

Strategies for Implementing Professional Development Activities on College Campuses: Findings from the OPE-Funded Project Sites (1999-2002)

Elizabeth Evans Getzel, M.A.

Lori W. Briel, M.Ed.

Shannon McManus, M.Ed.

Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Workplace Supports
Virginia Commonwealth University

Abstract

This article describes the responses to an on-line survey that was sent to 21 universities and colleges funded during 1999-2002 by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) to develop and implement faculty and administrator professional development activities. The projects were asked to respond to a series of open-ended questions concerning their experiences over the three-year period working with faculty, administrators, students with disabilities, and other professionals on their campuses. Their responses were analyzed qualitatively by identifying recurring issues and themes. Implications of the findings for future research and evaluation efforts on the effectiveness of professional development strategies and their long-term impact on the education of students with disabilities in higher education are explored.

Efforts to create faculty development programs to address student diversity and student services began to emerge on university and college campuses during the 1990s (Alfano, 1994) prompted by the growing number of diverse learners, including students with disabilities, entering postsecondary education programs. More and more students with disabilities are seeking advanced degrees as a result of a combination of legislative, academic, and social changes (Gilson, 1996). The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (Wagner, Cameto, & Newman, 2003) findings reflect the increased interest by students (and their families) to attend institutions of higher education. As a result, higher education programs, especially two-year colleges, were more likely to be a transition option in 2001 than in 1987 for students with disabilities. This option was for youth of all disability categories regardless of gender, race, or income level (Wagner et al., 2003).

A growing body of literature is focusing on the need for professional development programs for postsecondary education faculty (NCLD, 1999; Salzberg et al, 2002; Scott & Gregg, 2000; Szymanski, Hewitt, Watson, & Swett, 1999; Thompson, Bethea, & Turner, 1997; Wilson, Getzel, & Brown, 2000; Wilson & Getzel, 2001). Studies address faculty perceptions of teaching students with diverse needs, level of knowledge about students with disabilities, and the need for information and resources. Results reveal a need for professional development activities that provide faculty and staff with opportunities to increase their understanding about educating students with disabilities in higher education.

The literature provides a basis for understanding the information and materials needed by faculty on educating students with disabilities in higher education. This information is critical as higher education works to meet the unique learning needs of a diverse

student population, including students with disabilities. As greater numbers of students with disabilities seek advanced training from postsecondary programs to meet the growing demand of the market place for higher-level skills, there will be a continuing need to educate and assist faculty and staff about the availability of effective teaching strategies and technology.

It is equally important to learn what universities and colleges are doing in terms of faculty development and the outcomes of such activities. What strategies prove effective for faculty development? What are the challenges and barriers that colleges and universities face when implementing programs? What recommendations do colleges have for other institutions of higher education implementing faculty development activities? These questions and more need to be addressed as faculty and administrators work to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities.

In response to the growing need for faculty development activities across the country, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) issued a request for proposals (RFPs). The purpose of the RFP was to support

model demonstration projects in providing technical assistance or professional development for faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education as part of an effort to ensure that students with disabilities receive a quality postsecondary education. Proposals were to address one or more of the following activities, (a) develop innovative, effective, and efficient teaching methods and strategies; (b) synthesize research and other information related to the provision of postsecondary educational services to students with disabilities; and (c) conduct professional development and training sessions for faculty and administrators to meet the postsecondary needs of students with disabilities. As a result of the competition, 21 postsecondary sites were selected for the 1999-2002 grant funding cycle.

The sites represent a wide range of educational institutions, and each designed faculty development activities to meet the unique needs of their individual campus. Hence the project staff from these sites possesses a wealth of information and first-hand experience about the strategies and methods used to implement faculty development activities on their campuses. This article describes the responses to an on-line sur-

Table 1
Survey Site Participants
N=17

OPE Sites
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
California State University at Northridge
University of Connecticut
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
Landmark College
University of Minnesota
University of New Hampshire
Northern Illinois University
Ohio State University
Oregon Health and Science University
University of Rhode Island
Utah State University
Virginia Commonwealth University
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Stout

vey that was sent to each of the OPE-funded projects. Project staff were asked to respond to a series of open-ended questions concerning their experiences over a three-year period working with faculty, administrators, students with disabilities, and other professionals on their campuses to develop, implement, and evaluate faculty development activities.

Method

Participants

Survey respondents were project directors or coordinators of the 21 OPE-funded sites from 1999-2002. On-line surveys were sent to each of the 21 sites asking for their participation. Reminder e-mails were sent to ensure the highest return rate possible. Seventeen completed surveys were returned to Virginia Commonwealth University for analysis. Table 1 provides a list of the participating sites.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument asked respondents to provide information on the outcomes of their projects; ideas on what they had learned concerning faculty development in higher education; and suggestions and ideas for other colleges and universities on strategies for implementing faculty development programs. The survey instrument was designed to serve two purposes. The first was to gather information on the focus of their projects and the products developed as a result of their activities. Some of this information is briefly described in Appendix A. More detailed descriptions of the projects and their products are summarized in a publication "Faculty Development in Higher Education: Training Products and Resource Information," which is available by contacting the authors.

The second purpose of the survey was to gain insight from a variety of colleges and universities across the country concerning implementation of faculty development programs. The respondents were asked eight open-ended questions about implementation of their project activities and their impact. The responses were analyzed qualitatively by identifying recurring issues and themes. Each site provided several responses to the questions. The tables presented in the results section summarize emerging themes or similar trends among the responding sites, based on the responses of four or more sites.

Results

Faculty Input

The first question asked how feedback from the faculty helped to guide project activities. The responses illustrate how projects worked extensively to develop customized training and materials for faculty and staff at their institutions. Thus, feedback obtained from faculty helped to guide a number of the activities either in the development stage or modification of materials after presented to the faculty. Prior to the development of training materials, some sites, including University of Kentucky and Ohio State University, conducted focus groups or other assessments to determine the format or type of training to develop. California State University, Northridge, described how faculty input helped to shape the dissemination and media uses for their training; for example, the staff had planned to develop videotapes, but instead offered on-line training. Formative and summative evaluation methods were also used at all the project sites to continually enhance the content and format of the training. University of Wisconsin-Stout moved almost exclusively to disseminating information using a web site in response to the need for this type of dissemination rather than face-to-face training. Similarly, to keep a continual flow of information and feedback among faculty members who attended trainings, Northern Illinois University developed a listserv to send a "tip of the week" as a method of follow-up after a training, thereby allowing faculty an opportunity to share their experiences of implementing what they learned.

Faculty input also took the form of faculty members assisting in the development of training materials for their colleagues. For example, at the University of Kansas faculty members developed content-specific instructional devices and identified the components for the creation of a CD-ROM. In other projects, faculty members were not the only audience that the staff solicited information from concerning the content and information for professional development activities. Students with disabilities, university administrators, and auxiliary personnel also provided input. These groups were used either in the review of materials, presenters in training programs, or received training as part of the project activities. Landmark College produced a CD featuring college students talking about their learning disabilities. Table 2 summa-

Table 2
Use of Faculty Input for Project Activities

Activity	Frequency	Percent
Evaluation of Materials, Activities, and Training	12	71%
Determined Format of Training	11	65%
Participated in Development of Materials	4	24%

rizes the most frequent responses from the sites concerning faculty input in project activities.

Incorporating Project Activities

The second question asked how the projects were able to incorporate activities into their college or university setting. Over half of the responding sites did so through the development of a web site, which became a primary vehicle for providing information and training to faculty and other university personnel. A number of sites reported that activities involving on-site or face-to-face training were incorporated into established university or college meetings and events. For example, partnerships were developed with centers for faculty development on various campuses incorporating disability related training into their faculty development activities. Utah State University incorporated training information and materials into annual graduate teaching assistant orientations and departmental meetings. Similarly, the University of Arizona described their project as an outreach and infusion model. They were able to infuse learner-centered concepts and instructional strategies in academic departments on their campus. Infusing information, resources, and materials into existing programs and events at the university was voiced by several of the

sites as an effective method for reaching faculty and administrators.

The development of training materials and resources focusing on Universal Design principles was identified by five of the sites. The University of Connecticut, for example, developed a national resource for training faculty and administrators on Universal Design for Instruction, including on-line examples of inclusive instructional strategies. Day-to-day use of strategies and techniques by faculty and staff was viewed as a critical means for incorporating the information and materials developed by the projects.

In two project sites activities helped to build an increasing awareness and need for additional staff to assist in providing the services and supports needed by students with disabilities. Positions included a full-time disability coordinator through the University of Rhode Island project and University of Arkansas at Little Rock created an instructional technology specialist to focus on web accessibility and Universal Design. Table 3 lists activities that were provided by four or more responding sites.

Outreach Methods Used

Survey participants were also asked to identify the most effective methods of outreaching to faculty

Table 3
Strategies for Incorporating Activities on Campus

Strategies	Frequency	Percent
Development of Web Site	9	53%
Use of Established Meetings or Events	7	41%
Focus on Universal Design Principles	5	29%

and what contributed to their participation and interest. Availability of training in various formats was found helpful by a majority of the OPE sites in outreach to faculty, and is exemplified through the University of Washington project. The use of web sites, brochures, videotapes, and on-site presentations were all listed as effective strategies.

Collaboration was also a key factor when outreaching to faculty. Thus, sites emphasized the importance of building relationships with all parties involved, including faculty, administrators, staff, and students with disabilities. Some of the sites, including Virginia Commonwealth University fostered collaboration through the use of faculty liaisons to work with individual departments helping to disseminate information and provide input on topics for further training. Working with university centers for improving instruction and collaborating with other university student services to develop and implement of training activities was seen as an effective methods for reaching faculty. Additionally, the University of Minnesota, along with three other sites, reported on the importance of having administrative support across several levels of the university to endorse faculty development activities offered by the projects. On some campuses, faculty members were more responsive when a dean, vice president, or vice provost endorsed the projects' activities and encouraged their participation.

Four of the sites, including Oregon Health and Science University, believed that structuring their training and resource development around the concepts

of Universal Design proved effective for reaching faculty. Providing information within the context of Universal Design enabled faculty to learn how changes in their instruction, curriculum, and use of technology could benefit all students, including students with disabilities. Thus, using the concepts of Universal Design helped faculty broaden their perspective on teaching students with disabilities.

The use of an honorarium or other incentives was reported to be an effective way to obtain faculty participation by four of the sites. The University of New Hampshire found that faculty members who received these incentives agreed to share information with their colleagues or participate in an evaluation process documenting changes made in curriculum materials, policies, or teaching strategies. Table 4 summarizes the responses of the sites concerning outreach strategies for faculty participation.

Challenges/Barriers to Providing Training

The overwhelming response to the question on the greatest challenges or barriers to developing and providing faculty development activities was time constraints. Thus, 15 sites responded that the competition for faculty members' time to participate in training or other activities was the greatest barrier. The sites sought various methods and strategies to overcome the issue of time availability for professional development activities.

The second barrier was the lack of understanding or buy-in by faculty members of the need for pro-

Table 4
Effective Outreach Methods

Methods	Frequency	Percent
Availability of Training Format Options (i.e., web, brochures, videos, on site)	12	71%
Collaboration with Key Faculty, Administrators, Staff, and Students with Disabilities	6	35%
Applied Principles of Universal Design within Training Sessions	4	24%
Endorsement of Training by Key Administrators	4	24%
Use of Honorarium/Incentives for Faculty	4	24%

Table 5*Barriers or Challenges to Developing and Providing Faculty Development Activities*

Barriers	Frequency	Percent
Time Limitations of Faculty	15	88%
Lack of Faculty Buy-In for Training	7	41%
Lack of Administrative Support	4	24%

professional development activities and the relevancy of the information and materials provided to their teaching. Some respondents voiced concerns about the lack of awareness that some faculty members had concerning instructing students with disabilities, which led to negative attitudes. Other sites described difficulties with getting faculty members to see the need for professional development on an ongoing basis to keep updated on new technologies, instructional strategies, and other methods to assist students with disabilities.

The third most frequent barrier was the lack of administrative support. Respondents noted that without strong administrative support and leadership, faculty development activities were not viewed as critical. The participants' responses to this question are summarized in Table 5.

Changes to Project Implementation

Based on their experiences of implementing faculty development activities over the previous three years, project staff were asked to comment on whether or not they would have done anything differently. A majority responded no. Participants felt that specific outcomes had been achieved as a result of

the design and implementation of their projects. A few additional comments focused on developing more web based resources or on-line training for faculty.

Critical Information Needed by Faculty

The respondents were asked to express their opinions on what information was most critical for faculty when teaching students with disabilities. Three major areas emerged, Universal Design principles, legal rights and responsibilities for instructing students with disabilities, and information that facilitated further understanding and awareness on the part of faculty members. A little over 40% of the sites identified the need for instructing faculty members on the principles of Universal Design and ideas and strategies for implementing these principles.

Over half of the sites identified the need for faculty to obtain training on the issues around the legal rights and responsibilities of students with disabilities in higher education. Specifically, they reported that information was needed about the accommodation process on their campus and the roles and responsibilities of students with disabilities, faculty, and the disability support services office. The sites also listed

Table 6*Information Most Critical for Faculty Instructing Students with Disabilities*

Information	Frequency	Percent
Legal/Policy Issues Regarding Classroom Accommodations	9	53%
Understanding/Awareness of Educating Students with Disabilities	9	53%
Principles and Strategies of Universal Design	7	41%

issues related to accommodation and academic standards.

The third area identified by 53% of the sites as critical for faculty development involved information, resources, and materials that increased understanding and awareness of educating students with disabilities. Examples included helping faculty to understand the value-added aspects of having students with disabilities in their classes. Other topic areas focused on understanding student learning needs, creating an environment where students are comfortable in approaching faculty to discuss accommodations, increasing awareness of diverse learners in higher education, and the tools and strategies that are available to meet these diverse needs. Responses to this question are summarized in Table 6.

Recommendations for Other Colleges and Universities

The survey respondents were asked to provide recommendations to other universities or colleges implementing faculty development activities. Their recommendations are summarized in Table 7. The most frequent response to this question concerned building collaborative partnerships on campus. Building support networks with faculty, building trust among the various partners involved in educating students with disabilities, and working with a variety of services or departments on campus were believed to be the most important components of creating faculty development activities.

The sites also recommend that a variety of training formats be developed. Thus, approximately 40%

commented that training formats should include face-to-face, on-line, and print materials so that faculty and administrators can easily access the materials and information.

A final recommendation concerned the involvement of students with disabilities, faculty, and disability service providers in the development and implementation of professional development activities. Involving students with disabilities was seen as especially critical. The respondents felt that student involvement helped to maximize personal contact between faculty and students and increased faculty awareness of the educational experiences students were having on campus.

Impact of Projects

The projects provided a wealth of information in response to the question asking what their projects had achieved. Examples illustrate the ongoing or established nature of the activities and products they created. In the area of Internet/on-line resources, over half of the sites created resources and information for on-line training or web site use. Listservs proved to be an effective method for communicating with faculty and keeping up-to-date on their issues and concerns. Training materials and information developed for the project were also listed by a majority of the projects. Numerous publications, products and presentations were developed to assist faculty at their own university along with dissemination efforts to help other colleges and universities across the country.

Changes in university policies were identified as a project impact. For example, respondents described

Table 7
Recommendations for Other Colleges and Universities

Recommendations	Frequency	Percent
Build Collaborative Partnerships	9	53%
Develop Training Using Several Formats (i.e., face-to-face, on-line, and print)	7	41%
Create Training Teams (i.e., students with disabilities, faculty, DSS staff) to Assist with Development and Implementation of Faculty Training	7	41%

Table 8
Products and Impact of Project

Impact	Frequency	Percent
Training Materials and Presentations	16	94%
Internet/On-Line Resources	9	53%
Increased Awareness	7	41%
Increased Collaboration	5	29%
Policy Changes	4	24%
Creation of New Positions	4	24%

changes within departments that helped to create a more welcoming environment for students with disabilities. Other changes included clearer guidelines for accessing accommodations through the disability support services offices and implementation of these accommodations by faculty. Changes in policies resulted from increased interaction and collaboration among university services, faculty, and administrators. Further, the building of collaborative relationships led to changes in how their university or college met the challenges and issues educating students with disabilities. Thus, project sites described enhanced relationships with disability support services and writing labs, libraries, centers for faculty development and training, and information technology centers. Some projects had also been able to establish new positions within the disability services support network on campus, including the hiring of disability support services staff, faculty development personnel, and a consultant to assist in the access of student services. Table 8 summarizes the responses by the OPE sites.

Conclusion

The results of this survey provide an overview of the opinions and experiences of 17 project sites funded to develop and implement faculty and administrator professional development activities. The findings are a beginning step towards better understanding how universities and colleges implement these activities. However, some limitations should be noted. Research is needed to further validate the impact and effectiveness of the professional development activities reported by the sites. Specifically, studies are

needed that measure long-term individual and institutional changes, and the outcomes of faculty development on the education of students with disabilities.

Second, the results presented in this article were based on the opinions and views of 17 project directors or coordinators. A greater number of professionals involved in faculty development need to voice their experiences to achieve a greater cross-section of universities and colleges. Additionally, survey questions were designed to provide an overview of the experiences and thoughts of the OPE sites. This framework might potentially have limited the type of information or responses provided by the participants.

In spite of these limitations, the results present important strategies and approaches. Some of the experiences and ideas of the OPE sites have already been reported in the literature (e.g. 2000 Salzberg et al., 2002 Scott & Gregg). Comparable results were found concerning the need for a variety of formats for faculty and administrators to obtain information and training. The sites also faced similar issues when providing training, including time limitations of faculty, lack of administrative support, and lack of buy-in from faculty concerning the relevancy of the training or even the need for this type of professional development.

The results indicate that the advancement of technology has enabled faculty to access information and resources in spite of time limitations. However, the sites emphasized the need for collaboration to successfully implement faculty development activities. Thus, over half of the sites reported that a critical piece of designing and implementing professional development programs was building partnerships with fac-

ulty, administrators, students with disabilities, and other departments on campus. These partnerships were seen as necessary for creating an environment where these types of activities could thrive. How these relationships are fostered and maintained over time warrants further investigation.

The idea of infusing disability-related training into existing faculty meetings, retreats, or other events was another finding. Some of the sites felt that incorporating principles of Universal Design into their course development was part of this infusion process as a way to benefit all students. Universal Design strategies offered faculty a more comprehensive approach to teaching diverse learners, including students with disabilities.

The need for professional development activities to focus on increasing the awareness of the need to educate students with disabilities and understanding the legal responsibilities involved continued to remain pressing issues. Ongoing research and evaluation studies are needed to assess how colleges and universities incorporate the principles of Universal Design, and the impact on instructing students with disabilities and the delivery of services to meet their educational needs.

The 21 OPE-funded projects were a testing ground for trying new and innovative strategies for professional development in higher education. Further study is needed on the long-term impact of the training and information created through these projects as well as other projects funded to enhance the educational experiences of students with disabilities in higher education. It is critical that innovative practices are shared among institutions of higher education and that the results of research and evaluation studies on professional development activities are disseminated in order to add to the growing body of knowledge in the field of disability and higher education.

References

- Alfano, K. (1994). Recent strategies for faculty development. *ERIC Digest*. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges.
- Gilson, S.F. (1996). Students with disabilities: An increasing voice and presence on college campuses. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 6, 263-272.
- National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities. (1999, January 29). *Learning disabilities: Issues in higher education. Report from the NJCLD* [Online]. Retrieved August 8, 2001, from: http://www.ldonline.org/njcld/higher_ed.html
- Salzberg, C.L, Peterson, L., Debrand, C.C., Blair, J.J., Carsey, A.C., & Johnson, A.S. (2002, spring). Opinions of disability service directors on faculty training: The need, content, issues, formats, media, and activities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 15(2), 101-114.
- Scott, S., & Gregg, G. (2000). Meeting the evolving educational needs of faculty in providing access for college students with LD. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 33(2), 158-167.
- Szymanski, E.M., Hewitt, G.J., Watson, E.A., & Swett, E.A. (1999). Faculty and instructor perception of disability support services and student communication. *Career Development for Exceptional Children*, 22(1), 117-128.
- Thomson, A.R., Bethea, L., & Turner, J. (1997). Faculty knowledge of disability laws in higher education: A survey. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 40, 166-180.
- Wagner, M., Cameto, R., & Newman, L. (2003). *Youth with disabilities: A changing population: A report of findings from the National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) and the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Wilson, K.E., & Getzel, E.E. (2001). Creating a supportive campus: The VCU Professional Development Academy. *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 23(2), 12-18.
- 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.

Appendix A

Office of Postsecondary Education Demonstration Projects 1999-2002

University of Arizona

Project Director: Dr. Julie Padgett
520-626-5768 — Padgett@u.arizona.edu

Project Web Site: http://www.utc.arizona.edu/utc_peelmain.htm

Project Title: PEEL Program to Enhance and Ensure Learning for Students with Disabilities

Project Description: The PEEL Project at the U. of A. has infused into all existing faculty development programs relevant and usable information regarding creating effective learning environments for students with disabilities. Additionally, PEEL staff members have collaborated with 20 partner institutions around the country to provide faculty and administrator development relative to students with disabilities on their campuses.

Major Areas of Focus: Faculty, TA, and administrator development relative to students with disabilities. Faculty and TA professional development focuses on appropriate teaching strategies, and administrator development focuses on advocacy issues.

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Project Director: Melanie Thornton
501-569-8410 — mpthornton@ualr.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.ualr.edu/~pace>

Project Title: Project PACE

Project Description: Project PACE is a program of Disability Support Services at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR). The primary project objective is to improve the quality of education for students with disabilities through the development and provision of resources, technical assistance and professional development opportunities to faculty, staff, and administrators in postsecondary settings. Specific accomplishments include the development of teaching strategies, the establishment of two Faculty Resource Councils on Disability on two Arkansas campuses, the provision of professional development at several Arkansas institutions, and the development of products and resources for faculty development.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Establishment of a model for faculty development—the Faculty Resource Council on Disability—in which a faculty member from each academic department receives training and resources on teaching students with disabilities and, in turn, acts as a mentor to his or her colleagues. 2. Development and provision of faculty development opportunities. 3. Development and dissemination of products.

Buffalo State College

Information for this summary was obtained from the project's web site.

Project Director: Delores Battle, Project Co-Director
716-878-6210 — battlede@bscmail.buffalostate.edu
Marianne Savino, Project Co-Director
716-878-4500 — savinomr@bscmail.buffalostate.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.buffalostate.edu/%7Eequity/projsuccess.html>

Project Title: Project Success

Project Description: The goal of Project Success is to provide widespread appropriate professional development for administrators and faculty in order to affect systemic change in institutions of higher education

Major Areas of Focus: 1. To review and synthesize the exemplary literature and other information related to postsecondary education for persons with disabilities. 2. To develop innovative teaching strategies and supports to aid administrators and faculty in postsecondary institutions in western New York to bring about systemic changes in the education of persons with disabilities. 3. To use innovative technology to disseminate information and resources to administrators and faculty in postsecondary institutions locally, regionally, and nationally about efficient and effective ways to ensure that persons with disabilities receive a quality education.

California State University at Northridge

Project Director: Dr. Merri C. Pearson
S. Kay Vincent, Project Coord.
818-677-2611 — s.kay.vincent@csun.edu

Project Web Site: <http://p3.csun.edu>

Project Title: Preparing Postsecondary Professionals (P³)

Project Description: Preparing Postsecondary Professionals, the P³ project will improve the access of educational settings for students with disabilities, particularly focused on students with hearing loss in mainstreamed settings using state-of-the-art research and innovative technological methods. Because most students with hearing loss attend mainstreamed institutions of higher education, there is a need for systemic change in institutions to provide equal access and opportunity to these students. In addition, the project created and supplemented with sections for students so they can be empowered to help themselves and their faculty.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Create 20 in-service training modules to enhance postsecondary professionals who work with deaf and hard of hearing students—we develop challenges, strategies and tips on dealing with issues related to hearing loss.

2. To provide and evaluate innovative in service training and technical assistance to higher education administrators and faculty. 3. To increase the capacity of administrators and faculty to better understand and meet the needs of students with hearing loss.

Columbia University

Information for this summary was obtained from the OPE web site.

Project Director: Lynne M. Bejoian
212-854-2388 — lmb16@columbia.edu

Project Web Site: not available

Project Title: Universal Access Does Not Equal Dumbing Down: Stigma, Pedagogy & Elitism

Project Description: The objective of this project is to educate faculty at selective institutions to become effective teachers of students with invisible disabilities. The project team will create a faculty workshop and related follow-up activities and instructional media to educate faculty about issues of invisible disabilities and how to teach in an inclusive manner that benefits all students.

Major Areas of Focus: Information not available at this time.

University of Connecticut

Project Director: Dr. Stan Shaw, Professor and Co-Director, Postsecondary Education Disability Unit
sfshaw@uconn.edu
Dr. Joan McGuire, Professor and Co-Director, Postsecondary Education Disability Unit
mcguire@uconn.edu — 860-486-3321

Project Web Site: <http://www.facultyware.uconn.edu>

Project Title: Assuring Equal Academic Access for College Students with LD by Implementing Universal Design in the Instructional Environment

Project Description: This project has focused on the development of Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) as an approach to promoting academic access for students with learning disabilities and other diverse learners. Based on an extensive review of the literature, focus groups of students, and ongoing collaboration with faculty and administrators at partner institutions, the Principles of Universal Design for Instruction © have been developed as a significant training tool for faculty. Outcomes consist of instructional products and approaches developed by college faculty that reflect the Principles of UDI and are usable and generalizable across a range of academic settings and disciplines. All instructional products have been evaluated and packaged using distance learning technologies and are available through the project web site, Facultyware.uconn.edu. The extensive web site contains numerous resources on UDI and diverse learners as well as an innovative on-line process for expanding the collection of inclusive instructional products that are accessible to college faculty across the country at no cost.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. The development of the Principles of Universal Design for Instruction© as a significant training tool for faculty. 2. The development of an extensive interactive web site that provides resources on UDI as well as a platform for faculty to share inclusive instructional strategies and products.

University of Kansas

Project Director: Jean Schumaker
785-864-4780 — jschumaker@ukans.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.ku-crl.org>

Project Title: Open Door Project

Project Description: The Open Door Project provides research-validated instructional routines designed to enhance critical content elements to increase the accessibility of the content. Technology-based professional development modules have been prepared to prepare college and university faculty to effectively teach academically diverse classes that include students with disabilities

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Increase access to postsecondary curriculum through effective and efficient instructional routines. 2. Increase awareness of the instructional needs of students with disabilities. 3. Partner with university faculty in the development of a technology-based professional development delivery system. 4. Increase university faculty instructional delivery.

University of Kentucky

Project Director: Kristina Krampe
859-257-7973 — kmkram1@pop.uky.edu

Project Web Site: http://www.uky.edu/TLC/grants/uk_ed/

Project Title: Engaging Differences

Project Description: The primary goal of the Engaging Differences project is to develop a web-based performance support system (WPSS) for administrators, instructional employees, and auxiliary service personnel of postsecondary institutions that will enhance the quality of education and services provided to adult students with disabilities.

Major Areas of Focus: Accessibility guidelines (buildings and Web), etiquette, instructional accommodations, assistive technology, disability rights laws, campus policy, services, experts, related literature, and relevant legal cases.

Landmark College

Project Director: Lynne C. Shea
802-387-6706 — lshea@landmarkcollege.org

Project Web Site: <http://www.landmark.edu>

Project Title: Promoting Access for Postsecondary Students with Learning Disabilities

Project Description: Landmark College's project focuses on the needs of postsecondary students with learning disabilities. Training materials, guides, and professional development activities were developed and used statewide. Based on our expertise in learning disabilities, our project provided professional development to faculty and administrators at 19 participating Vermont colleges and universities. Additionally, a four-book series on working with postsecondary students with learning disabilities, authored by Landmark College personnel, was developed and disseminated. A CD, "College Students Talk About Learning Disabilities," was also produced and disseminated to project partners and other institutions of higher education. In addition, materials on using assistive technology have been made available through the Landmark College website.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Developed training program over three years for faculty and staff at 19 Vermont colleges and universities in the area of learning disabilities. 2. Produced four-book series on working with postsecondary students with learning disabilities. 3. Produced on-line resources in the area of using assistive technology with students with learning disabilities. 4. Produced CD: "College Students Talk About Learning Disabilities". 5. Increased institutional capacity for outreach in the area of instruction of students with learning disabilities by developing a training program for faculty presenters.

University of Minnesota

Project Director: Judy Fox
612-626-7292 — foxxx021@tc.umn.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.gen.umn.edu/research/CTAD/default.htm>

Project Title: Curriculum Transformation and Disability (CTAD)

Project Description: In response to the need for better faculty training on issues of disability in postsecondary education, staff from Curriculum Transformation and Disability (CTAD) created a two-day faculty development workshop emphasizing the application of Universal Instructional Design. Staff conducted a total of 12 workshops in the upper midwest at both two- and four-year institutions, working primarily with full-time faculty because of their presumed institutional longevity and impact. Dissemination products include a facilitator's manual that allows non-specialists to replicate the workshop at their home institutions, and an edited book entitled *Curriculum Transformation and Disability: Implementing Universal Design in Higher Education*.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Creation, implementation, and evaluation of a replicable, 12-hour, two-day faculty development workshop emphasizing the application of Universal Instructional Design. Staff conducted a total of 12 workshops at 7 different sites. 2. Creation of a facilitator's guide (including videotapes) that allows non-specialists to replicate the workshop at their home institutions. 3. Contribution to scholarly literature through publication of an edited book entitled *Curriculum Transformation and Disability: Implementing Universal Design in Higher Education*. Staff and participants also presented at numerous conferences, published a range of articles, and created a searchable, on-line annotated bibliography.

University of New Hampshire

Project Director: Cheryl Jorgensen, Project Coordinator
603-862-4678 — cherylj@cisunix.unh.edu
Cate Weir, Project Coordinator
603-228-2084 — cweir@cisunix.unh.edu

Project Web Site: <http://iod.unh.edu/EE/>

Project Title: Equity and Excellence in Higher Education

Project Description: “Equity and Excellence in Higher Education” is a faculty development project designed to provide college and university teachers with strategies for instruction that create an inclusive and accessible classroom that is supportive of diversity in its students.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Provide professional development to faculty on effective and inclusive instructional practices for diverse classrooms. 2. Facilitate small reflective practice groups of faculty who will work together to examine their own practices and try out new curriculum design and instructional methodologies. 3. Produce and disseminate information on effective college teaching to all NH higher education institutions. Support the development of a permanent capacity for supporting individual faculty to improve their instruction.

Northern Illinois University

Project Director: Dr. Nancy Castle (formerly Long)
815-753-9126 — nlong@niu.edu

Project Web Site: <http://factraining.hhsweb.com>

Project Title: Presidential Commission on Persons with Disabilities Project to Increase Retention and Success of Postsecondary Students with Disabilities Through Innovations in Instruction

Project Description: Fifty-four faculty and administrators participated in an in-depth training institute and mentoring program over the course of three years. The training design and mentoring program was then field-tested and refined for portability to the community college setting. An additional 10 faculty and administrators were included at the community college site. The final intervention package will include the contents of and procedures for the intensive training, for mentoring, for developing a class/student learning profile, and a computerized catalogued inventory (that will be continuously added to) of accommodations and alternative teaching techniques that were used by project trainees.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Understanding the concept of Universal Instructional Design. 2. Learning styles as they apply to working with individuals with disabilities (i.e., audio, visual, tactile). 3. Implementing UD principles and accommodations into course curricula (e.g., how to Bobby-approve your web site, etc.). 4. Locating resources to assist with implementation of UD principles and accommodations (e.g., using the Center for Access Ability Resources, using the project website, etc.). 5. Mentoring faculty and administrators.

Ohio State University

Project Director: Margo Izzo, Ph.D. & Ann Yurcisin, ED.S.
614-292-9218 — izzo.1@osu.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.osu.edu/grants/dpg>

Project Title: The Ohio State University Partnership: Improving the Quality of Higher Education Programs for Students with Disabilities

Project Description: The Nisonger Center at Ohio State University, in collaboration with key partners such as the Provost’s office, the Office for Disability Services (ODS), Technology Enhanced Learning and Research (TELR), the Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator’s office (ADA coordinator’s office), several colleges and academic departments from the main Columbus campus, a rural branch campus, and a local two-year community college, implemented a widespread climate assessment and action planning process across these sites that involved training, disability awareness initiatives, innovative curricular and policy changes, the purchasing of needed adaptive technology, the promotion of Universal Design for Learning, the creation of a web accessibility center, and the development of information resources for faculty.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Climate assessment (focus groups, in-depth interviews, polls, surveys, etc.) in order to establish a baseline level of disability awareness across several academic departments. 2. Department action planning based on identified climate assessment needs (training of faculty and disability awareness initiatives, policy and curricular innovations, purchasing of adaptive technology for student use, etc.). 3. Education and training of instructors in disability issues to help improve the climate and quality of instruction for students with disabilities was the target aim.

Oregon Health and Science University

Project Director: Jo-Ann Sowers, PhD
sowersj@ohsu.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.healthsciencefaculty.org>

Project Title: The Health Sciences Students with Disabilities Faculty Education Project

Project Description: The key goal of this project was to enhance the capacity of health science faculty to admit, teach, accommodate, and graduate students with disabilities. We surveyed faculty at health science institutions in Oregon and in other states regarding their attitudes, knowledge, and concerns regarding students with disabilities. The key implementation sites were the Oregon Health & Science University and Portland Community College. A faculty person from each health science department served as a program accommodation liaison and received substantial training and support to enable them to provide leadership regarding students with disabilities. A faculty training curriculum was implemented with faculty in each department and was further field-tested with faculty at over eight other institutions.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Enhancing the capacity of health science programs to successfully integrate students with disabilities into their programs. 2. To reduce the concerns faculty have regarding students with disabilities in health sciences programs. 3. To specifically address the issues of how to accommodate students with disabilities in health sciences programs during the clinical portions of their program.

University of Rhode Island

Project Director: Pamela Rohland
401-874-2098 — rohland@uri.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.uri.edu/ctc>

Project Title: Changing the Culture (CTC): Enhancing the Inclusion and Retention of Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Institutions

Project Description: Since 1999, with funding from the U.S. Department of Education (Grant Award #P333A990064), the University of Rhode Island has been developing effective teaching strategies used in professional development seminars for faculty and administrators at Rhode Island postsecondary institutions. The CTC project has successfully trained a network of 103 disability resource mentors, who serve as information resources to their colleagues. These participants represent the three state institutions and four private institutions of higher education in Rhode Island. We have developed a web site, listserv, a complete and tested curriculum for the training seminar, and a resource manual for each mentor. Apprentice trainer teams have been established to support and expand the networks of mentors at cooperating institutions. This formative period for a grass-roots movement of systemic change has begun to foster a more inclusive environment for college students with disabilities. The increased awareness and improved strategies benefit ALL students.

Major Areas of Focus: The guiding principle of CTC is that disability is an example of cultural diversity. Because of negative stereotypes, students with disabilities are often discouraged from participating fully in higher education and experience lowered expectations, inaccessible environments, and limiting course policies. These barriers threaten the intellectual identity and performance of students with disabilities in a manner similar to the barriers that African Americans and women experience. The overarching goal of the CTC project is to create systemic change in institutions of higher education that combats the threat to the intellectual, academic and personal achievement of students with disabilities (with policy changes in departments and administration, funding of positions, reduction of attitudinal barriers, increased retention and graduation rates for students with disabilities, etc.).

San Diego State University

Project Director: Bobbie J. Atkins, Ph.D., CRC
619-594-1569 — batkins@mail.sdsu.edu

Project Web Site: http://interwork.sdsu.edu/web_cont_edu/higher_ed.html

Project Title: Prototype of Disability Training for Faculty and Administration in Higher Education
(Project Higher Ed)

Project Description: The overarching goal of Project Higher Ed is to develop a prototype of disability education and training for faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education. The training will foster and enhance faculty's and administrators': knowledge of disability and skills and strategies necessary for meeting the postsecondary needs of students with disabilities.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Module #1 – Disability & Society. Objectives: (a) To become familiar with the historical and contemporary issues shaping the lives of individuals with disabilities. (b) To explore the myths and stereotypes surrounding individuals with disabilities. (c) To increase awareness about opportunities for individuals with disabilities, especially in colleges and universities. 2. Module #2 – Students with Disabilities in U.S. Colleges and Universities: Statistical Profile, Challenges, and Learning Characteristics. Objectives: (a) To be familiar with the current statistical profile of students with disabilities in U.S. colleges and universities. (b) To be aware of the challenges/barriers faced by many postsecondary students with disabilities. (c) To explore ways of improving the postsecondary experience of students with disabilities. 3. Module #3 – Orientation to Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) in Higher Education. Objectives: (a) To understand the variety and depth of services through the offices of Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS) within higher education. (b) To increase awareness of needs and services for students with disabilities within higher education. (c) To understand how to collaborate as students, faculty, counselors, and administrators in order to meet the needs of students with disabilities. 4. Module #4 – Universal Design for Learning. Objectives: (a) To become familiar with the concept of Universal Design for Learning. (b) To apply the principles of Universal Design for Learning to one's own teaching. (c) To be able to differentiate between Universal Design for Learning and academic accommodations for students with disabilities.

University of Southern Mississippi

Information for this summary was obtained from the project's web site.

Project Director: Valerie Decoux, Project Co-Director
601-266-5955 — Valerie.decoux@usm.edu
Jane Siders, Project Co-Director
601-266-5163 — Jane.siders@usm.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www-dept.usm.edu/~ids/ODA/mpttap.htm>

Project Title: Postsecondary Training and Technical Assistance Project

Project Description: In addition to focusing on improving the academic environment for students with disabilities, the project works closely with student organizations to improve the overall college experience for students with disabilities on campus. A critical link to junior high and high schools will be developed to not only increase the numbers of students with disabilities in Mississippi attending postsecondary institutions, but also to better prepare them for the challenges of college.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. USM will develop a statewide postsecondary disability information network. 2. Design and implement a replicable training and technical assistance process at USM founded on principles of adult education and instructional technology. 3. Develop and maintain a technology-based information system to provide postsecondary disability training to personnel and students in Mississippi universities, colleges, community colleges, and secondary institutions. 4. Promote campus-wide positive student awareness about students with disabilities. 5. Provide outreach training and technical assistance on postsecondary disability issues to faculty, staff, and administrators at Mississippi universities.

Utah State University

Project Director: Dr. Charles Salzberg
435-797-3234 — Salzberg@cc.udu.edu
Beth Price, Proj. Coord.
435-797-7020 — bethp@cc.usu.edu

Project Web Site: <http://asd.usu.edu>

Project Title: The Accommodating Students with Disabilities in Higher Education Project

Project Description: The Accommodating Students with Disabilities in Higher Education Project has developed a multimedia package of materials for teaching faculty, staff, administrators, and teaching assistants how to work with students with disabilities. These materials are presentation-ready, including suggested scripting and instructional materials, and are customizable to meet the needs of each institution. Available in both web-based and live workshop formats, these training programs are designed to require minimum time from faculty. Both offer basic understanding of the accommodation process and of the faculty, student, and disability services office roles in that process. Supplementary units expand information on topics such as Universal Design.

Major Areas of Focus: Our focus is on developing and disseminating a flexible-use training program for universities across the country that can be customized for the needs of each college or university.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Project Director: Liz Getzel
804-828-1851 — lgetzel@mail2.vcu.edu

Project Web Site: <http://www.students.vcu.edu/pda>

Project Title: The VCU Professional Development Academy (PDA): Increasing Capacity of University Personnel to Support Students with Disabilities

Project Description: VCU's Division of Student Affairs, in collaboration with the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Workplace Supports, established the Professional Development Academy to address faculty and staff development needs based on findings and recommendations of a comprehensive external evaluation at VCU. The PDA is designed to (a) foster a more supportive campus environment for students with disabilities, (b) equip administrators and support staff with disability related information and resources, (c) provide training and technical assistance to instructional faculty to ultimately facilitate successful academic outcomes for their student with disabilities and (d) establish a campus-wide network that will support a more decentralized support and service delivery model.

Major Areas of Focus: 1. Campus wide network of key faculty, staff and administrators. 2. Using Universal Design principles in instruction. 3. Supporting web accessibility. 4. Department specific technical assistance (i.e. laboratory, clinicals). 5. Disability awareness training and resources (including assistive technology). 6. Student summer orientation, fall orientation course and individual student support services.

University of Washington

Project Director: Sheryl Burgstahler
206-543-0622 — sherylb@cac.washington.edu
Project Web Site: <http://www.washington.edu/doi/Faculty>
Project Title: *DO-IT Prof: A Project to Help Postsecondary Educators Work Successfully with Students Who Have Disabilities*

Project Description: The *DO-IT Prof* project applies lessons learned by DO-IT and other researchers and practitioners nationwide to implement a comprehensive professional development program for college faculty and administrators. *DO-IT Prof* serves to improve the knowledge and skills of postsecondary faculty and administrators to better prepare them to fully include students with disabilities in academic programs on their campuses. The *DO-IT Prof* team includes faculty, disabled student services staff, and administrators at institutions of higher education in 23 states. Project partners include representatives from AHEAD, the National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports, the HEATH Resource Center, and WAPED (Washington Association on Postsecondary Education and Disability).

Major Areas of Focus: Responding to the diverse content and scheduling needs of faculty and administrators, the *DO-IT Prof* team created and delivered six models of professional development. Model 1: A 20 to 30 minute presentation to introduce participants to basic legal issues, accommodation strategies, and resources specific to their campuses. Model 2: A 1 to 2 hour presentation with special focus on providing accommodations to students with a variety of disabilities. Model 3: A tailored workshop for more in-depth training on topics selected for a specific audience. Model 4: A televised instruction option using a series of videotapes to deliver on public television. Model 5: A distance learning “anytime-anywhere” course that provides lessons and discussion delivered via electronic mail. Model 6: Self-paced, web-based instruction in The Faculty Room at <http://www.washington.edu/doi/Faculty/>

University of Wisconsin-Stout

Project Director: Dr. Pinckney Hall/Christine Varnavas, M.S.
715-232-2387 — varnavusc@uwstout.edu
Project Web Site: <http://www.askvrd.org/askable>
Project Title: Teachable Moments
Project Description: Teachable Moments began as a model using identified faculty as department resources/ liaisons and traditional training methods. As the project evolved, it was determined that a more timely approach was necessary. A just-in-time training model was then adopted and AskABLE, a question-and-answer service, was developed. AskABLE provides users with expert advice within approximately 48 hours. AskABLE experts are doctoral and specialized professionals with decades of experience in working with individuals with disabilities.
Major Areas of Focus: Utilizing the just-in-time training model via the Internet, AskABLE, a question-and-answer disability web site, was created to provide faculty, staff, parents and students with information, as they needed it.

About the Authors

Elizabeth Evans Getzel, M.A., is the VCU-RRTC Director of Postsecondary Education Initiatives at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia. She has over 20 years of experience conducting research, evaluation, and training in the areas of transition planning for secondary students with disabilities, postsecondary education for students with disabilities, and career planning/employment for individuals with disabilities. Requests for information can be emailed to her at lgetzel@mail2.vcu.edu.

Lori W. Briel, M.Ed., is a Research Associate at the VCU-RRTC in Richmond, Virginia. Currently, she provides comprehensive career planning and placement services for postsecondary students with disabilities. Additionally, she assists with the development and provision of professional development activities for university faculty. She has co-authored several journal articles and a book chapter in these areas.

Shannon McManus, M.Ed., is a Research Associate at the VCU-RRTC in Richmond, Virginia. She is the lead staff person on a study involving VCU students with learning disabilities and ADHD determining effective strategies that enhance their academic success. Her work also involves providing resources and information to faculty and staff on effective instructional strategies for students with disabilities.

Author's Note: The authors would like to thank Denise Rodier, Research Assistant, for her assistance in compiling the survey results for this manuscript.