

# Higher Education and Disability: Past and Future of Underrepresented Populations

David W. Leake  
Robert A. Stodden  
Center on Disability Studies  
University of Hawaii at Manoa

## Abstract

Over the past half century higher education in the United States has been challenged to develop and implement policies and practices that effectively promote the access, retention, and graduation of diverse underrepresented populations. One of these populations is comprised of individuals with disabilities, whose equal access to higher education is mandated by Federal legislation, notably Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. One unintended consequence of this legislation appears to be that institutions may be content with only meeting the letter of the law by providing accommodations and supports for equal access to the physical plant and to academic instruction, while neglecting the social sphere. However, leading theories of persistence in higher education highlight both academic integration and social integration, as reflected in having a sense of “belonging” on campus, as key factors for student success. Emerging trends suggest that the next phase of progress for students with disabilities in higher education will be establishing and implementing shared norms about what it takes to make a campus barrier-free and welcoming – a place where disability is not seen as a marker of membership in a “special” group virtually nobody wants to be a part of but is, rather, accepted and appreciated as an element in a valued range of diversity.

*Keywords: Diversity, equal access, social inclusion, sense of belonging, campus climate*

As important as Section 504 and the ADA have been, and as important as it is for people with disabilities to have access [to] legal remedies to overcome discrimination, compliance with the law is not enough. It is merely the starting point. . . universities and postsecondary institutions must move ‘beyond compliance’ and adopt new philosophies and approaches regarding students with disabilities (Taylor, 2003).

The Civil Rights movement that emerged in the United States in the 1960s focused on ending discrimination against Blacks, but it also inspired action by numerous other marginalized groups, including people with disabilities (Fleischer & Zames, 2001). People with disabilities were, however, different from other groups fighting for their rights because they also comprise a marginalized minority within those groups – a status that has been described as a “double whammy” by making them liable to discrimination on at least

two counts (Hollins, Downer, Farquarson, Oyepeju, & Kopper, 2002).

Education was a major battle arena as members and advocates of marginalized groups came together to demand equal access and treatment in the public school system and higher education. People with disabilities arguably faced the highest barriers of all since they were liable to be excluded from even attending school and many institutions of higher education (IHEs) routinely rejected applicants because they had disabilities (Paul, 2000). Significant victories came in the 1970s with passage by the U.S. Congress of what is now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ([IDEA], 2004), which assures a “free appropriate public education” for children with disabilities ages three through 21, as well as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504, 1973), which prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities by educational institutions, including IHEs, receiving federal funding.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ([ADA], 1990) expanded this requirement to institutions not receiving federal funding. Later reauthorizations of the IDEA came to define special education's ultimate purpose as the preparation of children with disabilities for adulthood, particularly with respect to "further education, employment, and independent living." The IDEA supports this purpose by requiring that transition-to-adulthood services be provided to students in special education based on individualized plans developed by age 16 at the latest. Special educators and many parents commonly encourage students to aim for further education, and research indicates this is listed as a goal in over 80% of transition plans (Newman, et al., 2011).

### **Diversity and Disability in Higher Education**

The combination of special education and transition-to-adulthood services required by the IDEA and the nondiscrimination mandates of Section 504 and the ADA have been credited with supporting increasing rates of enrollment in higher education by people with disabilities (Wolanin & Steele, 2004). Diversity and disability may be examined from the perspective of (a) diversity among students with disabilities (SWDs) or (b) disability as a component of diversity in higher education. With regard to the former, there is tremendous diversity among SWDs as to their kinds of disabilities, each of which tends to be associated with different sets of challenges. It is common to distinguish between disabilities that are (a) obvious or visible and therefore most likely to come to mind for members of the public in response to the term "disabilities" (e.g., conditions requiring wheelchair use, blindness) and (b) those that are hidden or invisible (e.g., learning disabilities, attention disorders). Fewer than 10% of SWDs have obvious disabilities, while the great majority has hidden disabilities (Newman, et al., 2011).

The predominance of hidden disabilities is significant when considering disability as a component of diversity in higher education. One reason is that students with hidden disabilities are not visible on campus in the same way as students of color or wheelchair users might be, which is likely to leave the mistaken impression that disabilities are rare among students at an IHE. Another reason is that students with hidden disabilities are quite likely to want to keep them hidden due to the associated stigma, and therefore do not self-disclose to peers who might provide social supports, or on surveys used to estimate SWD numbers, or to obtain classroom accommodations and other supports to which they might be entitled under the ADA (Litner, Mann-Feder, & Guerard, 2005).

With regard to disability as a component of diversity in higher education, numerous diverse subpopulations have been identified and studied. To gain a view of the range of subpopulations and the attention given to them, we examined and categorized all peer-reviewed research articles that appeared in five journals devoted exclusively to higher education from 2006 through 2012. These journals included two selected because they provide broad coverage of higher education issues, *The Review of Higher Education* and *Research in Higher Education*. In addition, the *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice* was chosen because SWDs have substantially lower retention rates than their peers without disabilities (Belch, 2005; Newman et al., 2011); the *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* because SWDs are more than twice as likely to attend two-year than four-year institutions (Newman et al., 2011); and the *Journal of College Student Development* because it is geared to the student affairs profession, which has a commitment to the development of the "whole person" (Braxton, 2009).

The results of this review are shown in Table 1. Of 906 articles we examined, 312 (34.4%) were on 23 specific subpopulations. Only 11 of the articles (1.2% of the 906 examined) focused on SWDs, suggesting that this population is not a high priority in higher education generally and also that disability researchers and advocates seldom seek to publish in "mainstream" higher education journals. As shown in Table 2, another review we conducted found that nearly 80% of articles on social issues for postsecondary SWDs appeared in disability-focused journals, with the *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability* having the most at 16 followed by the *Journal of Learning Disabilities* at four. Another indication of the anomalous position of SWDs among diverse subpopulations is that they are often not included in the diversity initiatives conducted by many IHEs to foster greater understanding of and connections between diverse student subpopulations (Higbee, Siaka, & Bruch, 2007).

### **Importance of a Sense of Belonging**

The Disability Rights Movement was driven in large part by the resentment of people with disabilities that they were viewed and treated as second-class citizens. Despite much progress in promoting the full inclusion of people with disabilities, SWDs who are given voice in interviews and focus groups still report, often with much emotion, that they face many social barriers and often experience marginalization on campus (e.g., Denhart, 2008; Myers & Bastian, 2010; Najarian, 2008; Troiano, 2003). This is a matter of con-

Table 1

*Student Subpopulations Covered in Five Peer-reviewed Higher Education Journals<sup>1</sup>, 2006-2012*

Subpopulation Covered	# Articles on a Subpopulation	% of Articles on a Subpopulation (N=312)	% of All Articles (N=906)
<b>Ethnic/Racial Heritage</b>			
Ethnically/Racially Diverse <sup>2</sup>	43	13.8%	4.7%
African American/Black	37	11.9%	4.1%
Asian American	12	3.8%	1.3%
Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)	45	14.4%	5.0%
Immigrant/International Student	9	2.9%	1.0%
Middle Eastern	3	1.0%	0.3%
Native American/Indigenous	8	2.6%	0.9%
White	3	1.0%	0.3%
Ethnic/Racial Heritage Subtotal	160	51.3%	17.7%
<b>Gender</b>			
Female	28	9.0%	3.1%
Male	7	2.2%	0.8%
Gender Subtotal	35	11.2%	3.9%
<b>Other Characteristics</b>			
Athletes	12	3.8%	1.3%
Bereaved	1	0.3%	0.1%
Christian	3	1.0%	0.3%
DISABILITIES	11	3.5%	1.2%
Dislocated Workers	1	0.3%	0.1%
Gamblers	3	1.0%	0.3%
Home-schooled	4	1.3%	0.4%
Non-normative Sexual Orientation	15	4.8%	1.7%
Low Income/First Generation	25	8.0%	2.8%
Non-traditional Students	8	2.6%	0.9%
Struggling Students	5	1.6%	0.6%
Substance Users	26	8.3%	2.9%
Student Activists	1	0.3%	0.1%
Military Veterans	2	0.6%	0.2%
Other Characteristics Subtotal	117	37.6%	12.9%

<sup>1</sup> *Community College Journal of Research & Practice* (39.5% of 195 articles on a subpopulation); *Journal of College Student Development* (47.4% of 293 articles on a subpopulation); *Journal of College Student Retention* (30.1% of 156 articles on a subpopulation); *Research in Higher Education* (14.2% of 197 articles on a subpopulation); *Review of Higher Education* (30.8% of 65 articles on a subpopulation).

<sup>2</sup> "Diverse" means target population comprised two or more non-White subpopulations, or research was conducted on the effects of campus diversity initiatives.

Table 2

*Peer-reviewed Research Articles on Social Issues for Postsecondary Students with Disabilities, by Year Published, Methods Used, Target Population, and Type of Journal in which Published*

	1982- 1987	1988- 1992	1993- 1997	1998- 2002	2003- 2007	2008- 2012	Total
Year Published	2	7	12	6	11	30	68 (100%)
<b>Method Used</b>							
Qualitative	1	4	4	3	4	13	29 (42.6%)
Literature Review	1		4	2	3	8	18 (26.1%)
Quantitative		2	3		3	8	16 (23.5%)
Mixed Methods		1	1		1	1	4 (5.9%)
Experimental				1			1 (1.5%)
<b>Target Population</b>							
All Disabilities		2	4	4	4	8	23 (33.8%)
Learning/Attention	1	1	3	1	4	8	18 (26.5%)
Hearing	1	3	3		1	2	10 (14.7%)
Psychiatric			1	1		2	4 (5.9%)
Autism spectrum					1	2	3 (4.4%)
Orthopedic		1				2	3 (4.4%)
Intellectual/Developmental					1	1	2 (2.9%)
Visual						1	1 (1.5%)
Acquired Brain Injuries						1	1 (1.5%)
Injured Military Veterans						3	3 (4.4%)
<b>Type of Journal</b>							
Higher Education				2	5	4	11 (16.2%)
Disability-Focused	2	7	12	3	6	23	53 (77.9%)
Other Type				1		3	4 (5.9%)

cern in view of the widespread understanding in higher education that students who feel socially accepted are more likely to persist and graduate than those who do not (e.g., Tinto & Pusser, 2006).

Research indicates that if new students do not start to feel like they “belong” within eight weeks of arriving on campus, they are at especially high risk for dropping out (Raley, 2007), while students who develop supportive social networks tend to be more successful academically (Antonio, 2001; Thomas, 2000). It has been argued that having viable social support networks may be particularly critical for SWDs in view of the greater challenges they are likely to face compared to their peers without disabilities (Mamiseishvili & Koch, 2010). SWDs, however, often experience stigmatization and social exclusion due to the negative attitudes of their peers and even faculty, or avoidance by others because of uncertainties about how to appropriately interact (Myers & Bastian, 2010; Nevill & White, 2011).

It is notable that a great deal of research and commentary has appeared in the higher education literature on how to make various underrepresented groups feel more welcomed and socially integrated on campus (about a quarter of the articles in Table 1 focused on social integration issues but, as indicated, articles on SWDs are rare outside of disability-focused publications). In addition to the previously mentioned diversity initiatives, most large IHEs responded to anti-discrimination mandates by establishing or supporting centers or clubs for various racial/ethnic minority groups that serve as safe havens where students can support each other to better understand and negotiate the complex sociocultural and bureaucratic landscape of the IHE (Tinto & Pusser, 2006). However, SWDs may not find these centers or clubs welcoming, as negative and stigmatizing perceptions of disabilities are common in just about all racial/ethnic groups (McDonald, Keys, & Balcazar, 2007).

Faculty members have often been identified as a key target of efforts to make SWDs feel like they truly belong, as too many continue to appear to lack a good understanding of disability issues in the classroom (Getzel, 2008). Like many people in the wider society, faculty members may tend to doubt the claimed disability status of students with hidden disabilities and may not believe that classroom accommodations should be provided because they give them unfair advantages (Barnard, Stevens, Siwatu, & Lan, 2008). SWDs have often reported feeling such negative perceptions and, as a result, deciding not to seek accommodations that might prove important to their academic success (e.g., Litner, Mann-Feder, & Guerard, 2005).

### **Research on Social Integration Issues for Students with Disabilities**

Given the barriers to essential social integration often encountered by SWDs, one might expect that social issues would be a major research focus for this subpopulation. However, it has been observed that there is surprisingly little such research (Belch, 2005; DaDeppo, 2009; Papatirou & Windle, 2012; Trammel, 2009). Rather, most research articles address “technical” topics such as classroom accommodations, diagnostic assessments, and assistive technology. The relative neglect of social issues is reflected in the results of a literature review we conducted that found only 68 peer-reviewed research articles published from 1982 through 2012 on social issues for SWDs in higher education. Table 2 provides an overview of these articles according to year published, methods used, disabilities addressed, and type of journal.

The coverage and depth of the extant research can be aptly described as thin, with authors typically noting a dearth of research on social issues. For example, DaDeppo (2009) described research on postsecondary students with learning disabilities as in its “infancy.” However, a welcome trend towards greater concern with social issues is evident, with 30 of the 68 articles being published just in the last five-year period covered (2008-2012). Many of these recent articles reflect emerging trends that hold much promise for transforming IHEs so that making SWDs feel like they truly belong becomes a campus-wide commitment.

Why has there been a relative lack of research on social integration issues for SWDs? One factor is that much research is oriented to “technical” issues important for the academic integration of SWDs, such as how to reliably assess the unique learning needs of students in different disability categories and how to effectively provide supports. Interventions typically involve medical, educational, or assistive technologies applied at the individual level. Another factor, and perhaps a more significant one, is that non-discrimination legislation may have had some unintended consequences by guiding attention to “equal access” as the predominant intended outcome (Taylor, 2003). IHEs typically responded to Section 504 and the ADA by establishing disability support services (DSS) offices responsible for ensuring that qualifying students gain legally mandated equal access (Madaus, 2000). “Equal access” has been primarily interpreted as referring to physical access to campus facilities (e.g., building entry ramps, accessible housing) and to accommodations and supports enabling participation in academic activities (e.g., note takers for students with hearing impairments). In contrast, equal access to the co-curricular

domain (social, recreational, and other non-academic activities) has rarely been highlighted as a responsibility for DSS offices (Guzman, 2008; Loewen & Polard, 2010). The essential need for supportive social relationships is not mentioned in either Section 504 or the ADA, and is apparently therefore seldom seen as a priority issue for DSS offices.

### **Envisioning a Future of Diversity and Disability in Higher Education**

As shown in Table 2, in recent years there has been a substantial increase in the number of articles relevant to social integration for SWDs. It is notable that many of these recent articles appeared in special journal issues on important topics for social integration, indicating growing awareness of and collaboration among scholars on this issue. Likewise there have been edited monographs addressing similar matters that were not included in our review of articles in peer-reviewed journals. Described below are several emerging trends reflected in the literature that hold promise for raising awareness about the social integration issue and stimulating action to address it. All of these trends point towards a possible future in which the campus climate is experienced by SWDs as welcoming and supportive so that all students feel like they truly belong.

### **Reorienting Disability Support Services towards the Social Model**

Understandings of the causes of and appropriate responses to disabilities have commonly been classified as fitting either a medical or a social model. The medical model targets the individual for intervention, and potentially provides SWDs with essential supports for higher education success. According to the social model, disability is a social construction emerging from society's environmental, economic, and cultural barriers to full social acceptance and inclusion (Fleischer & Zames, 2001). These models are not mutually exclusive but can complement each other. However, DSS offices, with some exceptions, have been critiqued as being guided almost exclusively by the medical model, which is congruent with the ADA's orientation to ensuring equal access for individual SWDs but does not direct attention to important social issues of stigma and unwelcoming campus environments (Hadley, 2011). Wider adoption of the social model is expected to reorient DSS offices to expand beyond a narrow interpretation of equal access to also address campus-level social barriers and foster social inclusion, as promoted in the special "Disability Studies" issue of the *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability* (Volume 23, Number 1, 2010) (e.g., Gabel,

2010; Guzman & Balcazar, 2010; Strauss & Sales, 2010; Thornton & Down, 2010).

### **Enhancing Collaboration among Student Services**

One of the themes running through a special issue of *New Directions for Higher Education*, edited by Harbour and Madaus (2011), was that more collaboration among student services is needed to better address the physical and social barriers faced by SWDs. Currently various IHE offices and programs tend to be situated in what have been called bureaucratic "silos" with the DSS office typically considered to have primary or sole responsibility for supporting SWDs (e.g., Burnett & Segoria, 2009). The University of Connecticut provides a model for how the barriers inherent in silos can be broken down and commitment for supporting SWDs expanded (Korbel, et al., 2011). Key elements of the model include (a) having each DSS office staff member serve as a liaison to promote collaboration with specific departments across campus, and (b) conducting workshops on a range of disability-related topics for various student affairs units, which also serve as venues for developing collaborative partnerships. An example of the potential of cross-unit collaboration is provided by Wessel, Wentz, and Markle (2011), who described how at least five different offices at a university collaborated to organize a "power soccer" club so undergraduate power wheelchair users could participate in athletics, with those who were subsequently interviewed reporting enhanced friendships, greater self-confidence, and improved communication and interpersonal skills.

### **Including Disability in Diversity Initiatives**

As noted earlier, many IHEs implement diversity initiatives, but these often fail to include disability. In line with the emerging idea that greater collaboration is needed across student services, DSS offices might work with those involved in diversity initiatives to strengthen or add a focus on disability (Higbee et al., 2007). This would provide an avenue for promoting the kind of language advocated by social model proponents to talk about disabilities in order to move away from the deficit orientation inherent in medical model descriptions. For example, Depoy and Gilson (2008) promote use of the terms *typical* and *atypical* to highlight the fact that human characteristics occur along a continuum and also to avoid the value judgments inherent in commonly used terms such as *normal* and *abnormal*, which imply a binary division rather than a continuum. In this vein, there has been increasing use of the term *neurodiverse* (as opposed to *neurotypical*) to describe people with disabilities such as autism, learning disabilities, attention disorders, or

certain psychiatric disorders.

Neurodiverse individuals may in fact have advantages in certain situations and occupations such as the attention to detail that many people with autism can bring to a task (Armstrong, 2010). Research also suggests that people with disabilities achieve more positive self-identities when they are able to “reframe” problematic personal characteristics as lying on a continuum of diversity rather than being outside the range of normalcy (Hahn & Belt, 2004; Olney & Kim, 2001). As use of neurodiverse and other non-stigmatizing terms becomes the standard, we can expect SWDs to gain enhanced feelings of belonging that in turn support the development of more positive self-identities and greater willingness to self-disclose in order to access services and supports promoting improved social and academic outcomes.

### **Extending Universal Design to the Co-curricular Domain**

Ensuring equal access often involves use of universal design, which refers to the modification of environments and activities so they are accessible to everyone, no matter their functional limitations (Roberts, Park, Brown, & Cook, 2011). Universal design is best known with regard to physical access, while what is known as universal design for learning is increasingly being used to make educational materials and activities more accessible for students with a wide range of learning styles and physical and sensory abilities. Universal design for learning holds the promise of helping to “normalize” the higher education experience of SWDs by reducing the need for them to self-identify and follow detailed procedural steps necessary to obtain classroom accommodations. The universal design approach also has the potential to improve access to the co-curricular domain (e.g., large screen transcription of announcements and speeches at public events) (Belch, 2005; Johnson, 2000; Strange & Banning, 2001).

### **Promoting Change through Student Activism**

The Disability Rights Movement has achieved many successes largely because people with disabilities have stood at the forefront and become visible as fellow human beings. The frontline advocacy of SWDs themselves may also be essential to successfully prompting IHEs to do what is needed to create campus environments that are truly welcoming for all. The Beyond Compliance Coordinating Committee at Syracuse University provides one model for student activism. According to the organization’s website (<http://bcccsyracuse.wordpress.com/>), it was founded in 2001 by a group of graduate SWDs with member-

ship open to all students. The organization has held numerous awareness-raising events and worked with the university administration to change policies and practices. The committee has achieved national reach through publications and conference presentations and its model has been adopted at other IHEs. Another organization working to strengthen the collective voice of SWDs is the Youth Legacy Foundation. Its activities include a Higher Education Network (currently focused in Minnesota) designed to link student groups at different IHEs so they can share resources and expand their impact and reach ([http://youthlegacyfoundation.org/?page\\_id=621](http://youthlegacyfoundation.org/?page_id=621)).

### **Assessing Progress in Creating Welcoming Campus Climates**

The various activities described above may be viewed as components of a broader initiative to transform what has been called the “campus climate” so it is experienced by SWDs as welcoming and fully accessible (Huger, 2011; Wilson, Getzel, & Brown, 2000). Over the years a number of instruments have been developed to assess how welcoming the climate is for diverse student subpopulations, including several specifically for students with disabilities. The College Students with Disabilities Campus Climate survey is comprised of 43 six-point Likert scale items (Lombardi, Gerdes, & Murray, 2011). The Assessment of Campus Climate to Enhance Student Success consists of several questionnaires that gather the perspectives of administrators and staff, faculty, and students (Vogel, et al., 2008). AHEAD offers a service to administer these questionnaires online and produce summary reports ([http://www.ahead.org/program\\_eval\\_tools](http://www.ahead.org/program_eval_tools)). Stodden, Brown, and Roberts (2011) provided a brief climate assessment tool consisting of 10 “agree” or “disagree” items (derived from a set of larger instruments on attitudes to people with disabilities, programmatic supports, facilities access, and instructional access) along with a scoring guide. Such instruments can be used by faculty and administrators to evaluate and improve their programs to better serve SWDs, and by SWD groups to validate their advocacy efforts to promote change and track the extent to which change is happening over time.

## Conclusion

The ultimate goal of the Disability Rights Movement has been to reach a point where everyone is viewed and treated as deserving of respect and full social acceptance. Higher education can play a leadership role in attaining this goal by creating inclusive and welcoming campus environments that serve as models for the wider society. Such environments are not legally required, as they would be based on changed attitudes and behaviors typically not possible to legislate. The development of welcoming attitudes and behaviors would instead seem to require continued advocacy by concerned individuals with and without disabilities who work to define and spread enhanced norms about what an IHE should be. Issues to consider include:

- Promote the benefits to higher education as a place of valuing and seeking out diverse ways of perceiving and thinking. This would require campuses to work toward a culture of exploration, acceptance, and support for and by a diverse range of teachers and learners.
- Advocate making campuses barrier-free and welcoming, physically, programmatically, and attitudinally. While many people may support this statement, it is imperative that SWDs and other marginalized students take up the charge for higher education campuses to be truly welcoming and supportive for all students. This requires that training (self- and group-advocacy) and support be provided to SWDs to step into the lead.
- Increase the proportion of faculty and staff with disabilities and other diverse characteristics, to raise the visibility and status of such persons on campus and provide SWDs with more potential role models, mentors, and advocates.
- Conduct more research on social integration issues for SWDs within the context of diversity. It is important to seek out and involve social scientists and others in this effort – too many times only researchers in the disability field are involved, which amounts to “preaching to the choir.” Research is especially needed on SWDs who are liable to face discrimination on other counts, such as being of ethnic/racial minority heritage or having a non-normative sexual orientation.
- Raise awareness of these issues broadly by publishing research articles and advocacy pieces in academic journals and general audience publications outside disability fields.

As the social model of disability continues to impact upon how disability services, supports, and accommodations are provided in higher education, increased opportunities will become available to support SWDs within the broader context of supporting all students to successfully access, retain, and complete the program of study of their choice. Furthermore, as SWDs are supported to rethink about themselves and others on a continuum of diversity, it is expected that all learners will feel a sense of belonging and express their needs to be successful learners, free of the restrictions and stigma that come with labels. Once campuses have become places where all students are supported to learn, regardless of their diverse needs, then we can all begin to feel the shift from a “rights based approach” to a “what’s right” approach to supporting SWDs in higher education.

## References

- Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.
- Antonio, A. L. (2001). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *The Review of Higher Education, 25*, 63-89.
- Armstrong, T. (2010). *Neurodiversity: Discovering the extraordinary gifts of autism, ADHD, dyslexia, and other brain differences*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Lifelong Books.
- Barnard, L., Stevens, T., Siwatu, K. O., & Lan, W. Y. (2008). Diversity beliefs as a mediator to faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(3), 169-175.
- Belch, H. A. (2005). Retention and students with disabilities. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 6*, 3-22.
- Braxton, J. M. (2009). Understanding the development of the whole person. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*, 573-575.
- Burnett, S. E., & Segoria, J. (2009). Collaboration for military transition students from combat to college: It takes a community. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 22*(1), 53-58.
- DaDeppo, L. M. W. (2009). Integration factors related to the academic success and intent to persist of college students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 24*(3), 122-131.
- Denhart, H. (2008). Deconstructing barriers: Perceptions of students labeled with learning disabilities in higher education. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41*(6), 483-497.

- Depoy, E., & Gilson, S. (2008). Social work practice with disability: Moving from the perpetuation of a client category to human rights and social justice. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://www.jswwearchives.com/content/view/103/66/>
- Fleischer, D. Z., & Zames, F. (2001). *The disability rights movement: From charity to confrontation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gabel, S. L. (2010). A disability studies framework for policy activism in postsecondary education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 23(1), 63-71.
- Getzel, E. E. (2008). Addressing the persistence and retention of students with disabilities in higher education: Incorporating key strategies and supports on campus. *Exceptionality*, 16, 207-219.
- Guzman, A. (2008, March). Reframing our disability perspective: A glance at disability studies. AHEAD ALERT Online Newsletter. Retrieved from <http://ahead.org/publications/alert/march-08#art1>
- Guzman, A., & Balcazar, F. (2010). Disability services' standards and the worldviews guiding their implementation. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 23(1), 48-62.
- Hadley, W. M. (2011). College students with disabilities: A student development perspective. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 154, 77-81.
- Hahn, H. D., & Belt, T. L. (2004). Disability identity and attitudes toward cure in a sample of disabled activists. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 45(4), 453-464.
- Harbour, W. S., & Madaus, J. W. (Eds.) (2011). Disability services and campus dynamics [special issue]. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 154.
- Higbee, J. L., Siaka, K., & Bruch, P. L. (2007). Assessing our commitment to multiculturalism: Student perspectives. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 37(2), 7-25.
- Hollins, S., Downer, J., Farquarson, L., Oyepaju, R., & Kopper, L. (2002). *Speaking up for myself*. London: The Royal College of Psychiatrists.
- Huger, M. S. (2011). Fostering a disability-friendly institutional climate. *New Directions for Student Services*, 134, 3-11.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, 20 U.S.C. § 1400, et seq.
- Johnson, D. (2000). Enhancing out-of-class opportunities for students with disabilities. *New Directions for Student Services*, 91, 41-53.
- Korbel, D. M., Lucia, J. H., Wenzel, C. M., & Anderson, B. G. (2011). Collaboration strategies to facilitate successful transition of students with disabilities in a changing higher education environment. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 154, 17-25.
- Litner, B., Mann-Feder, V., & Guerard, G. (2005). Narratives of success: Learning disabled students in university. *Exceptionality Education Canada*, 15(1) 9-23.
- Loewen, G., & Pollard, W. (2010). The social justice perspective. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 23(1), 5-18.
- Lombardi, A., Gerdes, H., & Murray, C. (2011). Validating an assessment of individual actions, postsecondary supports, and social supports of college students with disabilities. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 48(1), 107-126.
- Madaus, J. W. (2000). Services for college and university students with disabilities: A historical perspective. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 14(1), 4-21.
- Mamiseishvili, K., & Koch, L.C. (2010). First-to-second-year persistence of students with disabilities in postsecondary institutions in the United States. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 54(2), 93-105.
- McDonald, K. E., Keys, C. B., & Balcazar, F. E. (2007). Disability, race/ethnicity and gender: Themes of cultural oppression, acts of individual resistance. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39, 145-161.
- Myers, K., & Bastian, J. (2010). Understanding communication preferences of college students with visual disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(3), 265-278.
- Najarian, C. G. (2008). Deaf women: Educational experiences and self-identity. *Disability & Society*, 23(2), 117-128.
- Nevill, R. E. A., & White, S. W. (2011). College students' openness toward autism spectrum disorders: Improving peer acceptance. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 41(12), 1619-1628.
- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Knokey, A.-M., Marder, C., Nagle, K., Shaver, D., Wei, X., with Cameto, R., Contreras, E., Ferguson, K., Greene, S., & Schwarting, M. (2011). *The post-high school outcomes of young adults with disabilities up to 8 years after high school*. A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) (NCSER 2011-3005). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

- Olney, M. F., & Kim, A. (2001). Beyond adjustment: Integration of cognitive disability into identity. *Disability & Society, 16*, 563-583.
- Papasotiriou, M., & Windle, J. A. (2012). The social experience of physically disabled Australian university students. *Disability & Society, 27*(7), 935-947.
- Paul, S. (2000). Students with disabilities in higher education: A review of the literature. *College Student Journal, 34*(2), 200-210.
- Raley, Y. (2007). Why we quit. *Scientific American Mind, August/September*, 75-79.
- Roberts, K. D., Park, H. J., Brown, S., & Cook, B. (2011). Universal design for instruction in postsecondary education: A systematic review of empirically based articles. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 24*, 4-18.
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.
- Stodden, R. A., Brown, S. E., & Roberts, K. (2011). Disability-friendly university environments: Conducting a climate assessment. *New Directions for Higher Education, 154*, 83-92.
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Strauss, A. L., & Sales, A. (2010). Bridging the gap between disability studies and disability services in higher education: A model center on disability. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 23*(1), 79-84.
- Taylor, S. J. (2003). Introduction. In Cory, R., Taylor, S., Walker, P., & White, J. (Eds.), *Beyond compliance: An information package on the inclusion of people with disabilities in postsecondary education*. Syracuse, NY: National Resource Center on Supported Living and Choice, Syracuse University. Retrieved from <http://bcccsyracuse.wordpress.com/bcccarticles/>
- Thomas, S. L. (2000). Ties that bind: A social network approach to understanding student integration and persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*, 591-615.
- Thornton, M., & Down, S. (2010). Walking the walk: Modeling social model and universal design in the disabilities office. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 23*(1), 72-78.
- Tinto, V., & Pusser, B. (2006). *Moving from theory to action: Building a model of institutional action for student success*. Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/Tinto\\_Pusser\\_Report.pdf](http://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/Tinto_Pusser_Report.pdf)
- Trammell, J. (2009). Red-shirting college students with disabilities. *The Learning Assistance Review, 14*(2), pp. 21-32.
- Troiano, P. F. (2003). College students and learning disability: Elements of self-style. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 404-419.
- Vogel, S., Holt, S., Sligar, S., & Leake, E. (2008). Assessment of campus climate to enhance student success. *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability, 21*(1), 15-31.
- Wessel, R. D., Wentz, J., & Markle, L. L. (2011). Power soccer: Experiences of students using power wheelchairs in a collegiate athletic club. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 24*(2), 147-159.
- Wilson, K., Getzel, E., & Brown, T. (2000). Enhancing the post-secondary campus climate for students with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 14*(1), 37-50.
- Wolanin, T. R., & Steele, P. E. (2004). *Higher education opportunities for students with disabilities: A primer for policymakers*. Washington, DC: The Institute for Higher Education Policy.

## About the Authors

David Leake received his B.A. degree in psychology from Princeton University, and his Masters of Public Health and Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Hawaii at Manoa. He has been with the University of Hawaii's Center on Disability Studies for about 25 years working as a researcher, program evaluator, project director, and principal investigator. His research interests include transition to adulthood, postsecondary education for people with disabilities, self-determination, and child and adolescent mental health. He can be reached by email at: [leake@hawaii.edu](mailto:leake@hawaii.edu).

Dr. Robert A. Stodden received his B.A. degree in Psychology from Western Washington University, M.S. degree in Psychological Counseling from California State University at Long Beach, and a Ph.D. in Special Education from the University of Florida. His professional experience includes working as a secondary school teacher and counselor and a teacher educator/researcher at Boston College and the University of Hawaii at Manoa. He is currently Director of the Center on Disability Studies and Professor of Special Education at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. His research interests include secondary school preparation and transition of students with disabilities as well the status of young adults with disabilities in postsecondary education and employment settings. He can be reached by email at: [stodden@hawaii.edu](mailto:stodden@hawaii.edu)