

Promoting an Accessible Learning Environment for Students with Disabilities via Faculty Development (Practice Brief)

Feilin Hsiao¹
Sheryl Burgstahler²
Terri Johnson¹
Daniel Nuss¹
Michael Doherty¹

Abstract

Faculty members' positive attitudes, active engagement, and receptiveness to inclusive instructional practices may contribute to the retention and success of students with disabilities (SWDs). However, most faculty members are not adequately prepared to effectively implement inclusive instruction, and many remain uninformed regarding the functional impact of specific disabilities on academic performance. This practice brief describes a sustainable, year-long, five-module faculty development program that includes universal design of instruction, characteristics of diverse learners, accessible online learning, disability-related laws and regulations, a panel dialogue with SWDs, and a final project that involved disseminating, integrating, and applying knowledge and skills learned during the program. Results from pre- and post-training questionnaires indicated significant improvements in faculty members' willingness to accommodate SWDs, provide accessible materials, and cultivate inclusive classroom environments, as well as in their understanding of disability law and concepts and of the accessibility of campus resources.

Keywords: accessible learning, faculty development, disability, postsecondary education

According to the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics (Snyder, de Brey, & Dillow, 2016), students with disabilities (SWDs) account for 11% of all students in higher education, a percentage that has grown to nearly double the 6% reported in 1999. SWDs typically demonstrate less educational attainment than students without disabilities (Ryan & Bauman, 2016). As Jensen, Petri, Day, Truman, and Duffy (2011) have found, the retention of SWDs relates directly to how well accommodations meet their specific needs and assist them in fulfilling the expectations of their academic activities. Unlike students at the K–12 level, SWDs in higher education are required to self-identify as having disabilities to a designated campus unit to request accommodations. However, among youth who received special education services in high school and pursued postsecondary education, only 28% reported to their universities' disability services offices and received accommodations (Newman et al., 2011). Perceived resistance from faculty mem-

bers to provide accommodations and a lack of skills in explaining functional limitations caused by a disability and how it can affect academic performance are two factors behind these students' reluctance toward self-disclosure and accommodation requests (Barnard–Brak, Sulak, Tate, & Lechtenberger, 2010; Marshak, Wieren, Ferrell, Swiss, & Dugan, 2010). Since students who choose not to disclose their disabilities do not receive accommodations from disability services offices, their academic success depends solely on their own efforts, as well as the ability and willingness of faculty members to meet their needs through inclusive teaching practices.

At a number of universities, professional training programs have been developed and implemented with the aims of enhancing faculty members' awareness, attitudes, and competence in employing strategies to ensure equal access for SWDs in classrooms (Burgstahler, 2007; Cook et al., 2006; Murray, Lombardi, Seeley, & Gerdes, 2014; Murray, Wren,

¹ University of the Pacific; ² University of Washington

Stevens, & Keys, 2009; Park, Roberts, & Stodden, 2012; Rodesiler & McGuire, 2015; Rohland et al., 2003). The formats of these training programs can be differentiated by program duration (e.g., number of hours, days, weeks, and semesters), frequency (e.g., single workshops and series of training sessions offered over extended periods), type of delivery method used (e.g., in-person training, synchronous or asynchronous online instruction, and blended offerings), and type of instructional activities involved (e.g., didactic, interactive and experiential activities, collaborative learning, and reflective discussions). Reviews of these training programs have suggested outcomes of immediate and long-term impacts on faculty members' disability awareness (e.g., knowledge of characteristics of SWDs), willingness to provide accommodations, and quality of interaction with SWDs. They have also underscored improvements in faculty members' knowledge of resources, legal obligations, effective accommodation strategies, and assistive technology, as well as their self-efficacy in applying specific inclusive instructional methods, including the use of learning management systems (LMS) and the adoption of universal design practices.

Depiction of the Problem

Research findings have suggested that faculty members' positive attitudes, active engagement, and receptiveness to inclusive instructional practices may contribute to the retention and success of students with disabilities (Park et al., 2012). However, many faculty members begin to consider issues related to accessibility only when SWDs enroll in their courses. Consequently, they often lack adequate preparation to effectively implement inclusive instruction, are uninformed in regard to the functional impact of specific disabilities on academic performance, and are unsure about strategies for maintaining academic standards while providing reasonable accommodations. Although the results of existing professional training programs have indicated a positive impact on faculty members' disability awareness and their readiness to provide an accessible learning environment for SWDs, common barriers to faculty enrollment and participation in such training programs include: time constraints, scheduling issues, a lack of perceived urgency, and few incentives (Getzel, Briel, & McManus, 2003). To overcome these barriers, Reder, Mooney, Holmgren, and Kuerbis (2009) proposed three strategies: (1) emphasizing faculty ownership by understanding their needs and interests and involving local faculty members with interest and relevant expertise in program leadership and management; (2)

encouraging collegiality, community, and shared responsibility by creating collaborative systems within institutions; and (3) providing recognition and awards, including reduced workload, improved opportunities for promotion and tenure, and financial remuneration. In addition, given the increased number of SWDs on university campuses, the types of disabilities represented in a complex array of academic disciplines, and the limited resources available from disability services offices, it might also be helpful to empower faculty members to serve as trainers and academic unit liaisons (Murray et al., 2014; Rohland et al., 2003).

Participant Demographics and Institutional Partners/Resources

This practice brief describes a faculty development program—namely, Building a Team to Reach All Learners: Promoting an Accessible Learning Environment for Students with Disabilities—initiated by three faculty members from the Departments of Arts, Engineering, and Special Education. The program was funded by the Strategic Educational Excellence Development of a midsized private university with three campuses on the West Coast that is committed to student-centered learning. The university's Office of Disability Support Services (DSS) operates within the Division of Student Life, and during the academic year 2016/2017, it served approximately 514 SWDs, roughly 10% of the university's total student population. Predominant primary diagnoses reported by the students were psychological or mental health conditions (57%), physical disabilities (24%), specific learning disabilities (14%), and autism spectrum disorders (5%).

Faculty members were recruited via email invitations and electronic flyers that outlined a yearlong, five-module training program addressing disability awareness and inclusive instructional practices and offered a \$1,500 stipend for each participant. The 25 participating faculty members represented various university units, including the College of Liberal Arts, the Schools of Business, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, and Music, and the Dental and Law Schools volunteered to participate. These included 7 men and 18 women, who together had an average of 13.83 years ($SD = 8.63$) of teaching experience, ranging between three and thirty-six years. Only three faculty members had previously participated in related training either in short-lecture form or programs irrelevant to higher education. Table 1 presents the characteristics of the participants. Of the 25 faculty members who registered for the program, 19 completed all five modules.

The training and support offered through the program emerged from evidence-based practices developed as an initiative promoting the universal design of instruction hosted by the Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking, and Technology (DO-IT) Center at the University of Washington (<https://www.washington.edu/doi/>) and from cross-campus collaborations involving various units at the host university with support from the DSS and the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The program encouraged team building through dialogue among faculty members, administrators, support service providers, and SWDs.

Description of Practice

The aims of the training program were to enhance faculty members' competence in inclusive instructional practices and to ensure the program's sustainability by having faculty members become trainers and liaisons in their home academic units. Three specific objectives of the program were: (1) to enhance faculty members' knowledge and skills to meet the diverse needs of SWDs; (2) to establish ongoing collaborative partnerships and support networks for mentoring SWDs and support for faculty members; and (3) to promote positive attitudes toward SWDs as valued learners with the aim of improving the culture of the university.

To maximize faculty members' participation and to accommodate various learning styles and teaching schedules, the training program delivered content in various formats, including live streaming via WebEx and LMS engagement using Canvas, supplemented by Internet-based resources and individualized support. To increase faculty members' perseverance in completing all modules of the program, a stipend was provided upon completion of all modules. Faculty members participated in an intensive two-day external expert-led workshop, a month-long online course, live presentations and group discussions conducted by the director of DSS and faculty leaders, and a student panel of SWDs. Table 2 outlines the modules of the program. As an integral part of the program, student-panel participants identified factors of their successful academic performance, including the attitudes of faculty members, course policies and guidelines, and the effective use of technology. Table 3 describes the themes and content of the insights of the student panel.

Upon completing the training program, participants completed projects that involved disseminating, integrating, and applying knowledge and skills developed through the program. Each project involved an introduction to the discipline and overall requirements, a list of required academic activities

associated with major learning outcomes, potential or anticipated challenges for SWDs, examples of accommodations for each activity, and a common format of assessment. These newly-trained faculty became liaisons and trainers in their home academic unit. They collected information from colleagues regarding the discipline-specific needs of SWDs and proposed accommodations for specific scenarios and cases.

Evaluation of Observed Outcomes

The Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (Lombardi, Murray, & Gerdes, 2011) was used to evaluate the immediate effectiveness of the faculty training by measuring changes in participating faculty members' perceptions of, attitudes toward, and knowledge about accommodations and inclusive instruction. Based on a 6-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree), results from pre- and post-training questionnaires indicated significant improvement in the faculty members' willingness to accommodate SWDs, provide accessible materials, and cultivate inclusive classroom environments, as well as in their understanding of disability law and concepts and of the accessibility of campus resources. Table 4 presents a summary of the group-based data. No significant differences were found between gender groups and years of teaching experiences (fewer or more than ten years).

In addition, pre- and post-training interviews were conducted with participants to understand their needs and concerns, as well as to allow them to contribute ideas and provide feedback and reflections on the training. In pre-training interviews, participants identified four areas of need: (1) knowledge about various types of disabilities, (2) specific strategies for accommodating SWDs and applying inclusive instructional practices, (3) access to resources, and (4) availability of support services. Complementing the results of the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory, post-training interviews indicated that the program adequately addressed those areas, and participants reported achieving the most growth in (1) their knowledge of disability-related legislation and legal issues, (2) their knowledge of characteristics of students with various types of disability and reasonable accommodations, (3) their ability to use technology to accommodate SWDs, (4) their awareness of specific strategies and instructional methods, and (5) their understanding of the perspectives of SWDs.

Thematic analyses revealed that the perceptions and attitudes of participating faculty members improved with respect to their (1) flexibility and open-mindedness toward accommodating SWDs, (2)

belief that SWDs have the potential to achieve success in postsecondary education; (3) understanding of responsibilities of schools, the DSS, and faculty members and the shift from reactive to proactive approaches; and (4) understanding that inclusive instruction can benefit all students in the classroom.

Implications and Portability

This faculty training model highlighted the significance of faculty initiation and active involvement, as well as partnerships and collaboration among external experts, faculty members, service providers, and SWDs. The leadership and engagement of faculty leaders and directors of the CTL and the DSS facilitated the integration and implementation of effective strategies within the university and the promotion of positive attitudes toward SWDs as valued learners. The various formats for delivering training modules aligned with the principles of universal design by accommodating the typically hectic and diverse schedules of faculty members and keeping them engaged in live presentations, comprehensive workshops, panel discussions, online courses via the LMS, and the use of Internet-based resources. The integration of the LMS allowed participants to experience the online learning environment firsthand through a module that taught about and modeled inclusive design of online learning.

In final projects, participants disseminated the results of training in conversations with their colleagues. They also facilitated discussions about academic standards, the assessment of learning outcomes, potential or anticipated challenges for students with various disabilities to achieve those outcomes, and examples of accommodations for scenarios unique to their disciplines. Most importantly, the faculty members have continued to serve as liaisons and mentors of new faculty members, graduate assistants, and students interested in serving as peer mentors for SWDs.

By following the distributed learning format over a one-year period, the program nurtured a learning community of enthusiastic faculty members committed to meeting the diverse needs of SWDs, and the CTL helped to establish that community upon the completion of the program. In the community, faculty members of various departments have continued to collaborate, reflect on teaching, provide critical feedback on the implementation and practices of inclusive instruction in courses, and support the development and integration of innovative strategies for improving students' success.

The most compelling part of the program, as reported by most participants, was their development of an understanding of the perspectives of SWDs, which

made participants aware that SWDs can achieve success and aware of the ways in which they approach instruction and plan for classes. During the student panel, faculty members received direct insights into the characteristics of diverse learners and effective instructional and accommodation strategies, which generated dialogues among students, faculty members, and service providers.

This faculty development program is sustainable and ready for future replication; all training modules have been recorded, and the videos and resources, many available and regularly updated and enhanced by the DO-IT Center, are available from the websites of the CTL (LibGuide) and the DSS (Faculty Resources). The CTL has also replicated an online-accessible learning course for Teach 101, which targets instructors new to teaching. The program can serve as a template for continuous faculty development in providing inclusive, effective learning environments for SWDs.

Challenges

The primary challenge of implementing the training program was maintaining the engagement of faculty members at satellite campuses throughout all five modules. Factors that contributed to attrition included scheduling conflicts and time constraints due to conflicting teaching schedules and work demands, as well as a lack of familiarity with the LMS. Although a technician at the CTL supported training during the program, technical difficulties occurred; the synchronous WebEx delivery did not effectively engage off-campus participants, and the quality of the first two WebEx recordings was unsatisfactory. Although incorporating technology for online access provided an alternative means of participation, faculty members reported preferring face-to-face encounters due to their learning preferences and lack of computer literacy. Ways to strengthen the effectiveness of online delivery and increase the comfort level of faculty members with technology should be addressed in future offerings of the program.

Consistent with the findings of other research (Dallas, Upton, & Sprong, 2014; Levey, 2014; Lombardi et al., 2011), results from the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory indicated that the reluctance of participants to provide accommodations that would require significant modifications to classroom practices did not change. Possible factors of such resistance include the misconceptions that such modifications give SWDs unfair advantages and diminish academic standards, feelings of unpreparedness to provide major accommodations, time constraints,

increased workload without compensation, and lack of support from the university administration. Future training programs should therefore address the topic of resistance among faculty members.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future scholarship can further support the effectiveness of the faculty development program by focusing on the sustainable outcomes of SWDs. A particularly important question to answer is whether training faculty members affords SWDs better support in their learning. In response to that question, (1) focus group interviews, case studies, or academic record analyses for SWDs who receive instruction from program-trained faculty members could be collected and analyzed; (2) course evaluations with feedback related to instructional design could be solicited and reviewed; (3) program-specific policies detailing actions that improve the retention and success of SWDs could be explored; and (4) online surveys of students with and without disabilities who receive instruction from participating and nonparticipating faculty members could be undertaken.

References

- Barnard-Brak, L., Sulak, T., Tate, A., & Lechtenberger, D. (2010). Measuring college students' attitudes toward requesting accommodations: A national multi-institutional study. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 35*, 141–147.
- Burgstahler, S. (2007). Lessons learned in the faculty room. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 18*, 103–128.
- Cook, B. G., Rumrill, P. D., Camarata, J., Mitchell, P. R., Newman, S., Sebaly, K. P.,...Hennessey, M. L. (2006). The impact of a professional development institute on faculty members' interactions with college students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 14*, 67–76.
- Dallas, B. K., Upton, T. D., & Sprong, M. E. (2014). Post-secondary faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching strategies. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 80*, 12–20.
- Getzel, E. E., Briel, L. W., & McManus, S. (2003). Strategies for implementing professional development activities on college campuses: Findings from the OPE founded project sites (1999–2002). *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 17*, 5978.
- Jensen, R. J., Petri, A. N., Day, A. D., Truman, K. Z., & Duffy, K. (2011). Perceptions of self-efficacy among STEM students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 24*, 269–283.
- Levey, J. T. (2014). Attitudes of nursing faculty towards nursing students with disabilities: An integrative review. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 27*, 321–332.
- Lombardi, A. R., Murray, C., & Gerdes, H. (2011). College faculty and inclusive instruction: Self-reported attitudes and actions pertaining to universal design. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 4*, 250–261.
- Marshak, L., Wieren, T. V., Ferrell, D. R., Swiss, L., & Dugan, C. (2010). Exploring barriers to college student use of disability services and accommodations. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 22*, 151–165.
- Murray, C., Lombardi, A., Seeley, J., & Gerdes, H. (2014). Effects of an intensive disability focused training experience on university faculty self-efficacy. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 27*, 179–193.
- Murray, C., Wren, C. T., Stevens, E., & Keys, C. (2009). Promoting university faculty and staff awareness of students with learning disabilities: An overview of the Productive Learning u Strategies (PLuS) Project. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 22*, 117–129.
- Newman, L., Wagner, M., Knokey, A.-M., Marder, C., Nagle, K., Shaver, D.,...Schwartz, 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) (NCSE 2011-3005)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Park, H. J., Roberts, K. D., & Stodden, R. (2012). Faculty perspectives on professional development to improve efficacy when teaching students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 25*, 377–383.
- Reder, M., Mooney, K. M., Holmgren, R., & Kuerbis, P. (2009). Starting and sustaining successful faculty development programs at small colleges. In L. Nilson & J. Miller (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Vol. 27. Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (pp. 267–286). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rodesiler, C., & McGuire, J. (2015). Ideas in practice: Professional development to promote universal design for instruction. *Journal of Developmental Education, 38*, 24–31.

Rohland, P., Erickson, B., Mathews, D., Roush, S. E., Quinlan, K., Smith, A. D. (2003). Changing the Culture (CTC): A collaborative training model to create systemic change. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 17, 49–58.

Ryan C. L., & Bauman, K. (2016). *Educational attainment in the United States: 2015*. Washington, DC: Census Bureau.

Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2016). *Digest of Education Statistics 2015 (NCES 2016-014)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

About the Authors

Feilin Hsiao received her M.A. degree in music therapy from New York University and Ph.D. from the University of Iowa. She is a Board Certified Music Therapist with extensive clinical experience in special education. She is currently the Director of Music Therapy Program and associate professor in the Conservatory of music at the University of the Pacific. Her research interests include best practices in music therapy education and supervision, inclusive instruction for students with disabilities in higher education, and multicultural music therapy practice. She can be reached by email at: fhsiao@pacific.edu.

Dr. Sheryl Burgstahler received her Masters Degree in Mathematics and her Ph. D. in Policy, Governance and Administration of Higher Education from the University of Washington (UW). Her experience includes teaching and administrative work at middle school, high school, and postsecondary institutions. She is currently an Affiliate Professor in the College of Education and Director of the Access Technology Center and the DO-IT Center (where DO-IT stands for Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking and Technology) at the UW. Her research interests include the application of universal design in postsecondary settings, the transition from high school to college for students with disabilities, and the accessible design of IT. She can be reached by email at sherylb@uw.edu.

Terri Johnson received her B.A. degree and Ph.D. degree in political science from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Her experience includes a tenure-track position at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, where she was an award-winning teaching professor. Dr. Johnson served as founding Director of the Center for Educational Technology & Innovation at Carroll University in Waukesha, Wisconsin. She most recently served as the Director of the Center of Teaching & Learning at the University of the Pacific.

Dr. Johnson's research interests primarily focus on faculty development. She can be reached by email at: tljohnso41@gmail.com.

Danny Nuss received his BA degree in Communication from University of the Pacific and is currently completing a MA from Pacific. His experience includes working as a disability specialist in higher education and serving on many boards and committees in support of people with disabilities. He is currently the Director of Disability Services in the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities at the University of the Pacific. His research interests include intercultural communication, communication apprehension, and resiliency. He can be reached by email at: dnuss@pacific.edu.

Michael Doherty received a B.S. in electrical engineering from the University of Florida, an M.S. in computer science from the University of Rhode Island and a Ph.D. in computer science from the University of Colorado, Boulder. His experience includes developing simulation and control systems for General Electric. He is currently a professor in the Department of Computer Science at the University of the Pacific. His research interests include animation, simulation and computer science education. He can be reached by email at: mdoherty@pacific.edu.

Acknowledgement

This project was funded by the Strategic Educational Excellent Development fund supported by the University of the Pacific.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

ID	Gender	Academic Discipline	Teaching Experience (in years)	Previous Training
1	W	Accounting	15	No
2	M	Communication	28	No
3	W	Computer science	15	No
4	M	Computer science	7	No
5	W	Dentistry	9	No
6	W	Dentistry	3	No
7	W	Economics	10	Yes
8	W	Education	36	No
9	W	Education	9	Yes
10	W	Education	20	Yes
11	M	Engineering	3	No
12	W	English	27	No
13	W	General education	9	No
14	W	General education	11	No
15	M	Health science	22	No
16	W	Modern language & literature	20	No
17	W	Law	5	No
18	W	Law	5	No
19	W	Math	20	No
20	W	Music history	10	No
21	M	Music performance	19	No
22	W	Pharmacy practice	8	No
23	M	Political science	15	No
24	M	Sport sciences	9	No
25	W	Sport sciences	7	No

Table 2

*Outline of the Faculty Development Training Program***Module 1. UDI : The DO-IT Model:** A 2-day workshop led by an external expert

- An overview of UDI and a review of the evolution of responses to disability
- Differences in legislation and support for K–12 and postsecondary students
- Accommodations and UDI-based approaches to making educational products and environments welcoming and accessible
- The universal design and legal challenges of physical spaces, technology, services, and onsite and online instruction
- Departmental and campus-wide resources available for use by faculty members

Module 2. Laws and Regulations and the Accessibility of Campus Resources: A 2-hour workshop led by the director of the Office of Disability Support Services (DSS)

- Implications of laws and regulations
- The roles and rights of faculty members
- The rights and responsibilities of students
- The role of the DSS
- Accommodation processes
- What constitutes reasonable accommodations

Module 3. Characteristics of Diverse Learners and Accommodation Strategies: Student panel

- Challenges and successes during experiences with accommodation and accessibility in higher education
- Effective strategies to overcome barriers
- Suggestions for faculty members to create inclusive classroom environments

Module 4. Accessible Online Learning: A month-long online course administered via the learning management system delivered by an external expert

- Diversity, accommodations, universal design and technology, civil rights, legislation, and standards
- The accessible and usable design of online content
- Resources available to faculty members

Module 5. Celebrations, Reflections, and Moving Forward: A 2-hour focus-group discussion conducted by a faculty leader

- Information learned from the program
- How participants' perceptions and attitudes had changed as a result of participating in the program
- Specific actions that participants could take to apply what they had learned
- Examples of discipline-specific academic accommodations
- Feedback and recommendations for future training programs

Note. UDI = Universal design for instruction; DO-IT = Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking, and Technology Center at the University of Washington

Table 3

Factors of Academic Success: Insights from the Student Panel

Theme	Description
Faculty members' attitude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidence in the abilities of SWDs to succeed • Awareness of and attentiveness to the different needs of SWDs • Willingness to reach out and listen • Flexibility • Supportiveness
Course policies and guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency and structure in classes regarding due dates for assignments and tests • Clearly stated expectations • Provision of examples of grading criteria and rubrics for all assignments
Group projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of guidelines that define the roles of group members • Options to complete projects individually
Presentation of course content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlighting of important content in class (e.g., via fill-in-the-blank PowerPoint slides or summaries at the end of each section)
Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effective use of technology (e.g., the Learning Management System) to provide course materials, issue reminders, and post due dates of assignments and test dates on the course calendar

Note. SWDs = students with disabilities.

Table 4

Results of Pre- and Post-Training Questionnaires

Items	Pre-Training <i>M</i>	Post-Training <i>M</i>	<i>t</i>
Willingness to accommodate students with disabilities	4.78	5.14	-1.82*
Willingness to provide inclusive instruction			
Accessible course materials	4.54	5.18	-1.88*
Course modifications	2.85	2.77	0.42
Inclusive lecture strategies	5.13	5.17	-4.26
Inclusive classroom environments	4.86	5.21	-2.0*
Inclusive assessments	4.11	4.38	-0.94
Confidence with disability laws and concepts	3.50	4.65	-3.47**
Confidence with the accessibility of campus resources	4.68	5.32	-4.082***