REMOVING BARRIERS FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Gwen Schilling-Dickey, Grand Canyon University

ABSTRACT

While there has been a long-standing practice of providing service options for students with disabilities within the K–12 classroom, universities have less experience and fewer resources in this area. University students who have been diagnosed with a disability are expected to self-advocate and produce sufficient evidence in order to access disability services within their chosen university. Teachers in the K–12 classroom have an abundance of research to explore when looking for strategies that work to help their students with special needs succeed. On the opposite end of the spectrum, university instructors have little to no direct experience in the nuances of providing adequate educational opportunities to adults with diagnosed disabilities. This article provides information on the current research on serving adults with disabilities at the university level. It also gives information concerning barriers for students with disabilities and recommendations for removing those barriers.

Keywords: special education, self-advocacy, barriers, higher education, disability

INTRODUCTION

There has been a shift in the access to higher education for students with diverse needs. This is evidenced by an increase in the number of students with disabilities entering postsecondary educational programs and that trend is continuing (Abrue et al., 2015; Sanford et al., 2011; Scott, 2019). The movement toward inclusivity at institutes of higher learning is not limited to the United States. Researchers in other countries are seeing this increase as well (Grimes, et al., 2018; Moriña, 2017). In light of this development, serving students with disabilities at the university level requires not only some knowledge of the qualification process but also an awareness of the variety of disabilities that qualify for services at this level. All too often, university instructors have little to no understanding of the process involved in students becoming eligible for disability services or how the student's disability will impact their ability to successfully complete a college degree.

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Understanding the historical progression of educational access for students with disabilities can lead to a greater understanding of the progress made and challenges still faced in the educational setting. While K–12 teachers are likely to have taken some classes in special education, many university professors have not been exposed to the evolution of laws guiding these policies (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights, 2020). Yet, in order to understand where education is today in terms of serving students with diverse needs, it is necessary first to understand the major historical milestones in this area.

Prior to the 17th century, individuals with disabilities were often feared and shunned by society. Starting in the 1700s, religious organizations' beliefs began to change and there was a push to establish institutions that would help care for members of the community who differed from the accepted norms of society (Young, et al., 2019). Sadly, these asylums were often filthy, and the residents were treated terribly.

It was not until the 1940s and 1950s that more positive opportunities began to emerge for students with disabilities. During this time, parents became more actively engaged in advocating for their

children and formed local, regional, and national groups that communicated with one another about issues concerning the treatment of their children (Young, et al., 2019). However, it would take a few more decades and major civil rights legislation for other oppressed groups before the needs of students with disabilities would be recognized and they would be removed from the institutional setting and placed in either separate schools or separate classrooms within the local school district.

In 1975, the Education for All Handicap Children Act (PL 94-142) was signed into law by President Gerald Ford. The basic tenets of the law were that if states accepted federal money, they would be required to provide equal access to education for children with special needs from age 3 to graduation. This was considered a game changer for the rights of parents of students with disabilities and the students themselves. Eventually, preschool age children were included in the mix with the passing of PL 99-457, which stated that states were now responsible for providing educational benefit from birth when necessary. Eventually, PL 94-142 was amended and became the Individuals with Disabilities Educational Act (IDEA). As IDEA has evolved, many changes have occurred. Currently, IDEA calls for early interventions for young children, greater accountability so that educational outcomes improve, and an increase in the training and standards required to teach children with disabilities (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 2010; U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights, 2020). As each reiteration of the law was updated, students with diverse needs benefitted from greater access.

TRANSLATION OF LAWS THAT APPLY TO UNIVERSITIES

The two major legislative acts that impact the services available at the university level are the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the American Disabilities Act of 2008. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is the primary directive that applies to university services for individuals with disabilities. Like IDEA, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 has been amended numerous times. In Section 504, individuals with a diagnosed disability cannot be excluded from participation in, denied benefits of, or subject to discrimination under any program or activity that receives federal financial assistance (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights, 2020). Each of these laws impacts educational decisions for adult learners.

Thus, colleges and universities who accept federal funding must apply the provisions of this law in their policies and procedures. According to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Accreditation, institutions of higher learning can be audited for compliance with these policies and procedures (2020). This means that reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities must be allowed so they can fully participate in programs that persons without a disability are allowed to pursue (Dyer, 2018). Under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, public entities such as colleges and universities cannot exclude persons with disabilities from participating or deny them the benefits of services, programs, or activities (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights, 2020; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education, 2020). Understanding these guidelines is important for all universities so that the provisions of the laws are followed, funding is continued, and accreditation is maintained.

CURRENT PROGRAMS WITHIN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mandates

While federal mandates for serving college age students have been in place for over 40 years, what disability services look like within those institutions varies from one postsecondary institution to another. Some universities have large disability service offices that offer a plethora of supports and programs so their students feel connected with the university and their fellow learners. Other colleges and universities offer the bare minimum of services that meet the mandate so they can continue to receive federal funding. The U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2019) reported that 19.4% of undergraduate students on college campuses across the United States self-identified as having some type of disability. This is a significant number of students who may require accommodations and modifications to the curriculum.

Accommodations

What are appropriate accommodations or

modifications for a college student and are universities ensuring that these are being implemented with accuracy and fidelity? How are accommodations and modifications determined in the postsecondary setting? That determination is often linked to the documentation the student provides the university. Students who were eligible for services in the K–12 educational system are often able to access services using their Individual Education Plan (IEP). The IEP describes the student's diagnosed disability, current levels of academic performance, related services, and accommodations and modifications that were granted during their previous years of education.

Evaluations

Prior to receiving an IEP, students in the K–12 educational setting would have been given a multitude of cognitive and behavioral assessments that lead to a specific diagnosis. However, the students may know little about the assessments they had been given if their parent, caregiver, or teachers never explained the information to them. These evaluations may also be required for university level services. The U.S. Department of Education currently recognizes 13 categories of disability. Table 1 lists those disabilities, a brief description, and a few accommodations or modification that the student may have been granted in the K–12 setting (Individuals with Disabilities Act, 2004; Young et al., 2019). This is not an exhaustive list, but it does offer some clarity on the topic of appropriate accommodations.

Table 1. Types of Disabilities Recognized by the U.S. Department of Education

Disability	Description	Typical Accommodations/Modifications
Autism	A developmental delay that typical impacts verbal and nonverbal communication and social skills	Social skills training Modified curriculum Modified assignments Extended time
Deaf-blindness	Complete or significant loss of sight and hearing	Braille materials Extended time Modified curriculum Modified assignments
Deafness	Complete or significant loss of hearing	Sign language instruction Sign language interpreter Extended time
Emotional Disturbance	Emotional disturbances that are persistent and last over a long period of time	Behavioral and social skills training Counseling Extended time Redirection
Hearing Impairment	Partial or complete loss of hearing	Sign language training Sign language interpreter Note taker Extended time
Intellectual Disability	Significant subaverage intellectual functioning	Behavioral and social skills training Extended time Modified Curriculum Modified Assignment Note taker
Multiple Disabilities	Having more than one diagnosed disability	*depends on types of disabilities but often requires multilevel of supports
Orthopedic Impairment	Having an orthopedic impairment, disease, or abnormality	*depends on type of impairment Accessibility accommodations Technology accommodations Extended time Modified scheduling Modified access to curriculum
Other Health Impaired	Limited strength, vitality, or alertness to environmental stimuli	*ADHD students are in this category Extended time Redirection Isolated testing
Specific Learning Disability	One or more disabilities in the psychological process to understand language or math	Extended time Organizational supports
Speech Language Impairment	Communication disorder	Modification of oral assignments
Traumatic Brain Injury	Acquired injury to the brain	*depends on level of injury Social/emotional supports Extended time Modified access
Visual Impairment	Partial or total blindness	Voice technology Accessibility and access supports Modified textbooks Extended time

LITERATURE REVIEW

Most theoretical perspectives examining college experiences, both academic and social, are viewed through the lens of a typically developing student. Therefore, studies concerning how college age students learn and interact with their peers begin with typical development. In recent years, there has been a rise in the number of students with disabilities entering into universities, including students with intellectual or developmental disabilities, yet there is little research about how these students learn and achieve success at the college level.

Theory

More institutions of higher learning are recognizing the need to address the attrition rates for all students including those with special needs. Research has shown that only 58% of college freshmen graduate (Stein, 2018). In the effort to decrease the number of college dropouts, postsecondary institutions are turning to applicable educational learning theories. Arthur Chickering and William Perry are two noted theorists in the area of Student Development Theory (SDT) whose ideas have been implemented at the college level. SDT examines students' psychosocial, cognitive, environmental, humanistic, and developmental processing aspects of learning (Stein, 2018). Examining each aspect of SDT can lead to a greater understanding of the needs of a diverse student body.

Using SDT, Singh and Gilson (2020) examined Inclusive Post-Secondary Education Programs (IPSE) available at a number of colleges and universities. The researchers were interested in understanding how the IPSE programs were designed and whether these programs were providing meaningful outcomes for adults with Intellectual Disabilities (ID) or Developmental Delays (DD). The researchers emphasized the reciprocal dynamic between the student with these specific disabilities and the colleges they chose to attend. In comparison to their peers, did these students achieve transformational outcomes such as greater independence, higher social interactions, and better workforce opportunities?

The researchers concluded that the IPSE programs had the potential to significantly change the opportunities for adults with ID and DD. The learning outcomes need to reflect high expectations and be connected to that transformational process that was in place for their neurotypical peers (Singh & Gilson, 2020). How successful these expected outcomes were depended on the level of support and commitment from the university.

National Studies

In recent years, there have been more research studies conducted that addressed the types of services that are required for students with special needs to be successful at the university level. The National Center for College Students with Disabilities (NCCSD) is a federally funded organization established in 2015 that researches issues surrounding how students with disabilities are functioning within the higher education arena. The organization has researched eligibility determinations, access to materials, barriers to learning at the university level, and career readiness for adults who are exiting the university after graduation (NCCSD, n.d.). It is funded through the United States Department of Education.

The NCCSD (2020) conducted a series of focus group with university students across all regions of the United States. In addition to surveying the types of disabilities of the participants, the purpose of the study was to better understand what difficulties the students were experiencing in gaining access to disability services at their respective universities. The researchers found four major areas described as barriers by the participants: working with the disability resource office, the classroom and instructional environment, campus access and support, and the campus climate (Scott, 2019). As colleges and university leaders take a closer look at each of these areas of concern and implement policies that promote greater access, barriers for students with special needs can be diminished.

When students transition from high school to a university, many unforeseen problems may arise. Wendorf et al. (2015) conducted a study for the National Center for Learning Disabilities by interviewing over 1,200 young adults ages 15–25 who had exited high school within the past two years. Most of the participants were either directly diagnosed with a learning disability or self-identified as having a learning difficulty. The researchers were seeking information about the transition process from secondary to postsecondary outcomes. A 50-question survey was administered covering topics from family involvement in their educational

careers, personal perspectives concerning their educational experiences, and inquiries about their attitudes toward education. The survey also included questions about their current employment status and living conditions.

Some researchers use categories to classify students in order to better understand the level of struggle a student with disabilities might encounter when navigating higher education expectations. For instance, using Segmentation Analysis, a group of researchers found that the participants in their study fell into three major categories: strugglers, copers, and navigators (Wendorf et al., 2015). Strugglers were the lowest performers in terms of postsecondary success. They had low self-confidence, felt unsupported, and had little social interaction with their peers. The copers fell in the middle and had found ways to compensate for areas where they felt incompetent. Navigators tended to have higher levels of self-esteem and were more likely to be self-motivated (Wendorf et al., 2015). The navigators indicated the reason for their success was related to family support, teachers who were positive influences, and strong connections to their peer group.

The United States Department of Education funds many research studies that help educators design more effective instructional practices. The U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics (2017) studied educational outcomes for students with disabilities through an examination of several longitudinal studies that followed the progression of high school students into their postsecondary educational journey. Using the data from that analysis, Shaewitz and Crandall (2020) suggested a variety of reforms that should take place at universities that would enhance the chances of success for students with disabilities.

The authors suggested that for inclusion to be genuine, higher education leaders should consider how to fully embrace all students (Shaewitz & Crandall, 2020). Some specific steps that could bring about positive change included creating a culture of inclusion, reflecting on how language is used for addressing the individual student in need of services, and being intentional with how that information is conveyed campuswide (Shaewitz & Crandall, 2020). Additionally, the authors recommended streamlining the process of applying for access to disability services and providing more targeted training for professors who were serving students with disabilities.

International Studies

Inclusive education is seen as a basic human right and the basis for a fair and equitable society in several European countries. Spain, like many countries, has seen an increase in the number of students with disabilities entering programs within institutions of higher education (Moriña; 2017). This can be linked with a push for laws emanating out of European Union mandates concerning equal access (European Commission, 2010). Moriña (2017) explored both the challenges and opportunities for students with disabilities within the university system in Spain. She also focused on the idea that universal design could play a role in providing more equitable access for students with disabilities. Moriña (2017) concluded that university professors often expressed their desire to be more inclusive and supportive of students with disabilities but needed additional training to better understand the various disabilities and the strategies required to meet the needs of those students.

When students are proactive in seeking access to services at the higher education level, they are more likely to succeed. Grimes et al. (2018) were interested in learning more about the level of self-identification of students seeking disability services in Australia. While the national statistic for students with disabilities entering postsecondary institutions indicated a higher number was possible (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 2014), the researchers found that only 5.8% of students at Australian universities were disclosing they had been diagnosed with a disability and were in need of services from the university. In an effort to find out specific reasons a student with a disability would choose not to disclose their diagnoses, they had students with disabilities who had not self-identified complete an online survey that asked specific questions about why they would choose not to access services.

The sample size of the study included 386 students who had not self-identified to receive access to potential services. In examining the reasons given by the participants, the researchers found that many (31.9%) did not know services were available

for them at the university level. Numerous respondents (30.0%) indicated they knew the services were available but did not believe it would be helpful. Some students (19.9%) did not believe they really needed the help and other students (20.5%) reported they did not want the help because they believed they would be treated differently by faculty and peers (Grimes et al., 2018).

Ireland is another country whose educational system has seen an influx of students with disabilities entering the higher education arena. After noticing this significant increase Nolan et al. (2015) sought to better understand perceptions of the university experiences of both students and practice educators within those universities. Through educational policies, countries such as the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom had successfully implemented strategies that widened the participation of students with disabilities at the postsecondary level, but were these students achieving success once they entered the university?

Using a quantitative approach, the researchers surveyed 68 practicing educators and 251 students with disabilities (Nolan et al., 2015). The educators indicated their main concerns were whether the students would be able to reach the standard of competency expected for other students, if they would be offered an appropriate level of support and training in order to serve these students, and if there were health issue involved would they receive adequate information (Nolan et al., 2015).

Sixty-eight students participated in the study. The range of disabilities included Specific Learning Disabilities (29.5%), Ongoing Illness (23%), and Mental Health Difficulties (21.3%) (Nolan et al., 2015). A majority (57.7%) of the respondents indicated they had not disclosed their disability when registering for courses (Nolan et al., 2015). When probed for reasons for nondisclosure, the students indicated they were not aware of the forms needed to disclose, they were not encouraged to complete the required forms, or they were concerned about the perceptions of staff and peers should the disability be exposed.

BARRIERS TO SUCCESS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

Self-advocacy

In the transition from secondary to postsecondary education, many students with disabilities struggle to navigate the new expectation of total self-advocacy. Depending on when their disability was diagnosed, they could have spent years in the protective cocoon of parent and educator advocacy with little personal responsibility for seeking and maintaining the supports needed for success at the university level. Assuming someone informed them that access to some services would be available, upon arriving on campus they first have to figure out where the disability office is located. Finding the disability service office then leads to discussions about what types of documentation might be needed to confirm their right to access accommodations and modifications. At the university level, adults with a diagnosed disability are no longer placed on an Individualized Education Plan, but the students may be required to submit their current IEP and most recent evaluation as evidence for qualification for services. This can be tricky for the students who likely may have participated in their IEP meetings at the secondary level but were not the drivers of the decisions made during those discussions. Bruce and Aylward (2021) researched the practices of self-advocacy at several Canadian universities. They examined perceptions of students and faculty and found that when students had specific training in the process of self-advocacy, they were able to communicate their needs better and faculty responded more positively to the process.

Eligibility

Students may or may not fully understand an evaluation of some type was needed in order to determine their diagnosis. When the university asks for this documentation, they may be unfamiliar with the actual terms being used. Additionally, there can be a disconnect with the university requiring an evaluation that was completed within a certain time period, but the school district from which the student is transferring may have a policy of no comprehensive evaluations needed within the timeframe the university required. The question then becomes, where does the student get this new evaluation and who pays for it? Navigating the new expectations requires that these students be given clear directions as to what steps need to be taken to provide the documentation needed to obtain services.

Appropriate services

If the students are successful in submitting the

needed paperwork and are ruled eligible for some accommodations, those are generally administered in a one-size-fits-all approach at many universities. In other words, most of these students will be given the same accommodations regardless of their type of disability. Another issue that was described by the participants in many of these studies was that they encountered instructors who would not allow the accommodations, ignored their request for access to material, or were simply unresponsive (Scott, 2019). For students who had physical forms of disability, the reports indicated there were areas of campus that were not accessible to them. In terms of school climate issues, the participants reported their disability caused some negative interactions with their peers and that in some cases they did not access services because of the stigma involved in having a disability.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING OUTCOMES

There is no doubt that positive improvements have been happening in the area of disability in all aspects of society. Current students who have been diagnosed with a disability are far from being shunned or institutionalized. There are a multitude of supports and resources available to students with special needs from birth forward. As a result of several laws and statutes, educational access has improved greatly. Many of those improvements have been implemented at the K–12 level in particular. However, according to current research, colleges and universities need to implement more targeted policies and procedures to improve educational and employment outcomes for adults with disabilities (Bunbury, 2018; Dyer, 2018). One area that could greatly improve outcomes for adults with disabilities is meaningful collaboration with secondary schools. Making the transition from high school to college can be a challenge for any student, but when combined with a disability, the likelihood of success diminishes. Colleges and universities should have clear policies in place concerning the documentation needed to qualify for services (Dyer, 2018). Individuals involved with disability services on college and university campuses should reach out to their surrounding school districts and engage in more effective communication so the needed documentation is more easily transferable. This will reduce the confusion surrounding the documentation needed to qualify for disability services.

It can be a challenge to meet the needs of all learners at any level on the educational ladder, but there are some recommendations that can help prompt a closer look at university policies and practices. Shaewitz & Crandall (2020) suggested that the first step is creating a culture of inclusion by understanding that disability is a campuswide concern and should not be relegated strictly to on-campus disability services or counseling offices. To foster a sense of belonging, all levels of faculty, leadership, and staff need to be involved in student support services. Faculty are more likely to adopt practices that promote inclusion and eliminate barriers when they are provided training in methods and materials that meet the needs of their students (Shaewitz & Crandall, 2020). One example of successful inclusion practices is San Francisco State University's one-stop shop that helps streamline the process for applying for services using online access for both students and faculty. Another example is Gallaudet University. This university serves students who are deaf or hard of hearing and uses a design approach that creates an awareness of the sensory and visual needs of their students. Intense and ongoing training is provided to faculty so that they can better meet the needs of these learners.

Well-defined policies and training for staff and instructors should be in place so they are aware of the legal requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 2008 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Professors need to understand that these polices are directly related to the law and that funding is dependent on following federal mandates. Collaboration between the university instructors and the disability service office is essential (Dyer, 2018; Zehner, 2018). When professors have legitimate concerns, conversations about the required accommodations should be discussed in light of the legal requirements. The student also should be involved in those discussions.

Sometimes an able-bodied person is unaware of physical barriers that could impact access for students who have diverse needs. To address this, disability service personnel could periodically survey students with disabilities about issues concerning access to various parts of the campus. Additionally, they could research articles on access issues at other campuses and use that

information to examine areas of their campus that might cause students difficulty. Finally, they could find or initiate campuswide activities that allow for more collaboration between students with disabilities and their peers without disabilities (Kim & Aquino, 2017). All stakeholders should look for opportunities to bring these two groups together to form more cohesive bonds.

CONCLUSION

With hundreds of colleges and universities across the United States, and thousands when viewed through a global lens, students with disabilities are enrolling in record numbers. Like their peers, they want to succeed in their personal goals and become productive citizens within their communities. There was a time not long ago that this dream would have seemed impossible. Now, it is possible for some students with disabilities. They may need a little help along the way. Removing barriers requires the participation of all the stakeholders. When high school students with disabilities graduate, a connection should have already been made for transferring the required documentation to their college or university. Meetings between the parents, students, and disability services prior to enrollment in the college or university could eliminate misinformation about the policies and procedures for access to accommodations and modification.

Disability personnel at colleges and universities should have a greater understanding of the individual disabilities so appropriate accommodations are implemented. More training is needed for those personnel who work in the office of disability on most campuses. University instructors should be better trained in working with students with disabilities so they feel equipped to deliver their content in a way that is fair and equitable for all students. It is important that we strive to remove barriers for all students so that we can improve long-term employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities.

References

Abreu, M., Hillier, A., Frye, A., & Goldstein, J. (2015). Student experiences utilizing disability services support in a university setting. College Student Journal, 50(3), 323–328.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2014). Towards a performance measurement framework for equity in higher education. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/indigenous-australians/equity-in-higher-education/summary

Bruce, C., & Aylward, M. L. (2021). Disability and self-advocacy experiences in university learning contexts. Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research 23(1), 14–26. http://doi.org/10.16993/sjdr.741

Bunbury, S. (2018). Disability in higher education—do reasonable adjustments contribute to an inclusive curriculum? International Journal of Inclusive Education (24) 964–979. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1503347

Dyer, R. (2018). Teaching students with disabilities at the college level. Journal of Instructional Research (7) 75–79.

European Commission. (2010). European disability strategy 2010–2020: A renewed commitment to a barrier-free Europe. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:en:PDF

Grimes, S., Southgate, E., Scevak, J., & Buchanan, R. (2018). University student perspective on institutional non-disclosure of disability and learning challenges: Reasons for staying invisible. International Journal of Inclusive Education 23(6) 639–655. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1442507

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. §300 (2004).

Kim, E., & Aquino, K. (Eds.). (2017). Disability as diversity in higher education: policies and practices to enhance student success. Routledge.

Moriña, A. (2017). Inclusive education in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2016.1254964

National Center for College Students with Disabilities (n.d.). About us: What we do. http://www.nccsdonline.org/about.html

Nolan, C., Gleeson, C., Treanor, D., & Madigan, S. (2015). Higher education students registered with disability services and practice educators: Issues and concerns for professional placements. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 19(5), 487–502. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2014.943306

Sanford, C., Newman, L., Wagner, M., Cameto, R., Knokey, A. M., & Shaver, D. (2011). The Post-high school outcomes of young adults with disabilities up to 6 years after high School. Key findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2). https://www.nlts2.org/reports/2011_09/index.html

Scott, S. (April, 2019). Access and participation in higher education: Perspectives of college Students with disabilities. NCCSD Research Brief, 2(2), 3–27.

Shaewitz, S., & Crandall, J. R., (2020, October 19). Higher education's challenge: Disability inclusion on campus. Higher Education Today. American Council on Education. https://www.higheredtoday.org/2020/10/19/higher-educations-challenge-disability-inclusion-campus/

Singh, S., & Gilson, C. (2020). Toward an inclusive definition of college student development. Journal of Inclusive Post-Secondary Education, 2(2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.13021/jipe.2020.2719

Stein, C. (2018, July 23). The push for college education: College attrition rates. PA Times. American Society for Public Administrationhttps://patimes.org/the-push-for-higher-education-college-attrition-rates/

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics (2017). Characteristics and outcomes of undergraduates with disabilities (NCES 2018-432). https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2018/2018432.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2019). Digest of education statistics. Students with disabilities. https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=60

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education Accreditation Group, (2020). Accreditation: Postsecondary Education Institutions. https://www.ed.gov/accreditation

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (2010). Thirty-five years of progress in educating children with disabilities through IDEA. U.S. Department of Education. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED515893.pdf

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights (2020). A guide to disability rights laws. https://www.ada.gov/cguide.htm

Wendorf, J., Parker-Fisher, S., Horowitz, S., Raskind, M., & Anthony, E. (2015). Student voices: A study of young adults with learning and attention issues (Executive summary). https://www.ncld.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Student-Voices-Executive-Summary.pdf

Young, N. D., Fain, A. C., & Citro, T. A. (2019). Creating compassionate classrooms: Understanding the continuum of disabilities and effective educational interventions. Vernon Press.

Zehner, A. L. (2018). Campus climate for students with disabilities. In K. M. Soria (Ed.). Campus Climate at US Research Universities, (pp. 125–149). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-94836-2_6