



**DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO ENSURE STUDENTS WITH
DISABILITIES RECEIVE A QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION**

Report to Congress
Covering Fiscal Years
1999-2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	2
II.	Program Description	3
	Program Context and Background	3
	Legislative Purpose and Changes Since 1999	4
	Department of Education Management	5
	Authorizations and Average Funding Per Grantee	6
	Grantee Description	7
III.	Program Results and Outcomes	8
	Authorized Activities	13
	Evidence of Sustainability	16
IV.	Appendices	19

I. Executive Summary

The Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education Program¹ (Demonstration Program) was designed to support the development of innovative, effective, and efficient teaching methods and other program strategies to enhance the skills and abilities of postsecondary faculty and administrators in working with students with disabilities. Allowable activities include, but are not limited to, in-service training, professional development, workshops, summer institutes, distance learning, technology training, and syntheses of research related to postsecondary students with disabilities.

The program was first funded in 1999 and supports three-year grants to two-year and four-year institutions of higher education (IHEs) throughout the United States in both rural and urban settings. Since Fiscal Year (FY) 1999, the program has funded four cohorts of grantees, (in FY 1999, FY 2002, FY 2005, and FY 2008), distributing \$59,315,591 to 236 individual grantees.

This report is mandated by Congress. Under Section 762(d)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA), the Secretary is required to prepare and submit to the authorizing committees, and make available to the public, a report on all demonstration projects awarded grants for fiscal years 1999 through 2008. The HEA also requires the Secretary to make subsequent reports on demonstration projects funded under this program. Future reports will specify guidance and recommendations for how effective projects can be replicated.

Since FY 1999, grants awarded under the Demonstration Program have contributed to the success of college students with disabilities. Through the development and refinement of professional development opportunities and resources, faculty and administrators across the country are now better equipped with the skills and supports necessary to enhance the quality of postsecondary education opportunities for students with disabilities. Each project funded under the Demonstration Program has identified specific barriers that college students with disabilities may encounter as they pursue their academic goals, conducted assessments of those barriers, and disseminated materials to help faculty and administrators overcome those barriers.

Additionally, Demonstration Program grantees share teaching methods and strategies that are consistent with the principles of Universal Design (UD) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL). *(UD ensures the design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design. UDL is a scientifically valid framework for guiding educational practice that provides flexibility in the ways information is presented, in the ways students respond or*

¹ The Higher Education Opportunity Act, Pub.L. 110-315, enacted August 14, 2008, changed the name of the program to the Demonstration Projects to Support Postsecondary Faculty, Staff, and Administrators in Educating Students with Disabilities program. The Department's future reports and publications will use the new name.

demonstrate knowledge and skills, and in the ways students are engaged. UDL reduces barriers in instruction, provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges, and maintains high achievement expectations for all students, including students with disabilities and students who are limited English proficient.) By integrating UD and UDL principles into existing courses, grantees make those courses, as well as other student services, more accessible.

Demonstration Program grantees have also successfully used technology (such as Web-based training modules), and have coupled technology-based outreach with outreach training programs (such as workshops and summer institutes) to increase the capacity of faculty and administrators participating in their projects and those with whom they have shared their project-related materials.

The average award to Demonstration Program grantees from 1999 to 2008 was approximately \$273,000 per grant per year. Grantees have also secured non-federal resources to expand their resources. Although not required, Demonstration Program grantees have been very successful at securing long-term partnerships with other colleges and universities.

This report describes the purpose and goals of the Demonstration Program, its legislative mandate, and its management. This report will also detail the program's activities as well as its accomplishments.

II. Program Description

Program Context and Background

Research suggests that more students with disabilities are pursuing higher education than ever before. Over the last 20 years, matriculation rates for students with disabilities have more than doubled, and students with disabilities are becoming increasingly diverse by ethnicity and type of disability.² In 2008, students with disabilities represented approximately 11 percent of all postsecondary students. The National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) reported that the proportion of postsecondary students who reported having a disability increased from 9 percent in 2000 to 11 percent in 2004.³ Some states report increases in the number of postsecondary students from 1999 to 2007. California public postsecondary schools reported an increase of 20 percent in the number of undergraduate students with disabilities while New York schools reported an increase of 40 percent in the number of undergraduate and graduate students with disabilities.⁴

² Harbour, W. S. (2008). *The 2008 biennial AHEAD survey of disability services and resource professionals in higher education: Final report*. Huntersville, NC; The Association on Higher Education And Disability.

³ From the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study – <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/npsas>

⁴ United States Government Accountability Office. (2009, October). *Higher education and disability: Education needs a coordinated approach to improve its assistance to schools in supporting students*. Report to the Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives. Washington, DC: Author.

Despite these increases, youth in the general population were more than twice as likely as those with disabilities to be attending a postsecondary school in 2003.⁵ Nationally in 2006, adults aged 18 to 34 with a learning disability were 23 percent less likely to be enrolled in school or have completed some college than their peers without learning disabilities (Appendix I). Statistics show that the retention rates in postsecondary education among students with disabilities have also been considerably low.⁶

Given the high unemployment⁷ and poverty rates⁸ of persons with disabilities, increasing the participation of students with disabilities in postsecondary education is an important goal. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics indicate that students with disabilities who do manage to graduate from college exhibit similar labor market outcomes as their peers without disabilities.⁹ The Demonstration Program provides the professional development and technical assistance services that can help meet the needs of and improve outcomes for postsecondary students with disabilities.

During the course of their three-year projects, Demonstration Program grantees record and analyze the results of the project-related activities they have implemented and collect data based on program specific performance indicators. These performance indicators help assess and measure each project's progress. Departmental review of each project's annual performance report by program staff assists in the determination of the program's overall impact.

⁵ Wagner, M., Newman, L., Cameto, R., and Levine, P. (2005). *Changes over time in the early postschool outcomes of youth with disabilities. A report of findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) and the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Comparisons of data from NLTS and NLTS2 document education after high school, including participation in 2-year or 4-year colleges or postsecondary vocational, business, or technical schools.

⁶National Council on Disability, (2003). *People with Disabilities and Postsecondary Education*. Washington, DC: Author.

⁷In March 2010, the percentage of people with disabilities in the labor force was 22.5. By comparison, the percentage of persons with no disability in the labor force is 70.2. Office of Disability Employment Policy, March 2010. The employment rate of working-age people with disabilities is only half the rate of people without disabilities – 38% compared to 78% in 2005. (National Council on Disability, 2007.)

⁸ 24% of students with disabilities live in poverty, compared with 16% in the general population. (U.S. Department of Education, 27th Annual Report to Congress) Working age Americans with disabilities are more than twice as likely to live in poverty as other Americans. Stapleton, D. C., O'Day, B., Livermore, G. A., & Imparato, A. J. (2005, July). *Dismantling the Poverty Trap: Disability Policy for the 21st Century*. Rehabilitation Research and Training Center for Economic Research on Employment Policy for Persons with Disabilities, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/edicollect/124>

⁹ U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *Students With Disabilities in Postsecondary Education: A Profile of Preparation, Participation, and Outcomes*, NCES 1999–187, by Laura Horn and Jennifer Berktold. Project Officer: Larry Bobbitt. Washington DC: 1999. Laura Horn and Jennifer Berktold. Project Officer: Larry Bobbitt. Washington DC: 1999. Laura Horn and Jennifer Berktold. Project Officer: Larry Bobbitt. Washington DC: 1999.

Legislative Purpose and Changes Since 1999

This report reflects the structure and authorized activities of the program under Title VII, Part D of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA), prior to passage of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315) (HEOA) on August 14, 2008.¹⁰

The legislation authorizes the awarding of three-year grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements to IHEs on a competitive basis. This program supports innovative proposals from IHEs to improve their ability to provide a quality postsecondary education for students with disabilities. Authorized activities include the development of teaching methods and strategies, the synthesis of research and information, and the provision of professional development and training sessions. Each grantee is required to evaluate its project and disseminate effective practices to other IHEs.

The Secretary of Education, in making awards, is expected to provide an equitable geographic distribution of grants, distribute grants to both urban and rural areas, ensure the activities are developed for a range of types and sizes of IHEs, and include IHEs with demonstrated prior experience.

Department of Education Management

The Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) administers the Demonstration Program. To facilitate sharing and collaboration among grantees, the program office sponsors annual, in-person, technical assistance workshops. These workshops provide an opportunity for grantees to network, share project highlights, and offer resources for similar project-related activities.

Over the years, the Department has strengthened its commitment to developing a partnership between the program office and grantees and to creating forums for the exchange of topic-specific information. For example, the Demonstration Program has added “interest circles” to the annual project director’s meeting. Prior to the meeting, grantees receive an e-mail describing several project-related topics that they are asked to rank from most interesting to least interesting. The top four topics are discussed in groups, or “interest circles,” at the annual project director’s meeting. Project directors volunteer to serve as facilitators, each developing an outline that is shared among the grantees before the meeting. All grantees are asked to participate and to come prepared to share sound, proven information about topics and resources.

In addition to the in-person technical assistance workshops, OPE has held technical assistance workshops via teleconference for all potential grantees. Grantee feedback and personal observations by the Demonstration Program office have shaped the conference calls into more project-specific topics that are beneficial for both novice and seasoned project directors.

¹⁰ The text of the relevant section of the HEA is in Appendix III.

Dissemination of Findings

The HEA mandates that grantees use some of the grant funds for evaluation of the effect of their activities and dissemination of the results of the projects to other institutions of higher education. In addition to sharing information with peers through OPE-sponsored technical assistance events, grantees disseminate best practices through various national and regional level meetings and conferences. Project directors also publish reports and articles in highly respected publications, and various project materials are made available to the public through Web sites. A listing of dissemination efforts and Web links is included in this report in sections VI, VII and VIII. As the main federal funding stream dedicated to improving postsecondary instruction for students with disabilities, the Demonstration Program plays an important role in informing other institutions about evidence-based strategies.

Authorizations and Average Funding Per Grantee

As Table 1 shows, annual funding for grantees has ranged from \$238,095 to \$301,913. The number of new grantees has ranged from 21 to 27 per cohort year.

Table 1. Number of New and Continuing grants awarded and Appropriation Amounts

Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Number of new awards	Number of continuing awards	Average funding per award
1999	\$5,000,000	21	0	\$238,095
2000	\$5,000,000	0	21	\$238,095
2001	\$6,000,000	0	21	\$285,714
2002	\$7,000,000	27	0	\$259,259
2003	\$6,954,500	0	27	\$257,574
2004	\$6,912,971	0	27	\$256,036
2005	\$6,944,000	23	0	\$301,913
2006	\$6,874,560	0	23	\$298,894
2007	\$6,874,560	0	23	\$298,894
2008	\$6,755,000	23	0	\$293,696

Source: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education Program data; and Program Annual Performance Reports (APRs)

Grantee Description

Some grantees have received more than one grant since the program began. Table 2 shows, for each cohort, the proportion of grantees with prior grants. First-time grantees were a majority of the grantees in three out of four cohorts.

During the program’s 10-year span, grantees from two-year institutions composed 13 percent of the total grantees, while those from rural institutions made up four percent.

Table 2. Number of New Grantees and School Demographic Distribution

First Cohort Year	Number of Grantees	Number of Prior Grantees (%)	Number of Two-Year Schools (%)	Number of Rural Schools (%)
1999	21	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
2002	27	12 (44%)	4 (15%)	1 (4%)
2005	23	9 (39%)	5 (22%)	1 (4%)
2008	23	12 (52%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)
1999–2008	94	33 (35%)	12 (13%)	4 (4%)

Source: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education Program data and Program Annual Performance Reports (APRs)

The HEA requires that grant awards must result in an equitable geographic distribution. As Table 3 indicates, grantee institutions represent every region of the country with the far west and southeast having the greatest numbers of grantees.

Table 3. Geographic Distribution of Grantees

	Number of new grantees in geographic region								
New grantees	New England (CT ME MA NH RI VT)	Mid Atlantic (DE DC MD NJ NY PA)	Great Lakes (IL IN MI OH WI)	Plains (IA KS MN MO NE ND SD)	Southeast (AL AR FL GA KY LA MS NC SC TN VA WV)	Southwest (AZ NM OK TX)	Rocky Mountains (CO ID MT UT WY)	Far West (AK CA HI NV OR WA)	Outlying areas (AS FM GU MH MP PR PW VI)
1999–2008	14	9	15	6	16	7	5	21	1
1999	4	2	3	2	4	1	1	4	0
2002	5	3	6	1	4	3	2	3	0
2005	2	2	3	1	4	1	1	8	1
2008	3	2	3	2	4	2	1	6	0

Source: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education Program data and Program Annual Performance Reports (APRs)

III. Program Results and Outcomes

The Department has established two measures to assess the performance of this program in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Additional information about GPRA may be found at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/mgmt-gpra/gplaw2m.aspx>

(1) The percentage of faculty trained in project activities that incorporate elements of training into their classroom teaching; and (2) the difference between the rate at which students with documented disabilities complete courses taught by faculty trained in project activities, and the rate at which other students complete those courses.

Each project collected data from faculty trained through grant activities and from students attending classes taught by these faculty members. These data reflect completion of faculty training as well as student completion of courses taught by faculty who participated in training. Data reported for the 2006-07 academic year showed that the

percentage of faculty trained through project activities that incorporated elements of their training into their classroom teaching exceeded the program's target goal (94 percent actual, 88 percent target).

Students with documented disabilities successfully completed courses taught by faculty trained through project activities at a higher rate than students with no documented disabilities. Students with disabilities averaged a grade-point average in these courses one percent better than those with no documented disabilities during the 2006-07 academic year. This exceeded the target goal which was to have students with disabilities score 5.1 percent less (or better) than those students with no documented disabilities. The following table highlights each school's performance measures as well as the median of all institutions.

Table 1. Disabilities Demo Grantee-level Performance Results: 2006-07, Separated by Institutional Affiliation

Program Performance Measures

Grantee	State	Institutional Affiliation	Program Performance Measures	
			Percentage of faculty trained through project activities who incorporate elements of their training into their classroom teaching	Difference between the rate at which students with disabilities complete courses taught by faculty trained through project activities and the rate at which other students complete the same courses*
Allan Hancock Joint Community College District	CA	Public	100%	-27%
Baruch College Research Foundation	NY	Public	100%	23%**
Colorado State University	CO	Public	n/a	-3%
Eastern Washington University	WA	Public	100%	n/a
Kent State University	OH	Public	98%	-4%
Renton Technical College	WA	Public	92%	7%
San Diego State University	CA	Public	97%	3%
Sonoma State University	CA	Public	94%	-2%
St. Petersburg College	FL	Public	90%	5%
Texas A&M University	TX	Public	72%	-3%
University of Alaska - Anchorage	AK	Public	94%	-3%
University of Arkansas	AR	Public	100%	-11%
University of Hawaii	HI	Public	95%	3%
University of Massachusetts	MA	Public	89%	0%
University of Minnesota Regents	MN	Public	100%	6%
University of Southern Mississippi	MS	Public	98%	7%
University of Washington	WA	Public	90%	1%
University of Wisconsin Board of Regents	WI	Public	78%	-8%
Median of Public Institutions			95%	-1%
Bank Street College of Education	NY	Private, Non-Religious	85%	-1%
Landmark College	VT	Private, Non-Religious	58%	-3%
Universidad Metropolitana	PR	Private, Non-Religious	80%	-14%
Claflin University	SC	Private, Religious	100%	14%
DePaul University	IL	Private, Religious	71%	13%
Median of Private Institutions			80%	-1%
Median of All Institutions			94%	-1%

**Percentages were calculated by taking the percentage of students without disabilities who completed courses minus the percentage of students with disabilities who completed courses. (A negative percentage would represent that students with disabilities completed courses at a higher rate than students without disabilities.)*

***Number based on an estimate of non-program students pass rate of 90%, which is the average among all students. The 23% represents the percentage difference between students with disabilities and all other students who completed courses taught by faculty trained through project activities. (Percentage of Other Student Completion minus Percentage of Students With Disabilities Completion)*

-Source: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Demonstration Projects to Ensure Quality Higher Education for Students with Disabilities Program Grantee Performance Reports, 2006-2007

-This analysis includes those grantees in 2006-07 (n=23).

Overall the program exceeded its established targets for 2006-2007. The charts that follow show how individual grantees performed on these measures.

Chart 1 lists projects that met or exceeded both program targets for 2006-2007.

Chart 2 lists the project that did not meet either target for 2006-2007.

Chart 3 lists projects that have met one but not both of the two targets set for 2006-2007.

Chart 1

Projects That Met or Exceeded Both Program Targets*
Allan Hancock Community College
Kent State University
San Diego State University
Sonoma State University
St. Petersburg College
University of Alaska-Anchorage
University of Hawaii
University of Massachusetts-Boston
University of Washington
(n=9)

Chart 2

Projects That Met Only One Target*
Baruch College
Claflin University
Renton Technical College
University of Minnesota
University of Southern Mississippi
Bank Street College
Landmark College
Texas A&M University
Universidad Metropolitana
University of Wisconsin
(n=10)

Chart 3

Projects That Did Not Meet Either Target*
DePaul University
(n=1)

*** Colorado State, the University of Arkansas-Little Rock, and Eastern Washington did not provide one of the two measures and therefore were not included in the present figure. Santa Monica College was not included in the present figure because they voluntarily returned the grant to the Department during the early stages of the project's first year.**

Source: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education Program data; Program Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Authorized Activities

The legislation authorizes three broad types of activities: development of innovative, effective, and efficient teaching methods and strategies; synthesis of research and other information related to the provision of postsecondary educational services to students with disabilities; and the provision of professional development and training sessions for faculty and administrators from other IHEs to enable them to meet the postsecondary needs of students with disabilities.

The information below gives examples of activities undertaken by grantees in each of these categories.

(Note: Universal Design for Learning provides a blueprint for creating flexible goals, methods, materials, and assessments that accommodate learner differences. It is meant to underscore the need for multiple approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners.)

Examples:

Development of Teaching Methods and Strategies

Grantee: Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin (UW), Madison, WI (FY '05).

The Director of the Teaching and Excellence Center at UW-Platteville worked with several faculty members to design a multi-disciplinary course on Universal Design, incorporating the use of the ACCESS-ed Web site and measurement tools for course activity. UW-Milwaukee incorporated ACCESS-ed Project resources and strategies in an interdisciplinary course entitled Design and Disability. Both courses have been repeated two to three times, and have attracted students from a variety of programs, including education, engineering, architecture, and occupational therapy, as well as employers from the community who have interest in incorporating Universal Design (UD) into work activities.

Grantee: Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, IL (FY '99). At Northern Illinois, the Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center (FDIDC) is responsible for providing faculty with technical assistance which enhances their ability to instruct. The topic of persons with disabilities was covered as part of the popular Multicultural Curriculum Transformation Institute offered each May. Additional workshops, focused on specific topics related to making courses and the campus more accessible, were offered under the auspices of this grant.

FDIDC offers assistance to faculty (and graduate teaching assistants) on the development of accessible Web and related electronic resources for classroom instruction. The series of workshops offered has been heavily attended and highly rated. Individual faculty members have also identified “respected” journals in their areas of expertise that cover “instructional topics” related to their area. Working with these faculty (who attended the training and participated in the project) to publish in these journals on the topic of making

classes and programs in their subject area accessible to students with disabilities proved very valuable as this translated into positive reviews for tenure or promotion.

Synthesizing Research and Information

Grantee: Springfield Technical Community College (STCC), Springfield, MA (FY '02). STCC employed a two-pronged approach that: (1) applied the most current research on learning to the practice of classroom teaching, and (2) examined attitudes, values, and beliefs of individuals and of the campus community. In year one, STCC built upon a successful model of faculty training in Universal Design (UD) that was first implemented at STCC with funding from the National Science Foundation. Faculty from the math and science departments served as peer trainers for faculty from the humanities, social and behavioral sciences, business, and health occupations. Concurrent with UD training, a series of workshops was offered. These included a workshop on the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and its implications for higher education, a "brown bag luncheon" series of facilitated discussions examining attitudes towards students with disabilities, and other topics, as identified through surveys and focus groups of faculty, staff, and administrators. Attendance at an ADA workshop became part of the standard orientation for all new employees.

The Disability Service Coordinators from seven western Massachusetts colleges, (Holyoke Community College, Greenfield Community College, Berkshire Community College, Springfield College, Western New England College, Mount Holyoke College, and Elms College) formed a consortium to serve as an advisory board to the project. Campus disability coordinators were responsible for assessing the training needs of faculty, staff, and administrators on their campuses. Employees from consortium campuses were invited to participate in all training opportunities offered throughout the project. Year two activities included the design and offering of a graduate level course in UD for faculty from STCC's graduate program in Disability Studies. The course was piloted at STCC and offered to faculty from the consortium colleges in year three. Year three activities included the development of Web-based curricula that will enable Springfield College to offer the course through a variety of distance learning formats.

The consortium of seven two-year and four-year colleges brought to bear their collective expertise in the design and delivery of programs for students with disabilities. The inclusion of urban and rural campuses added a dimension to both needs assessment and training design. The combined experience of the seven campuses, each with unique demographics, allowed STCC to design a comprehensive and broadly replicable program that would be of benefit to institutions nationwide.

Provision of Professional Development and Training Sessions

Grantee: San Diego State University, San Diego, CA (FY '05). The overarching goal of the *Disability & Diversity* project at San Diego State University (SDSU) – Interwork Institute was to enhance the knowledge and skills of administrators, faculty, and staff through a universal model linking disability and diversity in postsecondary education. Project objectives included: increasing the number of administrators, faculty, and staff

who are knowledgeable about disability, assistive technology, and universal teaching and learning; increasing the number of administrators, faculty, and staff who possess the skills and competencies necessary for supporting and teaching students with disabilities; and increasing access to and dissemination of resources on disability and diversity.

The total number of courses revised by trained faculty stands at 130 (98 percent of all faculty trained). Faculty reported that they were applying the strategies and innovations covered in the training to their courses. Other participants who did not teach (i.e., administrators) also actively incorporated Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and related strategies into their programs and services, thereby impacting students indirectly.

Grantee: Landmark College, Putney, VT (FY '08). In February 2009, Steve Fadden, the Director of the Institute for Research and Training at Landmark College in Vermont, gave a presentation entitled, "Rationale, Implementation, and Results from Landmark College: A Needs-Based Professional Development Program to Support Students with Learning Disabilities in the Community College Setting Demo Disabilities Program." The cost to set up and maintain a project Web site can be substantial for Demonstration Program grantees. Among the topics Mr. Fadden discussed was the cost-effective means he used to disseminate his project-related materials. He noted:

In addition to using open source content management systems like Moodle, we have also gained support from our partners. When they see value in our materials, we ask them if they would like to host them to provide access to educators in the region. This results in Landmark being able to disseminate more broadly than would otherwise be possible, and it results in no server or Web maintenance costs for us. Other institutions see value in the content, and so are willing to host presentations locally for their faculty, staff, and regional partners. We are following standards that allow us to readily pack and transport our materials for others to use.

(Note: Moodle is a Course Management System (CMS), also known as a Learning Management System (LMS) or a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). It is a free Web application that educators can use to create effective online learning sites.)

Grantee: Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA (FY '05). In October 2008, Brett Christie, the Director of the Center for Teaching and Professional Development at Sonoma State University, gave a conference call presentation to all grantees in the cohort entitled, "ELIXR: A Solution for Faculty and Resource Development in UDL." During his presentation, several points of interest were discussed. Among them were: (1) a user community that is available to share best practices related to the implementation of the UDL video cases (e.g., one-hour workshop, half-day, full-day as part of new faculty orientation and as part of university system-wide accessibility efforts); (2) an opportunity for additional programs to author resources using the ELIXR Model;¹¹ and (3) improved

¹¹ ELIXR-Engaging Learners in X-a topic or a task- with R- A MERLOT Resource. (MERLOT-multimedia educational resource for learning and online teaching has over 60,000 members and over 20,000 resources as of August 2008).

faculty development opportunities, leading to direct classroom impact and support for students with disabilities.

Grantee: University of Washington, Seattle, WA. (FY '05). In 1999, DO-IT implemented professional development training sessions to prepare postsecondary faculty and administrators to fully include students with disabilities in courses. *DO-IT Prof* partners, selected in a competitive process, represented 46 postsecondary institutions, each paired with a local collaborator school with different demographics, resulting in a diverse group of 23 four-year and 23 two-year institutions. Project partners collaborated to: (1) conduct focus groups with students with disabilities and faculty; (2) maintain communication via email, telephone, and on-site meetings; (3) create curricula and resource materials; (4) develop, rigorously field test, and implement professional development programs for faculty and academic administrators; (5) work with an external evaluator to measure results; and (6) disseminate materials nationwide. Staff and partners delivered 250 training sessions to 6,500 faculty, administrators, and teaching assistants to help them understand relevant legislation, learn about campus resources, apply UD to instruction, and accommodate students with disabilities. Responding to the diverse content and scheduling needs of faculty, six training modules were created. They include a 20-30 minute overview for a departmental meeting, full-day workshops on specific topics, public television presentations, and Web-based instruction.

A total of 8,000 publications and videos on UD instruction and accommodating students with disabilities have been distributed. Concise handouts provided teaching strategies, and a comprehensive train-the-trainer curriculum included an overview of research, presentation outlines, scripts, videos, visual aids, and reference materials for six models of professional development.

Evidence of Sustainability

Grantee: University of Washington, Seattle, WA (FY '05). Partner institutions reported systemic changes toward more inclusive campuses and professional organizations, some of which are shared online (DO-IT). These include policies to promote UD through faculty mentorships and training, disability-related statements for syllabi, accessible Web and distance learning design, use of student technology fees to purchase assistive technology, captioned videos on institutional Web pages, the *AccessCollege* Campus Accessibility Indicators, and accessibility improvements of conferences. Receiving grants for each of the first three project periods since the beginning of the Demonstration Program has enhanced the University of Washington's ability to implement best practices, expand its reach, and increase its project impact, as demonstrated below.

AccessCollege (2005-2009) is the second project grant the University of Washington received under the Demonstration Program. *AccessCollege* continued to host and refine professional development activities for faculty and student service personnel and established more comprehensive interventions, such as the Summer Institute for Faculty

and Academic Administrators; identified, validated, and applied Campus Accessibility Indicators (DO-IT, 2007a); and worked with professional organizations to implement measurable change in the accessibility of their conferences, publications, and Web sites. Project outcomes include the following:

Training. Staff and partners delivered 130 presentations to 4,000 administrators, student service administrators and support staff, faculty, and teaching assistants.

Web site. *The Center for Universal Design in Education (CUDE)* was created to promote the universal design of educational entities; the *CUDE* includes 192 searchable articles.

Publications. 154,000 publications and videos were distributed (see Appendix G). Project staff edited a book, *Universal Design in Higher Education: From Principles to Practice*, published by Harvard Education Press (Burgstahler & Cory, 2008). The 44 authors include many leaders in OPE-funded projects; they synthesized research and shared specific applications of UD to instruction, information technology (IT), student services, and physical spaces. The project created concise publications and a train-the-trainer notebook, *Building Capacity for a Welcoming and Accessible Postsecondary Institution* (Burgstahler, 2007b).

Evidence of Sustainability via the *AccessCollege* Project is as follows:

- University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW-Madison) is currently working on a new procurement policy that addresses accessibility.
- The Campus Accessibility/Usability Committee was formed at UW-Madison and was instrumental in the development and hiring of a new provost position for equity and diversity. The definition of diversity now includes disability.
- Every academic department at Florida State University uses the personalized DO-IT publication “Working Together: Faculty and Students with Disabilities” to promote accessibility for students.
- At the University of Washington-Seattle, diversity issues are more broadly defined to include disability in the College of Engineering, other units, and the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity.
- At the University of Washington-Seattle, a multidisciplinary disability studies program emerged in the Law School.
- Johnson and Wales University--Providence, Rhode Island, is in the process of making all texts on campus available through e-text. Many of the materials are available only through their campus and were written by their faculty, so they have procured hardware and software to convert all texts to electronic format.
- At Green River Community College--Auburn, Washington, Universal Design processes have been implemented for all student service offices through intensive three-stage staff workshops.
- The University of Florida has begun to video caption all pre-recorded materials for classes and campus presentations.

- Arizona State University is working to develop and implement a policy that mandates universally designed and captioned video/Web content on their campuses.
- The University of Minnesota-Duluth includes a statement on their syllabi related to accommodations for students with disabilities.
- Des Moines Area Community College has implemented a scheduled Universal Design and accommodations training for all faculty and adjunct faculty on their campus.
- At Kutztown University, (Kutztown, PA), the Provost's Office has instructed faculty to include a statement on their syllabi about students with disabilities.
- On a national level, two *AccessCollege* Team members who have worked with the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) have brought about systemic change in that all ACPA conferences will have adaptive equipment set up for attendees with disabilities to access computers.

Grantee: Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI (FY '05). The ACCESS-ed Project strategies were developed in conjunction with a commitment to Universal Design institutionalization on the 26 University of Wisconsin (UW) System campuses. Over the course of the ACCESS-ed Project, a shift has occurred to developing policies for Web accessibility and adopting Universal Design as the process toward greater inclusiveness and accessibility on several UW campuses.

The ACCESS-ed Project has instituted a system of dissemination for infusing Universal Design on campuses through Departmental Accessibility Resource Coordinators (DARCs). This system has been institutionalized on four campuses: UW--Platteville, UW--Milwaukee, UW--Madison, and UW--LaCrosse. Other campuses are remaining active in developing DARC systems on their campuses for the dissemination of Universal Design information and resources. DARCs receive training and have been instrumental in providing research support, and in disseminating UD resources to colleagues.

Measurement of accessibility on postsecondary campuses has been a focus of the ACCESS-ed Project. Measurement tools and Accessibility and Universal Design Information Tools (AUDITs) have been adopted for use on several campuses within the UW System and at Misericordia College, in Dallas, PA. The UW-Milwaukee campus has looked to the ACCESS-ed Project staff to assist in planning modifications to the library, elevators, computer kiosk stations, and several other campus undertakings. Building design and building construction staff have learned some of the accessibility guidelines that meet ADA preferred standards, which exceed the minimum.

IV. APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Percentage of population and average difference in percentage of population aged 18 to 34 with or without a learning disability enrolled in school or having completed at least some college in the nation and by state: 2006

	Percentage of population aged 18 to 34 with a learning disability enrolled in school or having completed at least some college	Percentage of population aged 18 to 34 with no learning disability enrolled in school or having completed at least some college	Average difference in percentage of population aged 18 to 34 with and without a learning disability enrolled in school or having completed at least some college
Nation	41%	64%	23%
Alabama	35%	60%	25%
Alaska	63%	62%	-1%
Arizona	48%	59%	11%
Arkansas	31%	57%	26%
California	44%	61%	17%
Colorado	47%	64%	17%
Connecticut	57%	70%	13%
Delaware	37%	65%	28%
District of Columbia	51%	79%	28%
Florida	38%	60%	22%
Georgia	35%	60%	25%
Hawaii	25%	65%	40%
Idaho	39%	61%	23%
Illinois	44%	67%	23%
Indiana	37%	63%	25%
Iowa	48%	72%	23%
Kansas	45%	69%	24%
Kentucky	35%	60%	25%
Louisiana	33%	57%	25%
Maine	38%	63%	25%
Maryland	45%	68%	24%
Massachusetts	53%	73%	20%
Michigan	42%	67%	25%
Minnesota	46%	73%	27%

Mississippi	27%	61%	34%
Missouri	39%	63%	24%
Montana	31%	69%	38%
Nebraska	48%	71%	22%
Nevada	44%	53%	9%
New Hampshire	46%	70%	24%
New Jersey	42%	68%	26%
New Mexico	39%	60%	21%
New York	42%	69%	27%
North Carolina	45%	62%	18%
North Dakota	46%	76%	31%
Ohio	40%	64%	24%
Oklahoma	34%	60%	26%
Oregon	42%	64%	22%
Pennsylvania	38%	66%	28%
Rhode Island	47%	69%	22%
South Carolina	36%	59%	23%
South Dakota	44%	68%	24%
Tennessee	27%	57%	30%
Texas	42%	57%	15%
Utah	46%	67%	21%
Vermont	58%	66%	7%
Virginia	46%	67%	21%
Washington	46%	67%	21%
West Virginia	34%	57%	23%
Wisconsin	43%	66%	24%
Wyoming	35%	62%	27%
Puerto Rico	33%	63%	30%

Note: This is based on the civilian noninstitutionalized population 18 years and over and a self-reported physical, mental or emotional condition lasting six months or more that made it difficult "learning, remembering, or concentrating."

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006 American Community Survey.

APPENDIX II

Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title VII, Part D 20 U.S.C. 1140-1140d.

PART D--DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO ENSURE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE A QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION

SEC. 761. PURPOSES.

It is the purpose of this part to support model demonstration projects to provide technical assistance or professional development for faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education in order to provide students with disabilities a quality postsecondary education.

SEC. 762. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

(a) **COMPETITIVE GRANTS AUTHORIZED-** The Secretary may award grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements, on a competitive basis, to institutions of higher education, of which at least two such grants shall be awarded to institutions that provide professional development and technical assistance in order for students with learning disabilities to receive a quality postsecondary education.

(b) **DURATION; ACTIVITIES-**

(1) **DURATION-** Grants under this part shall be awarded for a period of 3 years.

(2) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES-** Grants under this part shall be used to carry out one or more of the following activities:

(A) **TEACHING METHODS AND STRATEGIES-** The development of innovative, effective, and efficient teaching methods and strategies to provide faculty and administrators with the skills and supports necessary to teach students with disabilities. Such methods and strategies may include inservice training, professional development, customized and general technical assistance, workshops, summer institutes, distance learning, and training in the use of assistive and educational technology.

(B) **SYNTHESIZING RESEARCH AND INFORMATION-** Synthesizing research and other information related to the provision of postsecondary educational services to students with disabilities.

(C) **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING SESSIONS-** Conducting professional development and training sessions for faculty and administrators from other institutions of higher education to enable the faculty and administrators to meet the postsecondary educational needs of students with disabilities.

(3) **MANDATORY EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION-** Grants under this part shall be used for evaluation, and dissemination to other institutions of higher education, of the information obtained through the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (C).

(c) **CONSIDERATIONS IN MAKING AWARDS-** In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this section, the Secretary shall consider the following:

(1) **GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION-** Providing an equitable geographic distribution of such grants.

(2) **RURAL AND URBAN AREAS-** Distributing such grants to urban and rural areas.

(3) **RANGE AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION-** Ensuring that the activities to be assisted

are developed for a range of types and sizes of institutions of higher education.

(4) **PRIOR EXPERIENCE OR EXCEPTIONAL PROGRAMS-** Institutions of higher education with demonstrated prior experience in, or exceptional programs for, meeting the postsecondary educational needs of students with disabilities.

SEC. 763. APPLICATIONS.

Each institution of higher education desiring to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this part shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require. Each application shall include--

- (1) a description of how such institution plans to address each of the activities required under this part;
- (2) a description of how the institution consulted with a broad range of people within the institution to develop activities for which assistance is sought; and
- (3) a description of how the institution will coordinate and collaborate with the office that provides services to students with disabilities within the institution.

SEC. 764. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this part shall be construed to impose any additional duty, obligation, or responsibility on an institution of higher education or on the institution's faculty, administrators, or staff than are required by section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

SEC. 765. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for this part \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

APPENDIX III

Grantee Administration and Activities

As part of the grant, grantees are given freedom to choose how to allocate funds. Table 4 gives a breakdown of how funds were allocated by grantees to this end.

Table 4. Allocation of Funds

U.S. Department of Education funds				
Budget categories	1999	2002	2005	Total
Personnel	\$8,822,656.81	\$9,662,269.73	\$9,709,669.00	\$28,194,595.54
Fringe benefits	\$2,047,029.48	\$2,411,216.03	\$2,542,041.00	\$7,000,286.51
Travel	\$569,929.80	\$1,138,810.28	\$1,050,516.00	\$2,759,256.08
Equipment	\$180,092.00	\$236,907.56	\$125,181.00	\$542,180.56
Supplies	\$341,917.00	\$733,108.23	\$804,956.00	\$1,879,981.23
Contractual	\$1,206,391.00	\$2,407,857.37	\$2,093,075.00	\$5,707,323.37
Construction	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other	\$1,451,385.85	\$1,815,491.12	\$2,233,697.00	\$5,500,573.97
Total direct costs	\$14,619,398.94	\$18,413,000.32	\$18,559,135.00	\$51,591,534.26
Indirect costs	\$1,174,587.04	\$1,423,231.12	\$1,461,480.00	\$4,059,298.16
Training stipends	\$461,981.00	\$501,465.00	\$433,144.00	\$1,396,590.00
Total costs	\$16,255,966.98	\$20,844,404.44	\$20,453,759.00	\$57,554,130.42

Source: Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education Program data; and Program Annual Performance Reports (APRs)

APPENDIX IV

Abbreviations

ACPA	American College Personnel Association
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
APR	Annual Performance Report
AUDIT	Accessibility and Universal Design Information Tools
CMS	Course Management System
CORD	Coalition for the Responsible Disabled
DARC	Departmental Accessibility Resource Coordinator
DO-IT	Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking, and Technology
DSS	Disability Student Service
ED	Department of Education
ELIXR	Engaging Learners in X-a topic or a task- with R-a MERLOT
FDIDC	Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
HEA	Higher Education Act of 1965
HEOA	Higher Education Opportunity Act, 2008
LMS	Learning Management System
MERLOT	Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching
RTC	Renton Technical College
STCC	Springfield Technical Community College
UD	Universal Design
UDE	Universal Design in Education
UDI	Universal Design for Instruction
UDL	Universal Design for Learning
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment

APPENDIX V

Meetings & Conferences

Brandon, A., Fadden, S., Trist, S., & Patton, S. 2008. Disability Support Services: Examples of Best Practices for Supporting Students with LD and ADHD in the Community College Setting. *Presented at the 31st Conference of the Association on Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD)*, Reno, NV.

Fadden, S. 2008. Understanding Community College Needs for Supporting Students with Learning Disabilities/Attention Disorders. *Poster presented at the 31st Conference of the Association on Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD)*, Reno, NV.

Fadden, S. 2007. A Best Practices Program to Support At-Risk Students in Community Colleges. *Presented at the College Board's Annual Two-Year College Showcase of Best Practices: Applying Research to Create or Improve Teaching, Student Services, or Institutional Initiatives*, October 19, 2007, Worcester, MA.

Fadden, S., and Strothman, J. 2006. Usability is more than accessibility: Supporting students with learning differences. *Presented at the 35th Annual Conference of the New England Transfer Association*, April 24-25, New Castle, NH.

Behling, K. (2005, August). Exploring the Universal Course Design Website. Poster Session presented at 27th annual Association for Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD) conference, Milwaukee, WI.

Behling, K. (2006, April). Faculty Development through Universal Course Design: Strategies for Disability Coordinators. Work presented at AHEAD, New England, Wellesley, MA.

Behling, K (2006, July). UCD Means Access for Everyone. Paper presented at AHEAD, San Diego, CA.

Behling, K. & Hart, D. (November, 2006). Equity and Excellence in Higher Education. Work presented at the U.S. Department of Education annual meeting, Albuquerque, NM.

Behling, K. & Hart, D. (December, 2006). Universal Course Design: Increasing Access to Postsecondary Education for Students with Disabilities. TASH, Baltimore, MD.

Behling, K. & Amirhosseini, Z. (January, 2007). Universal Course Design: A Model of Faculty Professional Development. Center for the Improvement of Teaching, Boston, MA.

Behling, K. (March, 2007). Universally Designing Pre-Schools. Boston Ready Conference, Boston, MA.

Behling, K. (April, 2007). Making Pre-School Accessible for All. Boston Head Start, Boston, MA.

Behling, K. (May, 2007). Universal Course Design: Increasing Access to the Library for All Students. NH Library Association Annual Conference, Bretton Woods, NH.

Behling, K. (July, 2007). Universally Designing College Curricula: Step-by Step Tools for Faculty and DSS personal. AHEAD, Charlotte, NC.

Behling, K. (October, 2007). Universal Course Design: A Model of Professional Development for Faculty. Fifth Annual Conference of the New England Center for Inclusive Teaching, Boston, MA.

Behling, K. (November, 2007). Universally Designing College Curricula: Step-by-step tools for faculty and DSS personal. New England ADHEAD conference, Boston, MA.

Behling, K. (November, 2007). Universal Course Design: Assuring Access to College for Everyone. Think College Conference, Detroit, MI.

Behling, K & Perlson, V. (November, 2007). Universally Designing College: Tips for DSS Personnel Across the World. World Usability Day Conference, Hanover, NH.

Behling, K. & Hart, D. (December, 2007). Universal Course Design: Increasing Access to Postsecondary Education for Students with Disabilities. TASH, Seattle, WA.

Behling, K. & Gragoudas, S. (April 2008). Youth Leadership Empowers Faculty to Turn to Universal Course Design. The Council for Exceptional Children, Boston, MA.

Behling, K. (July 2008). The Universally Designed Syllabus. AHEAD Pre-Conference. Reno, NV.

Behling, K. (January 2009). Universal Course Design 101. Northeastern University. Boston, MA.

Hart, D. & Behling, K. (2005, November). Promoting Inclusion in Postsecondary Education through Universal Course Design. Paper Presented at TASH, Milwaukee, WI.

Hart, D., & Behling, K (2005, December). Universal Design in Service Learning. Paper presented at the National Service Learning Conference, Washington, DC.

Hart, D. (April 2008). Capacity Building Institute at Pac Rim Annual Conference, Honolulu, HI.

June 2007- Workshop on Universal Design for Teaching and Learning (Ireland Delegation of Educators and Rehabilitation Professionals).

October 2007- Lecture on Universal Design for Learning (Delegation of Educators from China).

June 2008- Educational Leadership Program (American Samoa-San Diego State University)

July 2008- Diversity in Action (AHEAD conference)

January 2009- Universal Design for Learning (SDSU Spring Fast Track Course Design Institute)

February 2009 Psychological Needs of Returning Veterans.

DiMascio, M. 2006. "UDI Workshop." Instructor professional development conference, Community College of Vermont, Burlington, VT.

Mason, E. 2006. "Let's Talk Learning." Faculty professional development meeting, Community College of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, PA.

Patton, S. 2006. Dissemination activity (brochure distribution) conducted at Texas Region IV Dyslexia Conference, Houston, TX.

Patton, S. 2006. Dissemination activity (brochure distribution) conducted at League for Innovation conference, Charlotte, NC.

Reno, J. 2006. "Faculty Close Up." Local cable television news show, Houston Community College, Houston, TX.

Trist, S. 2006. "Campus Chat." Local cable television news show, Western Nevada College, Carson City, NV.

APPENDIX VI

Project-Related Published Reports

Adams, E., & Fadden, S. 2005. Lessons from Landmark: Serving Students with Learning Differences. *Community College Leader*, 1(1), November, 2005.

Alexandrin, J. R., Schreiber, I. L., & Henry, E. (2008). Why not disclose? In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 377-392). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington: DC: Authors.

Arendale, D., & Ghere, D. (2008). Teaching college history using Universal Instructional Design. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 119-130). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Atkins, B.J. (1996). Envisioning the future: Diversity in rehabilitation. *Rehabilitation Education*, 10(2), 211-223.

Atkins, B.J. (2006). Women leaders in rehabilitation: Multicultural-diversity opportunities and issues. *Journal of Rehabilitation Administration*. 30, 3, pp. 203-212.

Atkinson, D. (2004). *Counseling American minorities* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Axelson, J.A. (1993). *Counseling and development in a multicultural society*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Ayala, E.C. & Christie, B. (2009). *Engaging diverse learners through Universal Design for learning*. Manuscript to be submitted for publication in March, 2009.

Ayala, E.C. (2008). Universal Design for learning in higher education: Practical applications. *Institute for Teaching and Learning: Connections*, 1 (4).

Barajas, H. L., & Higbee, J. L. (2003). Where do we go from here? Universal Design as a model for multicultural education. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 285-290). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.

Behling, K. (September 2008). "Universal Course Design: Leveling the Playing Field for all Learners". RAP News Brief. Concord, NH.

Behling, K. & Hart, D. (May 2008). Universal Course Design: A Model of Professional Development: Strategies for bringing UCD to a College Campus and Ensuring its Sustainability. In Burgstahler, S., *Universal Design in Post-Secondary Education: From Principles to Practice*, Seattle, Washington.

Behling, K. (Ed.) (2008) Beyond Access: Universal Design to Promote Full Inclusion. *TASH Connections*, 34, 3, May/June 2008.

Behling, K. (2008). Going through the front door with Universal Design. *TASH Connections*, 34, 3, May/June 2008.

Behling, K. (2008). Getting In and Staying In: Postsecondary Education for Students with Intellectual Disabilities. *TASH Connections*, 34, 3, May/June 2008.

Behling, K. (Summer 2005). "Opening College Doors Wider with Universal Course Design". RAP News Brief. Concord, NH.

Brandon, A., Fadden, S., Trist, S., & Patton, S. 2008. Disability Support Services: Examples of Best Practices for Supporting Students with LD and ADHD in the Community College Setting. *Presented at the 31st Conference of the Association on Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD)*, Reno, NV.

Brothen, T., & Wambach, C. (2008). Universal Instructional Design in a computer-based psychology course. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 165-181). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Bruch, P. L., Higbee, J. L., & Siaka, K. (2007). Multiculturalism, Incorporated: Student perspectives. *Innovative Higher Education*, 32, 139-152.

Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R. R., Jacobs, W. R., & Ghare, D. (2004). Enabling access: Toward multicultural developmental curricula. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 27(3), 12-14, 16, 18-19.

Bruch, P. L., Jehangir, R. R., Lundell, D. B., Higbee, J. L., & Miksch, K. L. (2005). Communicating across differences: Toward a multicultural approach to institutional transformation. *Innovative Higher Education*, 29, 195-208.

Brueggemann, B., & Braun, C.C. (2003). Teaching, writing, disabilities. In Cheryl Glenn (Ed.), *Harbrace handbook for teachers*. Heinle/Thompson.

Brueggemann, B., Braun, C.C., & Sasso, M. (journal article in review). Making

composition accessible. *College Composition and Communication*.

Brueggemann, B., & Leweicki-Wilson, C. (book manuscript in review). *Teaching, writing, disabilities: A resource and reader*. Bedford/St. Martin's Press.

Bucher, R.D. (2004). *Diversity consciousness*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Burgstahler, S. (2002a), Distance learning: Universal Design, universal access. *Educational Technology Review*, 10(1). Retrieved May 24, 2006, from http://www.editlib.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Reader.ViewAbstract&paper_id=17776

Burgstahler, S. (2002b). The value of DO-IT to kids who did it! *Exceptional Parent*, 32(11), 79-86.

Cartwright, B. & D'Andrea, M. (2004). Counseling for diversity. In T.F. Riggart & D.R. Maki (Eds.), *Handbook for rehabilitation counseling* (pp. 171-187). Springer Publishing Co.

Casey, D. A. (2008). An administrative approach to Universal Design in allied health sciences. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 321-336). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Chang, M.J. (2005) Reconsidering the diversity rationale. *Liberal Education*, 91(1), 6-13.

Cunningham, D., Souma, A., & Gilmore Holman, K. (2008). Training professional and faculty advisors in Universal Design principles. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 337-348). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Duquaine-Watson, J. M. (2006) Understanding and combating the digital divide for single mother college students: A case study. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25, 570-584.

Duquaine-Watson, J. M. (2008). Computing technologies, the digital divide, and "universal" instructional methods. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 437-449). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Duranczyk, I. M., & Fayon, A. K. (2008). Successful undergraduate mathematics through Universal Design of essential course components, pedagogy, and assessment. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional*

transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education (pp. 137-153). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Evans, N. J. (2008). Theoretical foundations of Universal Instructional Design. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 11-23). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Fleischer, D.Z. & Zames, F. (2001). *The disability rights movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Foster Heckman, E., Brown, S. E. and Roberts, K. D. (2007). Mentoring Partnership Project: Exploring Mentoring Practices for Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education. HEATH Resource Newsletter.

Gander, MacLean & Strothman, Stuart W., Eds. Teaching Writing to Students with Learning Disabilities A Landmark College Guide. Landmark College, Putney, VT, 2001.

Goff, E., & Higbee, J. L. (2008a). *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation (PASS IT) implementation guidebook for faculty and instructional staff*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Goff, E., & Higbee, J. L. (2008b). *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation (PASS IT) implementation guidebook for student development and learning support*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Guillermo, M. (2003). Higher education administrators and students with disabilities: A survey of administrator knowledge and training needs (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64, 1189.

Hackman, H. W. (2008). Broadening the pathway to academic success: The critical intersection of Social Justice Education, Critical Multicultural Education, and Universal Instructional Design. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 25-48). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Hatch, J. T., Ghore, D. L., & Jirik, K. N. (2008). Empowering students with severe disabilities: A case study. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 393-403). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on

Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Henderson, C. (1999). *College freshmen with disabilities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Higbee, J. L. (2008b). Institutional transformation: Some concluding thoughts. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 481-484). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Higbee, J. L. (2008). Student diversity. In R. Flippo & D. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategies research* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Higbee, J. L., & Barajas, H. L. (2007). Building effective places for multicultural learning. *About Campus*, 12(3), 16-22.

Higbee, J. L., Chung, C. J., & Hsu, L. (2008). Enhancing the inclusiveness of first-year courses through Universal Instructional Design. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 61-77). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Higbee, J. L., & Eaton, S. B. (2008). Implementing Universal Design in learning centers. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 217-224). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Higbee, J. L., & Goff, E. (2008). *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Higbee, J. L., & Kalivoda, K. S. (2008). The first-year experience. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 245-253). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Higbee, J. L., Lee, P. H., Bardill, J. R., & Cardinal, H. D. (2008). Student evaluations of the effectiveness of implementing Universal Instructional Design. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 367-375). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Higbee, J. L., Siaka, K., & Bruch, P. L. (2007a). Assessing our commitment to multiculturalism: Student perspectives. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 37(2), 7-25.

Hirschman, A.M., (January 2009) *Reframing Disability: Multiple Intersections and Universal Design*. ALERT Newsletter, Association of Higher Education and Disability. <http://www.ahead.org/node/364#5>

Horn C. & Glider, W. (2006). Providing laboratory accommodations for students with disabilities. *Proceedings for the Association for Biology Laboratory Educators*.

Horn, C. (2006) *Building Accepting Campus Communities Faculty Guide to Accommodation*. University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Houtenville, A.J. (2005). *Disability statistics in the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Rehabilitation Research and Training Center. Retrieved on 2/15/05 from www.disabilitystatistics.org.

Izzo, M.V. & Carlton, P. (2000). Promoting the success of students with disabilities: The Ohio State University. *Impact: Feature Issue on Postsecondary Education for Students with Disabilities*. MN: Institute on Community Integration, 1 (13).

Izzo, M.V., Hertzfeld, J.E. & Aaron, J.H. (2001) Raising the bar: Student self-determination + good teaching = success. *The Journal of Vocational Special Needs Education*.

Izzo, M.V., Hertzfeld, J.E., Simmons-Reed, E., & Aaron, J.H. (2001). Promising Practices: Improving the Quality of Higher Education for Students with Disabilities. *Disability Services Quarterly*. University of Hawaii at Manoa. Disability Studies Center.

Izzo, M.V. & Lamb, M. (in press) Developing self-determination through career development activities: Implications for vocational rehabilitation counselors. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*.

Izzo, M.V. & Lamb, M. (2002). *Self-determination and career development: Skills for successful transition to postsecondary education and employment*. A white paper developed for the Post-School Outcomes Network of the National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Available on line from NCSET, University of Hawaii at: <http://www.ncset.hawaii.edu/publications/default.htm>

Izzo, M.V. & Murray, A.J. (2003) Applying Universal Design for Learning principles to enhance achievement of college students. Available on line from Technology Enhanced Learning and Research at Ohio State University at: http://telr-research.osu.edu/learning_objects/index.html

James, P., & Kader, T. (2008). Practicing Universal Instructional Design in visual art courses. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 87-105). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Kinney, D. P., & Kinney, L. S. (2008). Computer-mediated learning in mathematics and Universal Instructional Design. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 155-163). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Leung, P. & Atkins, B.J. (2007). Multicultural rehabilitation: An historical perspective. In P. Leung, C.R. Flowere, W.B. Talley, & P. Sanderson (eds). *Multicultural issues in Rehabilitation and allied Health Linn Creek, MO:Aspen Professional Services*.

Leung, P., Flowers, C., Talley, W., & Sanderson, P. (Eds.) (2006). *Multicultural issues in rehabilitation and allied health*. Linn Creek, MO: Aspen Professional Services.

Longmore, P.K. & Umansky, L. (2001). *The new disability history: American perspective*. NY: New York University Press.

McCarthy, D. (in press). The informed use of simulation activities: A personal perspective. In J. L. Higbee & A. A. Mitchell (Eds.), *Making good on the promise: Student affairs professionals with disabilities*. Washington, DC: ACPA—College Student Educators International and University Press of America.

Miksch, K. L. (2008). Universal Instructional Design in a legal studies classroom. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 107-112). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Moriarty, M.A. (2007). Inclusive Pedagogy: Teaching Methodologies to Reach Diverse Students in Science Instruction. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 40(3).

Moriarty, M.A. (2006). Inclusive Pedagogy for Diverse Learners: Science Instruction, Disability, and the Community College. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Murray, C., Wren, C., Stevens, E., & Keys, C. (under review) "Promoting University Faculty and Staff Awareness of Students With Learning Disabilities: An Overview of the Productive Learning Strategies Project." *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*.

Murray, C. Lombardi, A., & Wren, C. T. (under review). The effects of disability-focused training on the attitudes and perceptions of university staff. *Remedial and Special Education*.

Murray, C. Lombardi, A., Wren, C. T., & Keys, C. (in press). The effects of disability-focused training, types of training, and training duration on university faculty attitudes and perceptions regarding university students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*.

Murray, C., Flannery, B., Wren, C. (in press). University staff members' attitudes and knowledge about learning disabilities and disability support services. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*.

Murray, C. Wren, C. T., & Keys, C. (in press). University faculty attitudes regarding students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*.

Myers, K. A. (2008). Infusing Universal Instructional Design into student personnel graduate programs. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 291-304). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Opitz, D. L., & Block, L. (2008). Universal learning support design: Maximizing learning beyond the classroom. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 205-216). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Sharby, N., & Roush, S. E. (2008). The application of Universal Instructional Design in experiential education. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 305-320). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Shaw, M. E., Kampsen, A., Broad, C. A., & Albecker, A. (2008). Universal Design in advising principles and practices. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 231-244). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Shea, Lynne & Strothman, Stuart, Eds. Teaching in the Disciplines: Classroom Instruction for Students with Learning Disabilities. Landmark College, Putney, VT, 2002.

Shea, Lynne C. & Strothman, Stuart W., Eds. Understanding Learning Disabilities at the Postsecondary Level: A Landmark College Guide. Landmark College, Putney, VT, 2003.

Stodden, R. A. and Brown, S.E. (2006). Climate Assessment Instrument # 1: Attitudes. The Ohio State University Faculty & Administrator Modules in Higher Education (FAME) Project. Columbus. Retrieved April 6, 2007, from www.olsn.org/ILT/ada/Fame/.

Strothman, Stuart W., Ed. Promoting Academic Success for Students with Learning Disabilities. Landmark College, Putney, VT, 2001.

Sydik, J. (2007). Design Accessible Web Sites: *Thirty-six Keys to Creating Content for All Audiences and Platforms*. Raleigh, NC: Pragmatic Programmers.

Thomas, R.R. (1991). *Beyond race and gender*. New York, NY: American Management Association.

Thomas, R.R. (2006). *Building on the promise of diversity*. New York, NY: American Management Association.

Tregoning, M. E. (in press). Being an ally in language use. In J. L. Higbee & A. A. Mitchell (Eds.), *Making good on the promise: Student affairs professionals with disabilities*. Washington, DC: ACPA—College Student Educators International and University Press of America.

Wagner, M. K. (2008). Transforming the community college by eliminating division between educational and student services. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 451-464). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Wagner, M. K. (2008). Transforming the community college by eliminating division between educational and student services. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 451-464). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.

Wheaton, J. E., Chovan, J., O'Briant, & Howell, R. D., (2001). Lack of accessibility on the Web and the need for ADA compliance: Results from one university. *Rehabilitation Education, 15*, 225-232.

Willkomm, T., Simmons, D., & Behling, K. (Expected 2009). Universal Course Design: A Model of Professional Development. In Press: *AHEAD Journal*.

APPENDIX VII

Project Developed Web sites/Web sites with Project-Related Materials

<http://www.washington.edu/doi/>
<https://www.facultyware.uconn.edu>
<http://www.arkahead.org/resources.htm>
<http://www.ahead.org/resources/universal-design/resources>
<http://www.augsburg.edu/classprogram/udi.html>
<http://bsu.edu/dsd/article/0,,56172--,00.html>
http://dsprio.berkeley.edu/universal_design.html
http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/dss/faculty/universal.cfm#CP_JUMP_173226
http://www.bridgew.edu/aac/faculty_resources.cfm
http://csufresno.edu/ssd/fac_staff/guide/universal_design.shtml
<http://www.uottawa.ca/cacuss/UID/bibliography.htm>
<http://counselonline.cua.edu/archives/interviews/fall2006.cfm>
<http://www.ccri.edu/dss/resources.shtml>
<http://www2.creighton.edu/about/ada/adainformation/otheradainfo/index.php>
<http://www.ct.gov/dcf/cwp/view.asp?a=2570&q=383028>
<http://academic.cuesta.edu/acasupp/dsps/Newsletter/Newsletter110907.pdf>
<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~wud/2005/details/udi.html>
<http://radio.weblogs.com/0114870/2005/01/>
<http://www.eonline.org/content/view/24/34/>
<http://www.fctd.info/resources/newsletters/displayNewsletter.php?newsletterID=10016>
<http://www.grinnell.edu/offices/studentaffairs/acadadvising/facultyresources/disabilities/>
https://www.hvcc.edu/news_events/newsstory.php?id=511
https://www.hvcc.edu/issr/retention_newspr03_1.pdf
http://iod.unh.edu/EE/articles/articles_udl.html
<http://www.classaccommodation.org/Universal%20Design.htm>
<http://www.lcc.edu/odss/faculty%20resources/>
<http://www.lemoyne.edu/FacultyStaff/STUDENTSWITHDISABILITIESFACULTYRESOURCES/tabid/1425/Default.aspx>
<http://cwis.marywood.edu/Disabilities/faculty%20resources.stm>
<http://www.mscd.edu/~access/faculty/universal.shtml>
<http://milescc.edu/DisabilityServices/Faculty/resources.htm>
<http://www.montgomerycollege.edu/Departments/dispsvc/add-res.htm>
<http://www2.nea.org/he/advo07/advo0207/issues.html>
<http://www.ncldtalks.org/content/interview/detail/2478/>
<http://www.ncsu.edu/dso/home/universal-design.html>
http://adaptiveenvironments.org/neada/site/beyond_accommodations
http://ctlnhcc.project.mnscu.edu/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC=%7B35581867-0D8E-4EE7-A051-1750A1E56C2B%7D
<http://vawin.jmu.edu/vertex/article.php?v=1&i=2&a=2>
<http://ds.oregonstate.edu/orahead/links.aspx>
<http://pdc.pepnet.org/Links/edu.asp>
<http://www.pstcc.edu/departments/swd/faculty.html>

<http://recognizingdifferences.com/index.php?/resources/>
<http://www.rit.edu/ntid/drt/classact/side/universaldesign.html>
<http://www.rscclcc.tn.us/keyword.asp?keyword=DISABILITY%20SERVICES&keywordSub=DISABILITY%20SERVICES%20ONLINE%20RESOURCE%20GUIDE#faculty>
http://www.somerset.kctcs.edu/FACULTY_TitleIII_UniversalDesign.html
<http://www.southernct.edu/programs/utpp/links.htm>
http://www.socc.edu/serv_resrc/disability/faculty/universaldesign.htm
<http://cobyweb.cobleskill.edu/DSS/>
<http://dyslexia.mtsu.edu/modules/articles/displayarticle.jsp?id=48>
<http://www.towson.edu/facultyonline/ISD/accessibility.asp>
<http://www.trentu.ca/admin/specialneeds/learninginnovations/UID.htm>
<http://www.advocacyinstitute.org/UDL/resources.shtml>
http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/dss/faculty/universal.cfm#CP_JUMP_173226
<http://ualr.edu/pace/index.php/home/resources/>
http://www2.ucsc.edu/drc/faculty_staff/faculty_resources.shtml#b4
http://ocrl.ed.uiuc.edu/Newsletter/2007/fall/fall2007_2.asp
http://www.uindy.edu/ssd/external_resources.php
<http://www.umuc.edu/distance/odell/>
<http://www.unomaha.edu/diversity/ud.php>
http://ds.uoregon.edu/DS_Pages/DS_Responsibilities.html
http://www.uri.edu/disability/ctc/inclusive_teaching.html
<http://www.uvm.edu/access/?Page=facstaff/facstaff.html&SM=facstaff/facstaffsubmenu.html>
http://www.washington.edu/doi/Brochures/Academics/equal_access_udi.html
<http://www.r2d2.uwm.edu/ud/udeliresources.html>

###