordic project implementation partner. The Nordic partner (project leader) has been responsible for the use of project funds, in conformity with the decisions taken by the Steering Group and instructions given by the secretariat. Accounts have been audited in accordance with the regulations of the partner institution.

Narrative project reports have been prepared both on a semi-annual and an annual basis, either by the Baltic coordinator or the Nordic project leader. Financial reports on the use of the Nordic funds have been prepared by the Nordic project leader. The Secretariat has prepared a joint annual report of the cooperation that has been presented to the Nordic Steering Group and the Coordination Group.

The activities performed in each project have been joint seminars and workshops (2-4/year) with the group of participants selected for the respective projects (20-50 persons/project), a study visit to a Nordic country (depending on the Nordic partner) and half day workshops at schools and teacher training institutions where the participants work. The workshops and seminars have included both lectures and group work where the participants has planned or presented real case studies and work performed between the seminars.

3.5 Summary of Midterm evaluation

The overall conclusion of the Midterm evaluation in April 2002 was that the cooperation had created enthusiasm for inclusive education in the Baltic countries and that the implementation the three main projects were well under way. Five of the six minor projects had then recently been started. The projects were found to be highly relevant in relation to the educational reform processes and the context of special needs education in the Baltic countries. It was also noted that the participants in the projects had created networks that will be important for furthering the inclusive education process and that the cooperation and exchange with the Nordic partners was valuable and stimulating. The project implementation was considered efficient and there were good perspectives for achieving the project objectives.

The main challenges identified for the future development of inclusive education in the Baltic countries related among other things to harmonisation of educational, health and social policies and legislation to better assist children with special educational needs; improved definitions and statistics; and pre- and in-service teacher training on inclusive education needs to be increased, both as regards content and scope.

For the further implementation of the ongoing cooperation, the Midterm evaluation recommended to perform awareness campaigns about the right of the child and the advantages of inclusive education; active dialogue between the Nordic Steering Group and the Ministries in the Baltic countries to ensure high level support for the projects; recognition of the knowledge gained by project participants through certification; and regular meetings of Baltic and Nordic project coordinators for exchange of experiences.

Regarding possible continued future cooperation after 2004 the Midterm evaluation recommended the use of logical framework approach for establishing objectives, planning and follow up; that possible Nordic partners should be selected in an open and transparent process; that allocation of funds should be made on the basis of budgetary needs rather than on equal shares; and to include parents associations in project implementation.

4. Findings per country

The findings of the Final evaluation are presented for each country starting with comments on recent general developments in each country, followed by comments on the main project and continuing with the minor projects in each country.

4.1 Estonia

The Law on General Education gives the parents the right to decide in which school their children should study. In the case of children with special needs an Advisory Pedagogical Commission recommends to the parents if the child should go to an ordinary or a special school. Laws and regulations on education and child protection are presently being revised. One important change to be approved during 2004 is to delegate the responsibility for individual planning regarding students with special needs to each school and take away the obligatory consultation with the Advisory Pedagogical Commission. According to present regulations all students with special needs should have an individual study plan, but so far only a third of them has got that.

During 2004 the financing system for schools will be changed so that the budget is related to and follows the student. A student with special needs is entitled to a higher budget than the ordinary student. This budget will follow the students if they move from a special school to an ordinary school or from one ordinary school to another. Cooperation between schools and social welfare services is still much dependent on the individual teachers and social workers, as well as on available financial resources for social welfare in each municipality.

The students with special needs that attend ordinary schools have increased slightly in the last years to about 13 % of all schoolchildren, whereas the percentage of students with special needs that attend special schools have decreased somewhat from 2,8 to 2,5 % of all schoolchildren. It could be noted that five years ago the students with special needs in ordinary schools were only 2-3 % of all children attending school. At the same time the total number of school children is substantially decreasing over the coming years because of low birth rates.

Transition Project (Main)

Objective: “Promote inclusive education so that students with special educational needs would be able to join ordinary schools, followed by education in vocational school and be able to enter the labour market”.

The project has had four areas of intervention in order to reach the main objective. These have been to promote successful transition of students from comprehensive to vocational schools and further to working life, to improve teachers’ pedagogical skills, to create network needed to carry out the project and to ensure sustainable benefits, and to prepare curriculum and other facilities for in-service training of teachers after the project ends.

The participants in the Transition Project have been teachers from ordinary schools and vocational schools (28) that have cooperated in the transition of selected cases of students with special needs from ordinary to a vocational school or from vocational school to the labour market. Representatives of Tallinn Pedagogical University and Tartu University, as

well as from the Ministry of Education have also participated in the project as advisors or mentors (8). The participants were divided in four groups with one participant as mentor and coordinator of the group's work between the seminars organised by the Finnish project partner.

The direct result of the cases worked with are that, out 30 initial cases graduating from basic or vocational schools, 22 went from ordinary schools to vocational schools or from ordinary and vocational schools to the labour market in 2003. Some of these students (7) have for various reasons left the vocational school or the employment in early 2004.

The participants met or answering the evaluation questions give clear evidence of the effects of the project on the change of attitudes towards students with special needs among themselves and also among other teachers in their schools. They also refer to new knowledge acquired, including active learning methods and individual planning, which have helped to develop their own work and the work their schools. Several participants also confirm that the project has helped them to know and understand themselves better ("we got more confidence and courage to speak in favour of inclusive education"), and that it had created contacts with other schools that did not exist before. The project has produced a handbook with articles and case studies written by the participants.

With regard to curricula for teacher training, the universities involved have introduced changes regarding special needs education in their basic curricula, but so far there is no in-service training curricula developed related to transition and vocational education. In summary, most of these results are well in line with the objectives and targets set at the start of the project, although the establishment of in-service training curricula seems to require more time and resources than had been available for the project.

Teacher Training Project

Objective: "Development of participants knowledge and competence in special needs education, including analytical model. Development of teacher training institutions' competence for in-service training and school development."

30 teachers, directors and vice directors from 6 ordinary schools from different parts of Estonia have taken part in the joint seminars in this project. These participants have then spread knowledge about new methods and organised team work on real cases in their schools involving the other teachers in the school. Nordic partner representatives have also taken part in meetings and workshops at each of these schools. The focus of this project has been on training of teachers in ordinary schools on how to relate to students with learning or behaviour difficulties.

Participants met confirm that they have acquired important new knowledge and learnt to analyse situations regarding behaviour and learning difficulties of students in an open and constructive way. They also appreciate the introduction of team work and closer contacts between the teachers in a school. A change of attitudes has occurred, but some participants also point out that to go from new knowledge and changed attitudes to changed actions in real situation often takes time. Participants from teacher training institutions confirm that the project has introduced new aspects and dimensions regarding training of teachers in special needs. However, they also note there is not yet enough resources available to the universities to implement in-service training in the form proposed by the Nordic partner.

In summary it could be concluded that the above mentioned results are well in line with the first part of the project objective whereas second part is only partly fulfilled.

Cooperation Project

Objective: “Establish a regional Pedagogical Psychological Counselling service to secure teachers assistance in individual planning of education for students with special needs in ordinary schools.”

This project actually started at the end of 2003 in the Võru county and could therefore not yet be evaluated. A group of 25 teachers from ordinary and special schools as well as kindergartens have been selected to work together with a group of psychologists, speech therapists and social workers. The participant in the project will spread knowledge and ideas among other teachers in their own schools

Final remark

Cooperation and contacts among the three projects in Estonia have taken place in the form of joint participation in some seminars and conferences. Also the fact that the teacher training institutions, the Pedagogical University in Tallinn and the Pedagogical Department of the University in Tartu have taken part in both the Transition Project and the Teacher Training Project has contributed to contacts between the projects.

4.2 Latvia

The Law on General Education of 1999 states that students with special educational needs should be given opportunity to acquire education in any educational institution, in accordance with their health condition and abilities. The Pedagogical Medical Commissions at state and municipal level give advice on whether a child should attend a special school or not. Special schools, which are often situated far away in the countryside, are considered to fulfil not only the function of education, but also of rehabilitation and social welfare for poor families, as many local governments lack trained social workers and budget for social services. There is still a number of children with more severe disabilities staying in residential homes or with their families without getting regular education.

Special schools receive financing directly from the state budget, whereas ordinary schools are financed through the municipalities (teacher salaries financed by the state budget). Possible plans to change this system towards a budget following the student, are waiting a general administrative reform regarding regional and municipal divisions.

The percentage of children attending special schools in Latvia is presently about 3 % of all schoolchildren. The number of students that attend special classes or follow special programs in ordinary schools is limited. The actual number of children in special schools has increased slightly during recent years, at the same time as the total number of schoolchildren is decreasing each year due to low birth rates. The reduction is estimated to be 25 % over the next 5 years.

Teacher Training Project (Main)

Objective: “Development of participants knowledge and competence in special needs education, including analytical model. Development of model for in-service training. Development of special schools’ advisory services to ordinary schools”.

The participants in this project (45) have been directors and teachers from special schools, some ordinary schools and representatives from four teacher training institutions. There has been less participation from ordinary schools in the project than what was initially expected.

Apart from joint workshops, the Nordic partners have also taken part in internal workshops at five of the special schools participating in the project, which have been reorganised as resource centres for support and advice on special needs education in ordinary schools. One ordinary school (Sabile) has also been very active in developing special needs education and has been used as an example for other schools and as a place for practice during teacher training.

A main result of the project confirmed by all participants met are the contacts and discussions with representatives of other schools and teacher training institutions from all over the country. These contacts would not have happened without the project. The knowledge gained from workshops and study visits have helped the participants to increase their understanding of how to implement special education both in special and ordinary schools. Another main result is the development of support system for special education based on the resource centres mentioned above. Some of special schools participating in the project note that more students are transferred to ordinary schools than a couple of years before. The Sabile ordinary school has also been able to receive students with special needs from a nearby residential children's home who had not received any education before.

The teacher training institutions have developed a common view on training in special education and introduced new content and new courses in pre- and in-service training. However, national curricula and standards for in-service teacher training in special education have not yet been revised and formalised by the Ministry of Education. This is partly due to the frequent changes of ministers.

The results presented above are in line with the objectives set with regard to development of participants knowledge and competence and development of special schools' advisory services. The objective of developing a national model for in-service training is only partly fulfilled.

Cooperation Project

Objective: "Establish Pedagogical Psychological Support Team in Rezekne region and city. Development of participants knowledge and competence in special needs education, team building and school development".

The main participants in this project have been a group of 20 teachers from ordinary schools in the city and region of Rezekne. They have followed a two year upgrading course in special needs education at the Faculty of Education at Rezekne College. It could be noted that two representatives of the Faculty also participated in the Teacher Training Project and that the participants of the Cooperation Project have visited ordinary school (Sabile) that is an active participant in the same project. With reference to what was noted about the Teacher Training Project above, the Cooperation Project could be seen as a practical implementation of an in-service training model in special education for teachers in ordinary schools.

The Cooperation Project has also included the establishment of a regional Pedagogical Psychological Support Team with four staff. This staff work part time as advisors to ordinary schools in the city and region. Furthermore, the project has included close contacts with and active support from the leaders of the City and the Regional School administrations.

The participants and other stakeholders met clearly confirm a change of attitudes and understanding among school administrators, directors and teachers in the schools. The participants also appreciate to have been able to get further training and to exchange experiences among themselves. Two examples of statements from participants with regard to

this are – “children with special needs feel less outside if they study in ordinary schools” and “children could not be changed, but the school could be adapted to their needs”.

The result of establishing the Support Team seems to be most important for the smaller schools in countryside, that don't have their own special teachers or psychologists. The participants also confirm increased contacts with, and involvement of parents. An indirect result of the project is that schools visited confirm that the number of students with special needs has increased during the last 4 years, and that few children with special needs are sent to special schools. Another important indirect result of the project is the interest expressed by the Faculty of Education at the College to become a Centre for Training in Special Education. In summary, these results show that the objectives of the project have been well achieved.

Transition Project

Objective: “To facilitate the transition from special schools to vocational schools for students with special needs”.

This project has involved 22 participants from two special schools, four vocational schools, one college and a representative of the Ministry of Education and Science. The participants met give evidence of new knowledge acquired and changes in attitudes among teachers in vocational schools. Students from the two special schools entering vocational schools in the middle of 2003 (20) have so far mainly been well integrated and showed good results. The project has also resulted in contacts between teachers from the vocational and other schools. This has partly been possible through joint seminars with the Teacher Training and Cooperation projects. In general, these results seem to be well in line with the project objective.

Final remark

Cooperation between the projects in Latvia has been close, especially between the Teacher Training and Cooperation projects, as they have had the same Nordic counterpart, but the Transition project has also been involved in the form of joint seminars and conferences and some participants taking also in the Teacher Training Project.

4.3 Lithuania

Lithuania has recently (2003) adopted a new and revised Law on General Education. Special assistance is provided to those who need it according to assessment by the Special Needs Education Commission at each school or by the Pedagogical Psychological Services in the municipality. The parents have the right to decide in which school their children shall be educated. There is also a Strategy for Education 2002 – 2012 adopted by the government, that identifies special needs education as one of five main priorities. This is partly due to influence from the Nordic cooperation projects. The strategy is directed towards inclusive education that should be flexible and based on individual planning. A student based financing system of schools was introduced for ordinary schools in 2003 and for special and vocational schools in 2004. The cooperation between the education and social welfare sectors is facilitated by the regional administration structure coordinating and supporting activities of the municipalities in both areas.

The percentage of schoolchildren with special needs is estimated to about 10 %, with 1 % attending special schools. In Lithuania, as in the other Baltic countries, there is an ongoing reduction in the number of children entering school due to declining birth rates. There is about 25 % less children aged 0-9 in 2003 than five years ago.

Cooperation Project (Main)

Objective: "Create a model to ensure admission of all children to adapted education in a feasible setting based on individual evaluation. Create a structure for early identification of children with special needs".

This project has included about 120 participants from two of Lithuania's ten regions (Siauliai and Panevezys). The participants have been headmasters and teachers from ordinary and special schools, staff from municipality and regional administrations. They were divided in groups of about 20-40 focusing on five different themes (light/moderate disabilities, severe disabilities, social/emotional problems, pedagogical psychological services, role of local government). Each group have had separate workshops and study visits to Denmark or Sweden. There have also been joint seminars and conferences arranged for all participants.

There is clear evidence given by the participants that the project has helped to change attitudes and to introduce new knowledge and methods. Examples mentioned are focusing on the strength and possibilities of the child instead of problems, and the importance of team work between teachers and with specialist staff. There are also more contacts and joint activities between special and ordinary schools. A further example is an ordinary school inviting parents to children with special needs to show them how the school can serve their children. An important result of the project is also that it has stimulated the self-esteem of the participants by training them as "consultants" spreading the knowledge and convincing other teachers of the importance of inclusive education and new methods acquired. A further important result is the reorganisation of some special schools to resource centres giving advice and services to ordinary schools and in some cases also to residential children's homes.

Measurable results of the project are that a substantial number of students have been transferred from special schools to ordinary schools. There are also children with more severe disabilities from residential children's homes starting to attend special schools. There are also evidence of good cooperation between the schools and the regional and municipal authorities, for instance regarding transportation of students from residential homes to schools or regarding equipment and school facilities.

The above mentioned results are well in line with the project objectives, with the exception that early identification and intervention has not been a focus of the project. This is possibly due to the fact that identification activities have to be implemented by and in close cooperation with the health care services.

Teacher Training Project

Objective: "Improve basic and in-service training of teachers for inclusive classroom teaching of pupils with special needs. To distribute material on inclusive classroom teaching to teachers and teacher trainers".

This project has been implemented as an addition to the Cooperation Project. It has included some seminars for teachers and teacher trainers from universities and the publication of material for teacher training. The material include international research on inclusive education, guidelines for in-service training on special needs in ordinary schools and case studies written by the participants in the Cooperation Project.

University representatives met underlined the importance of differing between the training and competence of a teacher in a special school and the in-service training in special needs of teachers in ordinary schools. They also noted that Lithuania was still in the transition from the earlier medically oriented model of segregating children with special needs to the new model

of social interaction. It was confirmed that the project has had an influence on the development of a recently approved new concept for teacher training, including teachers combining special needs education and other main school subjects.

The result seems to be in line with the objectives insofar as the project has influenced teacher training models and distributed training material. However, the implementation of these things in actual teacher training is still to come.

Transition Project

Objective: “Promote inclusive education so that students with special educational needs studying in ordinary schools would be able to participate in vocational education”.

The participants in the project have been 21 students with special needs in ordinary schools in that have continued studies in vocational schools, as well as teachers and directors in vocational schools (30). Teachers in the ordinary schools took part in the initial steps of the project. The students come from schools in the same two regions where the Cooperation Project has been implemented (Siauliai and Panevezys) and have themselves taken an active part in the workshops arranged by the project.

Although the project started only a year ago the results are clear. 21 students with special needs have been accepted in third level of vocational training and showed positive study results in their vocational subjects. Attitudes among teachers in vocational schools have changed from being sceptical in the beginning to understanding the situation of students with special needs. The students themselves also confirm that project has helped them to understand themselves, their situation in school and what they want to do (“it has given a meaning to my life”).

Other result are that cooperation between ordinary and vocational schools has been established and continues, that a working group for special needs education in vocational schools has been formed by representatives of the Ministry of Education and other ministries and institutions and that other vocational schools have started to use the experiences of the project. From the above it could be concluded that the project objectives are being well fulfilled.

Final remark

The cooperation between the three projects in Lithuania has been very close due to the fact that they have all been implemented in the two regions with involvement of the same local coordinators in each region. Furthermore, the Teacher Training Project has been implemented more as an additional activity to the Cooperation Project with the same Nordic partner.

5. Summary of findings per type of project

In this section a summary comparison of the project results will be made according to the three main types of projects implemented – Transition, Teacher Training and Cooperation.

5.1 Transition projects

All the transition projects have had direct effects on supporting individual students with special needs to go from ordinary or special schools to vocational schools and also to some extent to enter the labour market. In the case of some schools participating the project, the transition of students to vocational school in general has increased as a result of taking part in the project.

However, the most important effect of these projects are possibly on the participating teachers in vocational schools and ordinary schools, who have learnt to see, understand and support students with special needs through counselling and individual planning. In many cases these teachers have also been successful in spreading this learning process within their schools. Another important effect of these projects is that contacts and cooperation has been established between ordinary and vocational schools, which did not exist before.

Only the main Transition Project in Estonia included in its objective to influence in-service teacher training in relation to transition and vocational training. This objective is, however, only partly fulfilled, although there are steps taken in both Estonia and Lithuania towards new models for teacher training related to vocational training.

5.2 Teacher Training projects

The three teacher training projects have had somewhat different focus. The main project in Latvia focused on supporting special schools to be resource centres for ordinary schools and cooperation among teacher training institutions on in-service training models. The project in Estonia focused on promoting team work among teachers and situation analysis regarding behavioural problems in ordinary schools and the competence of teacher training institutions to support in-service training in this area. The project in Lithuania focused on publication and dissemination of teacher training material based on the experiences in the Cooperation Project in the same country.

There is a clear effect of all projects on the participating teachers and teacher trainers with regard to acquirement and application of new knowledge and methods. In several cases knowledge and methods have also been spread and applied within the schools and training institutions where the participants work.

However, national models for in-service training regarding special education for teachers in ordinary schools have still to come in all three countries, although changes in teacher training concepts and contents have been directly influenced by the experiences from the Nordic cooperation projects. This situation is possibly due to the relative independence of the university training institutions in relation to the ministries of education, the limitation of resources at universities and perhaps also the lack of tradition among the training institutions of close contacts with the schools in practical application of in-service training models.

5.3 Cooperation projects

The cooperation projects have also differed somewhat in structure and focus in the three countries, although they have all been implemented at the regional level. The main project in Lithuania has had more participants than any other project in the cooperation, as it covered two regions and was divided into five thematic areas related to both ordinary and special schools, support services and local government. The cooperation project in Latvia has been focused on further training of teachers in ordinary schools in cooperation with the local teacher training institution and also on establishing a pedagogical psychological support team to assist ordinary schools. The project in Estonia, which just started, is focused on teachers from ordinary and special schools and their cooperation with specialists.

The effects of the two projects implemented so far have been clear with regard to knowledge and methods acquired and applied by the participants. They have also had effects on the work within schools and the reorganisation of special schools to resource centres, as well as on supporting activities from the municipal and regional levels.

Through the direct involvement of a teacher training institution in the Latvian cooperation project and the participation of representatives for teacher training in special education in the Lithuanian project, both projects have had influence on teacher training, which could possibly promote the development and future application of in-service training models.

6. Conclusions

6.1 Achievement of objectives

Summarising the results achieved in relation to objectives noted under section 4 and 5 above, it could be concluded that all projects have achieved their main objective with regard to increased knowledge and competence of participants. They have also created contacts and network between schools and other institutions. The transition projects have achieved transition of students from ordinary and special schools to vocational schools and in some cases to the labour market. The cooperation projects have managed to involve municipal and regional authorities and create support functions for special education in ordinary schools. The teacher training projects have succeeded in introducing team work and analytical methods and have also made contributions to new content and curricula for teacher training.

Furthermore, the new knowledge and competence acquired have been spread within participating schools and institutions and has contributed to a change of attitudes towards students with special needs and their inclusion in ordinary schools among the participants and within their schools.

The above summary of the results leads to the conclusion that the overall objective of the cooperation “to support competence development at different levels, with a view to increase the possibilities for pupils in need of special support to receive a high quality education within the ordinary school system” has been fulfilled.

Looking at the objectives for the individual projects it could also be concluded that they have in most cases been fulfilled. In the case of the Teacher Training Project in Latvia the development of a national model for in-service training in special education has still to come, although the concerned teacher training institutions have changed and developed their own courses with respect to this, especially the teacher training institution involved in the Cooperation Project in this country. A specific project objective that has not been fulfilled is the creation of a structure for early identification of children with special needs in the Cooperation Project in Lithuania.

6.2 Impact and sustainability

From the results presented above it could also be concluded that the main impact of the cooperation has been on the attitudes and work in schools participating in the different projects, both ordinary schools, vocational schools and special schools. Through the cooperation projects there is also an impact on both attitudes and work of local authorities, support services for special education and the assessment of children’s special needs at the regional and municipal levels.

This impact is shown by the fact that within participating schools and regions more children with special needs are receiving education in ordinary schools, either because they are transferred from special schools or the assessment of special needs more seldom result in sending them to special schools. The impact is also clear insofar as more children with special needs continue education in vocational schools. There is furthermore in some cases also an

impact of the cooperation on children with disabilities in residential homes, who before did not get any education, but now go to nearby ordinary or special schools.

Comparing the impact of the cooperation on children with different types of disabilities it could, however, be concluded that the impact had been most visible with regard to light and moderate disabilities. The impact with regard to inclusive education for children with more severe disabilities is still much more limited. Reasons for this are the lack of financial resources required for adaptation of schools and special assistance, but most probably also prevailing conceptions and attitudes related to severe disabilities.

With regard to the impact of the cooperation at the national level, it could be noted that the cooperation has had some impact on policies and regulations mainly through the ministry representatives who had taken part in the Nordic cooperation projects. As mentioned above, there is also some impact on national curricula for teacher training in special education, although not yet resulting in national in-service training models being approved.

With regard to the sustainability of these results and impacts in the longer term, it is obvious that the process towards inclusive education will continue with increasing international contacts and EU membership for the Baltic countries. It could be noted here that the cooperation has facilitated the initial participation of the Baltic countries in the European Agency for Special Education. The speed of the transition process will depend not only on the resources available, but also on how the knowledge and experiences gained in the Nordic cooperation projects are spread at the national level, and particularly on how the teacher training institutions will be able to promote new models of pre- and in-service training for special education in ordinary schools.

6.3 Project management and costs

The Nordic costs in the cooperation have been used in two main areas. One refers to the work of the Nordic partners and include salaries, travel and interpretation. The other is costs for Baltic participants for study trips to the Nordic countries and for participation in seminars and workshops in the respective countries. The total Nordic project costs have been more or less evenly utilised for these two main purposes. However there are substantial variations between the different projects as shown in the following table.

The table compares the use of funds within the different projects as percentage of total costs for each project divided in four types of costs - salary costs for Nordic staff (including administration fees and costs for interpretation), travel costs for Nordic staff, costs for study tours to Nordic countries, costs for seminars and workshops in the Baltic countries. It should be noted that the budget for main projects have been 1500 000 DKK and for minor project 480 000 DKK, and also that two projects are not included (Teacher Training in Lithuania and Cooperation in Estonia).

<i>Type of cost</i>	Lithuania		Estonia		Latvia			Average
	<i>Coop.</i>	<i>Trans.</i>	<i>Trans.</i>	<i>Teach. tr.</i>	<i>Teach. tr.</i>	<i>Coop.</i>	<i>Trans.</i>	
	<i>DK</i>	<i>FIN</i>	<i>FIN</i>	<i>NOR</i>	<i>NOR</i>	<i>NOR</i>	<i>ICE</i>	
Nordic staff etc	34%	65%	68%	4%	6%	6%	10%	26%
Nordic travel	33%	21%	25%	24%	22%	17%	29%	23%
Study trips	33%	11%	6%	17%	15%	17%	30%	16%
Seminars workshops	0%	2%	1%	56%	57%	61%	31%	34%

The main reason for the differences between the projects is the fact that the main Norwegian partner organisation (Norwegian Support System for Special Education and their co-partners in Norway and Iceland) is not charging any salary costs for their coordinator and other staff involved in the projects. Instead more than half of the Nordic costs in these projects are used to finance costs for arranging seminars and workshops in the Baltic countries. In projects involving other Nordic partners, on the other hand, salaries and related costs (administration fees) account for a high percentage of total costs. In these projects, however, the Nordic funds are not utilised to finance seminars and workshops.

This means that the projects with the Norwegian partner have been able to subsidise local costs covered by the Baltic countries in the other projects. The projects supported by the Norwegian partner have also most probably used more time of the Nordic staff in comparison with the other projects, as they do not have had a budget limit for the use of Nordic staff. In fact these projects have had a higher total Nordic contribution than the other projects.

Within the costs for Nordic staff the costs for travel also vary due to the distance from the various Nordic countries to the Baltic countries. The same factor also influences the costs for study trips, but these costs are also influenced by the fact that the number of participants in the study tours have varied. However, the variations in these two types of costs are smaller than in the costs for salaries and seminar/workshops.

The Baltic countries have mainly given contributions in kind in form of time dedicated by the local participants in the projects. They have also given direct contributions in the form of paying the costs for arranging seminars and workshops in some of the projects (in Estonia and Lithuania). In the case of the Transition Project (main) in Estonia the in kind contribution was estimated to be at least 200 000 DKK and the direct contribution to about 100 000 DKK. In the Transition Project (minor) the in kind contribution was estimated to be at least 150 000 DKK. It is reasonable to think that the in kind contributions are on the same levels in the other projects with some variation depending on how many participants there are in each project.

From the perspective of efficiency, available funds seem to have been reasonably well used taking into account the different conditions between the projects outlined above. Cheap air tickets and accommodation have been sought when possible both for Nordic partner visits to the Baltic countries and for the study visits to Nordic countries. Nordic partner staff and lecturers have been generally praised for high competence and pedagogical skills by the Baltic project participants, and the latter have been very satisfied with the possibilities to see inclusive education in practice in the Nordic countries. The total costs of the cooperation seem also most reasonable if compared with the above mentioned results and effects, taking into account that the cooperation had influenced a substantial number of teachers and schools in the three countries over a period of four years.

With regard to practical project management and reporting there seems to be some difference between the projects in the roles of Nordic and Baltic partners. The Norwegian partner seems to shoulder more responsibility for project management and reporting in their projects (Latvia and Estonia), than the other Nordic partners, especially than those involved in Lithuania. This is possibly an effect of more time available for the Norwegian staff as mentioned above.

6.4 Relevance of objectives and project design

As already stated in the Midterm evaluation, the cooperation and its overall objective have been highly relevant in relation to the ongoing reforms within the education sector and the adaptation of policies and implementation to international standards. The cooperation has

been the main external support for special education in all three countries and also considered a main contribution to the education sector in general in some of the countries.

The relevance of the design of the cooperation could be viewed from different perspectives. One perspective is in relation to identification of issues for, and participants in, the cooperation. Other perspectives are the overall organisation of the cooperation, participation of local stakeholders and the implementing capacity of these stakeholders.

The main issues for the cooperation (the three types of projects) have been chosen in a process of prioritisation between the Baltic and the Nordic and are clearly relevant in relation to the main objective and the ongoing reform process. The three issues all include the common theme of supporting competence development of teachers. The identification and selection of participants in the projects have been guided by the interest expressed by schools, institutions, regional authorities and individual teachers. Having participants from all over the country has also been a principle in some of the projects.

The overall organisation of the cooperation in three different projects per country had spread the responsibilities for project implementation among Nordic partners, although three main project partners have been responsible for 2–3 projects each. An alternative way of organising the cooperation would have been to have one project per country with three subcomponents and one main responsible Nordic partner (with possible subcontracts for the components).

This alternative would have facilitated coordination and contacts between the projects in each country. It could possibly also have facilitated closer contacts with higher levels of the ministry in each country, if the Nordic partner organisation had had direct support for such contacts from the education ministry in their own Nordic country. On the other hand the organisation chosen for the cooperation has given the possibilities for each Baltic country to cooperate with several Nordic partners, possibilities which would perhaps have been reduced with the alternative organisation of the project. It is difficult to say that the alternative organisation would have produced substantially better results than the one chosen. The differences would possibly have been marginal.

The relevance of the cooperation with regard to local implementing capacity varies slightly at different levels and among the projects. As noted above, the capacity of coordination at the central ministry level has been limited in terms of human resources (although not in dedication). The implementing capacity of teacher training institutions has also had some limitations in time and resources, whereas the implementing capacity at regional level in the cooperation projects (Latvia and Lithuania) seems to have been most satisfactory.

The design of cooperation projects with regard to participation of local stakeholders has also been good. Headmasters and teachers from different types of schools have been directly involved in all projects. Teacher training institutions have been directly involved in the teacher training projects, but also in the several of the other projects. Regional and municipal administrators have been directly involved in the cooperation projects. A group of stakeholders that has not been much involved in the projects is parents associations, although there is evidence of involvement of parents in the process of transition of individual students to vocational schools. A reason for this lack of involvement could be that these associations are still few and relatively small. The active involvement of higher levels of ministries has varied among the countries depending on how frequent the changes of governments and ministers have been.

An important aspect of project design with regard to participation of stakeholders is the participatory learning methods used by all Nordic partners in the implementation of project activities. This has implied an introduction of active and applied learning based on real

situations and cases instead of only textbooks and lectures. It has also implied the involvement of other teachers in team work and practical school development activities at the schools and institutions from which the participants come. These methods were initially questioned by the Baltic participants but have gradually been well accepted and appreciated. Another important practical aspect of the involvement of stakeholders is that they through the cooperation have got more opportunities to meet each other than before. As an example of this aspect one participant noted – “the most important thing in the seminars is to have long coffee breaks”.

6.5 Follow up of recommendations from the Midterm evaluation

As a follow up of the main challenges for the future development of inclusive education and recommendations for the future identified in the Midterm evaluation in 2002 (see under 3.5 above) the following could be noted.

With regard to the main challenges for inclusive education in general the harmonisation of educational, health and social policies and legislation for the assistance of children with special needs should be further pursued, although steps have been taken in the Baltic countries. Definitions and statistics seem also still to be in need of further development. However, as noted above in section 6.2, possibly the main challenge for the future is still pre- and in-service training of teachers in inclusive education.

With regard to the recommendations for the future within the ongoing cooperation, the recognition of project participation has been implemented in all projects in the form of certification often presented in the form of specific study points for different components of project participation.

In the case of active dialogue between the Nordic Steering Group and the Baltic ministries, efforts have been made for that purpose in relation to meetings with the Steering Group in Baltic countries. However, these occasions have been too few to develop and pursue an active dialogue. The frequent change of ministers and other leading representatives in some of the countries further limits the possibilities of dialogue. An alternative way of developing a more active dialogue would possibly be to divide the responsibilities for this dialogue on the part of the Nordic countries between the Nordic ministries of education, linking one Nordic country with one Baltic country for developing closer contacts and dialogue.

The proposed meetings between the Baltic and Nordic project coordinators seems to not have been arranged. Meetings between the coordinators, for all countries together or at the level of each Baltic country, could possibly have further strengthened the effects at the country level and the exchange of experiences between both Nordic and Baltic partners.

6.6 Recommendations for possible future support

The conclusion presented above is that the impact of the cooperation so far is most visible at the level of individuals, schools and local authorities participating in the cooperation. The impact of the cooperation is less evident at the national level regarding curricula and models for teacher training, as well as with regard to changes in general regulations for special and inclusive education. On the basis of this conclusion, the following main areas for possible future Nordic – Baltic cooperation are recommended.

- Systematic dissemination of methodologies and experiences from the present cooperation at the national level in the Baltic countries in form of publications (some have already been produced), conferences and seminars.
- The establishment and implementation of national in-service teacher training models and curricula focused on education of students with special needs in ordinary schools (ordinary teachers and specialists).
- Further adaptation of laws and regulations to facilitate the implementation of inclusive education and support for students with special needs in ordinary schools.

For project design and implementation the recommendations of the Midterm evaluation mentioned above are repeated. They refer to - the use of logical framework approach for establishing objectives, planning and follow up; that possible Nordic partners should be selected in an open and transparent process; that allocation of funds should be made on the basis of budgetary needs rather than on equal shares; and to include parents associations in project implementation. It is also recommended to consider organising a future cooperation with one main Nordic partner for each Baltic country (with possible subcontracts).

Annex 1 - Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for Final Evaluation - Development of A School for All – Nordic-Baltic Co-operation in Special Needs Education (February 2004)

The Nordic Council of Ministers (NCM) is funding a project entitled “Development of A School for All – Nordic-Baltic Co-operation in Special Needs Education”. The overall objective of the project is to support competence development at different levels, with a view to increase the possibilities for pupils in need of special support to receive a high quality education within the ordinary school system in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

The Project is designed as an umbrella programme with ten projects to be implemented during the period 2000 to 2004. The focus is on three main areas i.e. transition, teacher training and co-operation.

The Final Evaluation

The Steering Group for the Nordic School Co-operation has decided to carry out a final evaluation by the end of the project period with the assistance of an external consultant. The main purpose of the evaluation is to render a summary judgement on of the project's performance. The Nordic Steering Group will use the findings of the evaluation for accountability purposes and if and when designing new support projects to Special Needs Education. The Baltic Ministries of Education and the Nordic implementation partners are also receivers of the evaluation results in order to improve new project concepts and design, as well as its implementation.

The evaluation should focus on project results, effects and impact. The critical issues to be looked into are the project results, the effects and impact of results, as well as any unforeseen effect and impact of project outcome. The issues regarding change in attitudes and behavioural patterns to Special Needs Education should be highlighted. The follow-up of the conclusions and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation should also be looked into.

The evaluation should preferably also discuss the conceptual issues concerning who is excluded from school and what are the physical, personal and institutional barriers to access and participation. The development of inclusive education policies and social policies, the development of inclusive schools and human resources to support inclusion, including teacher training, should also be addressed.

The relevance of the project in terms of project design should be revisited, i.e the identification of problems and beneficiaries, the participation by local stakeholders, the local implementation capacity, complementarity and coherence with related activities undertaken by government or other donors, and the strengths and weaknesses of overall project design.

Project efficiency in terms of project management, costs and value-for-money, the Baltic countries contributions, the costs for the Nordic inputs, the technical assistance given, the quality of monitoring etc should also be discussed.

In order to make a summary judgment on of the project's performance it will be important to collect information directly from the stakeholders through interviews and questionnaires. A draft report in English should be presented to the Steering Group for the Nordic School Co-operation not later than 15th March 2004. The Consultant will be required to present the report on the final conference arranged by the Nordic Steering Group 22-23 April 2004.

Annex 2 – Evaluation questions

Questions to Ministry officials and project coordinators:

1. What have been the major developments since 2002 in the education sector in general with influence on inclusive education?
2. What have been the major developments since 2002 with regard to inclusive education in particular? Changes in attitudes, behaviour, definition of concepts, organisation, curriculum, teacher training, etc.?
3. To what extent has the NMR financed projects been coordinated with and complementing other initiatives in the education sector?
4. What are the most important results of the NMR financed projects?

Questions to project coordinators and participants in each main or minor project:

5. What are the most important results of the project?
6. Is it possible to identify impact of the project results on:
 - Attitudes of teacher trainers, teachers, school directors and school authorities in both ordinary and special schools?
 - Number of children with special needs included in ordinary education?
 - The role of special schools and their cooperation with ordinary schools?
 - In-service training programs?
 - Changes in organisation and curriculum for mainstream teacher training programs?
 - Changes in organisation and curriculum for special teacher training programmes?
7. Are the results of the project in line with objectives defined and expectations at the start of the project? What are the reasons for possible differences with objectives and expectations?
8. What have been the main problems with regard to the implementation of the project?
9. Are there any unforeseen factors that have influenced project results? Are there any unplanned results arising from the project?
10. Have the activities been carried out in accordance with the plan? What are the reasons for possible deviations? Have the changes made had a positive or negative effect on project performance?
11. Have the human, material and financial resources made available by NMR, the Nordic partners and the Baltic ministries been sufficient to carry out the activities?
12. Has the project had sufficient cooperation and support from the Ministry (central and regional level), school administrators, teachers and other local stakeholders?
13. To what extent has organisations of parents and other advocacy groups participated in project implementation, or been reached by dissemination of project experiences?
14. Has the project had sufficient cooperation and support from the Nordic partners? What has been the value of using the Nordic expertise in this project?
15. How has the design and management of project functioned in relation to expectations, to achieving the objectives of the project and for the efficiency of its implementation?
16. How has information about the project results and experiences been disseminated and received?
17. How can the experiences of the project be further used to support inclusive education?
18. What should be the focus of a possible new project to support the development human resources and policies for inclusive education?
19. To what extent have recommendations in the Mid-term evaluation in 2002 been taken into consideration or implemented during the last period of the Project?

Annex 3 - Persons met and answering questions

	Steering Group and Secretariat
Tove Lindberg	Senior Adviser, Ministry of Education and Research, Norway
Merja Strömberg	Senior Adm Officer, Ministry of Education and Science, Sweden
Steinar Sandstad	Director General, Norwegian Support System for Special Education

Estonia

Kai Kukk	Special Education, Policy Dept, Ministry of Education
Ene Mägi	Head of Special Education Dept, Pedagogical University, Tallinn
Jaana Kõgesaar	Professor Special Education Dept, Tartu University
Ene Mall Vernek	Regional Director of Education, Southern Estonia
Pille Liblik	Coordinator of Regional Cooperation Project, Võru County
Krista Sillar	Vice Director, School No. 32, Tallinn
Urve Raudsepp-Alt	Special Teacher, School No. 32, Tallinn
18 participants in Transit. Proj.	Answering questions about the project, Project Coordinator's Report
Vice Director and 15 teachers	Kalamaja Basic School, Tallinn
Director and 14 teachers	Paldiski Basic School
Leena Kaikkonen	Jyväskylä Vocational Teachers Training College, Finland
Arvid Karlsen	Norwegian Support System for Special Education
Einar Christiansen	Norwegian Support System for Special Education
Aase Tromborg (mail)	Viborg County, Denmark

Latvia

Sarmite Vegere	State Secretary, Ministry of Education and Science
Guntas Vasilevskis	Head, General Education Dept, Ministry of Education and Science
Anna Dreimane	Special Needs Education, Ministry of Education and Science
Ilze Berzina	Director, Sabile Normal School
Mara Burcaka	Special Teacher, Sabile Normal School
Mara Puspure	Faculty of Education, University of Latvia
Erika Lanka	Faculty of Education, University of Latvia
Director	Special School Gaujienas
Director	Special school for visual impairments Strazdumuižas
Director	Special school for hearing impairments Valmeieras
Director and teacher	Special school for mental impairments Kokneses
Director and teacher	Special school for mental impairments Pelcu
Director and teachers	Special school No 5 Riga

Anda Leitanne	Dept of Home Economics, University of Agriculture, Jelgava
Inta Balode	Director, Special School No 3 Riga
Andrejs Keziks	Vocational Teacher, Special School No 3 Riga
Sandra Paegle	Teacher, Vocational School No 34 Riga
Irma Jufko	Special Teacher, Normal School No 13 Riga
Peteris Vucenlazdāns	Dept of Pedagogy and Psychology, Faculty of Education, Rezekne
Marīte Rozenfelde	Dept of Pedagogy and Psychology, Faculty of Education, Rezekne
Director and teacher	Normal School Nartrinu Municipality, Rezekne Region
Director and teacher	Normal School No. 6, Rezekne City
Director of Education Board	School Administration, Rezekne City
Member of Education Board	School Administration, Rezekne Region
4 members	Regional support team, Rezekne City and Region
15 teachers	Participants in regional training seminars Rezekne City and Region
Arvid Karlsen	Norwegian Support System for Special Education
Marit Hognestad	Norwegian Board of Education
Fjölfnir Asbjörnsson (mail)	Ídnskólinn, Iceland

Lithuania

Rimantas Vaitkus	Vice Minister, Ministry of Education and Science
Mindaugas Briedis	Head, Teacher Education Division, Ministry of Education and Science
Romualdas Puvaskis	Head, Dept for Vocational Training, Ministry of Education and Science
Algirdas Pauliukonis	Dept for Vocational Training, Ministry of Education and Science
Regina Labiniene	Head, Special Needs Division, Ministry of Education and Science
Teresa Aidukienė	Special Needs Division, Ministry of Education and Science
Alvydas Šedžius	Governor, Šiauliai County
Leonas Strazdas	Deputy Governor, Šiauliai County
Julija Kvedarienė	Division of Social Affairs, Šiauliai County Administration
Apolinaras Micus	Deputy Mayor, Akmenė District Municipality
Julijona Leonaitienė	Director, Venta Residential Home for Children
Laima Grigotienė	Deputy Director, Venta Residential Home for Children
Dalia Bakaitienė	Special Teacher, Venta Residential Home for Children
Vaclovas Laukys	Director, Dabikine Special Education Centre
Daiva Daugirdienė	Representative NGO "Hope"
Vytautas Giedraitis	Director Romuva Secondary School
Stanislava Prazauskienė	Vice Director Romuva Secondary School
Aleksandras Budrevičius	Director Special Education Centre
Juozas Lokčikas	Director Šiauliai Special Boarding School
Renata Kielaitė	Special Teacher, Šiauliai Pedagogical Psychological Service
Renata Geležinienė	Special Teacher, Educational and Care Centre "Goda"
Diana Freibergienė	Special Teacher, Žeimelio Secondary School
Virginija Antonovienė	Special Teacher, Special Educational Centre Ringuva
Zinera Baršauskienė	Special Teacher, J.Laužikas School
Danutė Ogintienė	Special Teacher, Šiauliai Special Boarding School
Jonas Ambrukaitis	Professor, Special Education Research Centre, Šiauliai University
Saulius Dargužas	Headmaster, Šiauliai Light Industry Vocational School
Valentina Songailienė	Teacher, Šiauliai Light Industry Vocational School
Stanislava Simsonienė	Teacher, Šiauliai Light Industry Vocational School
Vida Liorentienė	Teacher, Kuršėnai School of Polytechnic

Kęstutis Žeimantas	Teacher, Žeimelio Agriculture Vocational School
Zita Kukuraitienė	Deputy Governor, Panevėžys County,
Ričardas Kliminskas	Head, Education Dept, Panevėžys County Administration
Auksė Mažylienė	Pedagogical Psychological Services, Panevėžys County Administration
Aušra Gabrėnienė	Special Needs Education, Education Dept, Panevėžys City
Birutė Krasuckienė	Headmaster, Panevėžys Special Boarding School,
Rasa Asminavičienė	Teacher, Panevėžys Special Boarding School
Genė Sutkuvienė	Special Teacher, Panevėžys Special School for deaf children
Dalia Jankevičienė	Panevėžys Special Pre-Primary School for visually impaired
Irena Daunoravičienė	Special Teacher, Linkaučių Basic School
Rita Kiršlienė	Teacher, Papilio Basic School
Rita Kiršlienė	Teacher Papilio Basic School
Giedrė Gruzdienė	Headmaster, Aušra Secondary School, Panevėžys
Egidijus Samas	Headmaster, Secondary School No 18, Panevėžys
Angelė Vabalienė	Special teacher Secondary School No 18, Panevėžys
Jolanta Sulskienė	Teacher, Secondary School No 18, Panevėžys
Bronius Sadula	Headmaster, Panevėžys Vocational Training Centre
Kazinieras Tautvaišas	Teacher, Panevėžys Vocational Training Centre
Danutė Eivienė	Deputy, Panevėžys Trading & Business Vocational School
Dalia Matuliauskienė	Teacher, Panevėžys Trading & Business Vocational School
Elena Vasiliauskienė	Teacher Margarita Rimkevičiūtė Technological School
Loreta Masiliūlienė	Teacher Margarita Rimkevičiūtė Technological School
Aase Tromborg (mail)	Viborg County, Denmark
Finn Christensen (mail)	Viborg County, Denmark
Ingrid Magnusson (mail)	Special Pedagogical Institute, Sweden

Annex 4 - List of documents

- Mid-term Evaluation of the Development of A School for All – Nordic – Baltic Cooperation in Special Needs Education, Stockholm Group for Development Studies, April 2002 (and all the documentation listed in this report).
- Annual Report “A School for All” 2002
- Annual Report “A School for All” 2003
- Report for the Final Evaluation, Estonia Transition Project, Jyväskylä Vocational Teachers Education College, Finland, March 2004
- Report for the Final Evaluation, Lithuania Transition Project, Jyväskylä Vocational Teachers Education College, Finland, March 2004