

The iEvaluate OSD Guidelines and Exemplars: A Disability Services Evaluation Tool

Lyman Dukes III
University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Abstract

Program evaluation is rapidly becoming the norm in higher education and this includes disability services. Postsecondary institutions increasingly encourage disability service programs to demonstrate accountability specified through appropriate benchmarks. However, professionals in disability service offices typically report that while they understand and value the need to evaluate their programming, they are often too overwhelmed with the daily needs of individual students to find the time to engage in program evaluation (Goodin, Parker, Shaw, & McGuire, 2004). Experts in service provision for students with disabilities at the postsecondary level were asked to participate in a study that would culminate in an assessment tool for the purpose of evaluating a disability services office. The outcome of the study is the iEvaluate OSD assessment instrument. Included as an appendix is an iEvaluate OSD evaluation form that can be reproduced free of charge for office evaluation purposes.

Program evaluation is rapidly becoming the norm in higher education and this includes disability services. Given the significant budget reductions at many postsecondary institutions and the expectation of effective outcomes for campus divisions and departments, this trend is not surprising. College administrators now expect divisions and departments to implement activities that clearly meet their respective goals and objectives. Because faculty salaries are a fixed cost, institutions will be challenged to maintain funding for services (e.g., tutoring, counseling, advising) that do not produce effective results (S. Shaw, personal communication, January 29, 2010). Programs that do not demonstrate that they add value may well find their budgets frozen, reduced, or eliminated entirely (Parker, Shaw, & McGuire, 2003).

To better define the profession and provide a baseline for demonstrating program outcomes, a number of general benchmarks or principles for postsecondary disability services were developed in the last dozen years. Standards that were adopted include: (a) Professional Standards (Shaw, McGuire, & Madaus, 1997) that identify skills and knowledge required of service providers and define the profession as a whole, and (b) Program Standards and Performance Indicators (Shaw & Dukes, 2006) that provide direction regarding

services intended to ensure equal access to postsecondary education for students with disabilities. "The development of standards for professionals operating in postsecondary disability service settings sends a clear message that the profession has reached a new level of maturity" (Dukes & Shaw, 1998, p. 208). However, maturity will only truly be demonstrated when programs rate themselves based upon an established set of Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) standards (Goodin et al., 2004).

A Rationale for Program Evaluation

Postsecondary education has become a requirement for entry into most jobs in the United States (Carnavale & Fry, 2000). Many students with disabilities and their families are well aware of this trend as evidenced by the fact that the transition plans of four out of five students with disabilities indicate a desire to participate in postsecondary education (Cameto, Levine, & Wagner, 2004). Students with disabilities represented just 2.6% of the postsecondary education population in 1978, and have tripled to more than 9% today (Henderson, 1999). The response to this enrollment trend has been a rapid expansion of services for students with disabilities at postsecondary institutions over the past 30 years (Dukes, 2006). Yet, most postsec-

ondary institutions have not maintained follow-up data nor have they conducted consistent evaluation of service effectiveness. (Mull, Sitlington, & Alper, 2001).

Historically, there have been few resources available to evaluate office or program effectiveness. The methods currently used include the following:

- *AHEAD Program Standards*: The standards offered by AHEAD have been touted as a tool for comparing office practice to a set of benchmarks endorsed by the profession (Shaw & Dukes, 2006). However, this is not a formal assessment tool nor does it include instructions for conducting such an evaluation.
- *CAS Professional Standards*: As with the AHEAD Standards, the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) has published Standards for the OSD. These Standards also come with a tool for rating one's OSD based upon the Standards. It is this author's understanding, albeit formally unsubstantiated, that many OSD professionals would prefer an assessment instrument designed specifically by and for experts in the OSD profession.
- *Outside Evaluators*: Historically, this has been the primary vehicle for office evaluation. However, there is no formal means for accessing an outside evaluator. Typically, such persons are found through word-of-mouth or on a listserv specifically directed at OSD administrators.

“Given the fiscal, administrative, and legal accountability of the OSD, it is vital that the personnel responsible for ensuring equal educational access conduct a periodic self-assessment of their performance” (Dukes & Shaw, 1999, p. 28). Yet, service providers have indicated that even thinking about program evaluation is discouraging (Dukes, McGuire, Parker, Refsland, & Reustle, 2007). Moreover, OSD professionals typically report that while they understand and value the need to evaluate their programming, they are often too overwhelmed with the daily needs of individual students to find the time to engage in program evaluation (Goodin et al., 2004). The author and a professional colleague (Goldstein et al., 2006) informally collected data at an international conference for OSD administrators that indicated the following:

- 95% of respondents were currently considering completing a program evaluation;
- The vast majority of respondents indicated a desire to be directly involved in an office evaluation; and
- The vast majority of respondents indicated a desire to use an existing program or tool for an office evaluation.

The iEvaluate OSD Assessment Tool

Experts in service provision for students with disabilities at the postsecondary level were asked to participate in a study that would culminate in an assessment tool for the purpose of evaluating a disability services office or program. The outcome of the study, described here, is the iEvaluate OSD assessment instrument. The tool is intended to capture, in the fewest number of questionnaire items possible, common daily practices of a typical disability student services office. An iEvaluate OSD evaluation form that can be reproduced free of charge for office evaluation purposes is available (see Appendix). The research question that guided the development of the iEvaluate OSD assessment tool was: “What service components do postsecondary disability service experts perceive as essential for inclusion in an office or program evaluation instrument?”

Method

The current study was designed to identify OSD service components appropriate for inclusion on a questionnaire that will be used by disability service professionals for the purpose of office or program evaluation. Specifically, postsecondary disability service experts were asked to indicate the importance they would place on a set of service delivery guidelines and their corresponding exemplars for inclusion in an office evaluation questionnaire. Following each guideline, a list of office practices was provided that serve as model exemplars of the respective guideline. The exemplars spell out actual office practices that indicate compliance with the respective guideline. Study participants rated the importance of 10 guidelines and 162 exemplars (service components) across 9 domains using a 5-point Likert scale (1 – Not Important, 2 – Slightly Important, 3 – Moderately Important, 4 – Very Important, 5 – Essential).

Research Design

The Delphi method is based upon the notion that experts in a particular discipline can reasonably forecast its future practices (Anderson, 1998). Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson (1975) defined the Delphi technique as a “method for the systematic solicitation and collection of judgments on a particular topic through a set of carefully designed sequential questionnaires interspersed with summarized information and feedback of opinions derived from earlier responses” (p. 10). This is accomplished by having experts in a profession complete multiple rounds of a questionnaire. Each participant is provided the opportunity to, first, numerically rank all individual survey items and also provide qualitative comments regarding each ranking. Subsequent rounds of the survey allow respondents to review mean ratings and qualitative comments for any item that did not reach consensus during the previous round. Then, those survey items are again ranked, at which time respondents are provided the opportunity to justify their ranking or change their ranking based upon the mean ranking and qualitative commentary from other participating experts. Subsequent rounds follow in the same manner. Study participants remain anonymous, thus allowing each participant to freely respond without the influences inherent in face-to-face group interactions.

In education, the Delphi method has been used in some of the following ways: to establish competencies and practices of practitioners, to develop curriculum, to forecast changes in postsecondary education, to identify essential functions of disability service professionals, to identify essential service components for LD services at postsecondary institutions, and to identify the AHEAD Program Standards and Performance Indicators (Anderson, 1998; Dukes, 2006; Friend, 2000; Shaw, et al., 1997). In the current study, expert panelists ranked office or program practices for possible inclusion in a disability services assessment tool across 3 survey rounds. Following Delphi protocol, during rounds 2 and 3 panelists had the opportunity to reconsider their rankings for items that did not reach consensus during the previous round. The development of the questionnaire will be described next.

Questionnaire Development

Items included in the *iEvaluate* OSD survey instrument were crafted following an extensive review of literature on service provision for college students

with disabilities. Relevant research such as the original AHEAD Program Standards (Shaw & Dukes, 2001), Anderson’s study (1998) of essential LD service components, and the Madaus (1996) study that identified OSD Professional Standards provided guidance. Two publications, the AHEAD Program Standards and Performance Indicators (Shaw & Dukes, 2006) and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) professional standards for disability support services (Dean, 2006) were particularly influential during the instrument development process. This process resulted in a set of 10 guidelines and 162 exemplars. Exemplars are tasks that represent the respective guideline in practice.

A modified Delphi procedure was used to solicit the expert opinion of study panelists across three rounds. The modified Delphi is a slightly different method than the full or traditional Delphi technique.

The major modification consists of beginning the process with a set of carefully selected items...The primary advantages of this modification to the Delphi is that it (a) typically improves the initial round response rate, and (b) provides a solid grounding in previously developed work (Custer, Scarcella, & Stewart, 1999, para. 6).

During round 1 of the current study, panelists rated pre-selected items and provided qualitative written feedback regarding those items. During rounds 2 and 3, respondents re-rated items that had not reached consensus during the previous round and also re-rated those items that had been reworded or moved to another category as a function of written panel feedback. In addition, respondents rated any new items recommended by respondents during the previous round. Qualitative written feedback was solicited during all survey rounds. Expert panelists were encouraged to provide feedback regarding the following: the wording of guidelines and exemplars, whether there were any missing guidelines or exemplars, the goodness-of-fit of an item with its category, and the elimination of any items that were repetitive.

Questionnaire Validation

The questionnaire development process met survey design specifications (Gable & Wolf, 1993). Demographic information regarding experts was collected to ensure each met criteria for participation. Information

regarding the respondent, her or his respective institution, and the characteristics of the program or office was solicited. Experts chosen to serve as panelists represented a cross-section of institutions in higher education (e.g., two- and four-year institutions, public and private, etc.). The participants selected for the study were chosen as a result of their demonstrated expertise as disability service professionals. Both the CAS professional standards and the AHEAD Program Standards and Performance Indicators were used, along with other relevant literature, to produce the round 1 iEvaluate OSD survey instrument. The initial survey was reviewed by both the author and another disability services expert with more than 30 years experience prior to being finalized. Round 1 of the survey provided further opportunity to address content validation. That is, as a part of the round 1 process, expert panelists were asked to comment on item clarity, relevance, and potential repetition. In addition, they made suggestions regarding any missing items and also had the opportunity to comment on the goodness-of-fit of each item with its respective domain. As a function of round 1 feedback regarding content, 18 items were added, 33 items were re-worded, and raters suggested moving three items prior to round 2. Panelists had the opportunity to again employ content validation processes during the completion of round 2. Prior to round 3, the expert panel added 10 items, and reworded 25 items.

Panel Selection

Linstone and Turoff (1975) indicate that panel participants in a Delphi study must have both a thorough knowledge of and experience with the topic being examined. In fact, the validity and reliability of the results depend to a great degree upon the panelists who agree to participate (Anderson, 1998). Criteria for participation in the current study were as follows: (1) at least 5 years of recent experience in postsecondary disability services, (2) a reputation established through presentations related to disability services, or (3) experience providing training and / or consultation related to services for college students with disabilities. Panelist selection was also impacted by the desire to select experts who reasonably represent the diverse array of postsecondary institutions in the United States. Panel participants represented both public and private schools, both two- and four-year institutions, multiple levels of competitiveness with regard to institutional entry criteria, and small, medium, and large

institutions (based upon student population).

For studies whose goal is to meet informational objectives, a small panel size is suitable (Friend, 2000). In addition, group homogeneity is important if a small panel is used. The current study participants all held a Master's degree or higher in a health, rehabilitation, or education field. Furthermore, all held (and in one case had held) an institutional position as an OSD coordinator, director, associate director, or Dean. Dalkey (as cited in Linstone, 1978) indicated 7 as a minimum panel size for Delphi research. Potential study participants were selected from an expert list generated by the researcher and another disability services authority with more than 30 years experience. Of the 13 postsecondary disability service experts solicited, 9 agreed to participate in the current study. At the time of the study, all participants were also members of AHEAD, the professional organization that represents disability service providers. Respondents were informed that results would only be analyzed and reported at the group level, thus ensuring anonymity. Approximately two weeks following the mailing of each round of the survey, an electronic mail was sent to any non-respondent. Seventy eight percent of the respondents participated across the 3 rounds of the survey. Response rates by round are provided in the upcoming "results" section.

Results

The research question that guided the development of the iEvaluate OSD assessment tool was: "What service components do postsecondary disability service experts perceive as essential for inclusion in an office or program evaluation instrument?" Service components included in the completed assessment instrument met the following criteria: (a) A mean of 4.0 or greater on a 5.0 Likert rating scale, and (b) 66.66% of the expert panel rated the component in either the same or an immediately adjacent category (e.g., a rating of "5" or a rating of "4," that is immediately adjacent to "5" on the rating scale). Studies that employ the modified Delphi method commonly use similar rating criteria. Ten out of 10 Guidelines and 155 out of 190 (including the 28 items that were added by participants during following rounds 1 and 2) Exemplars representing nine categories (or domains) met the rating criteria described above and were included in the final version of the iEvaluate OSD assessment instrument. It should

also be noted that it was possible for an item to reach consensus for exclusion from future iterations of the survey. In fact, some items were deleted from the survey in this manner. In total, 17 items were eliminated from consideration for the final instrument as a function of consensus for exclusion. The Appendix reflects all items that were rated essential and, thus, included in the assessment instrument.

Round One

During round 1, respondents completed two sections of the iEvaluate OSD survey. The first section requested demographic information from respondents, which served as a second check that each met criteria for inclusion as an expert panelist. Part 2 of the survey included the guidelines and exemplars to be rated. Each respondent was asked to rate the importance of each guideline and exemplar for potential inclusion in a tool for office / program evaluation purposes. A 5-point Likert scale was used to rate each item from 1 – Not Important to 5 – Essential. Respondents also provided written feedback that shaped the second and third iterations of the questionnaire. Participant ratings and qualitative feedback led to the removal, by consensus, of 7 items and the addition of 18 new items for the Round 2 survey. The expert panel identified 9 guidelines and 107 exemplars as essential for inclusion in the iEvaluate OSD instrument during round 1. Seven of nine participants (78%) participated in round 1 of the survey.

Round Two

The round 2 survey identified those guidelines and exemplars that had reached consensus in round 1 and asked respondents to re-rate items that had not reached consensus as well as those items that had been reworded, moved, or added. To facilitate the reconsideration of items that had not reached consensus, the round 2 survey included mean ratings for each item to be re-rated and also any written comments that had been made by participants about the respective item. Those items that had been re-worded, as a function of round 1 expert feedback, had their new language noted in bold, italicized print, so as to easily distinguish the changes in the item. The item was also noted as *item re-worded due to panelists' recommendation*. During the re-rating process panelists were asked to consider both the mean rating and the panel comments regarding the item when providing a round 2 rating. If an

expert chose to rate an item differently than the mean rating, then he or she was asked to justify the reason for doing so. The purpose of requesting a justification for disagreeing with the mean rating (i.e., consensus rating) was to encourage panelists to gravitate toward consensus. In this round, no additional guidelines were rated essential, however, 43 additional exemplars were rated essential. Four items were excluded by consensus. Ten new items were added to the survey for inclusion in round 3. Six of nine participants (67%) responded to round 2 of the survey.

Round Three

The round 3 survey format was identical to that used during round 2. Again, guidelines and exemplars that had not reached consensus were re-rated in light of their mean ratings and the remarks made by participants about respective items. Items that had been re-worded included the new language in bold, italicized print so that the new terms were easily distinguished. As in round 2, it was also noted that the item had been re-worded. Those items that had reached consensus during rounds 1 and 2 were noted as such. In the survey instructions for this round, expert panelists were oriented to the study goal of consensus, and asked to justify their item rating if that rating was not consistent with the panel mean. During round 3, one additional guideline and five more exemplars were rated as essential. Six items were excluded by consensus while five items on the survey never reached consensus for inclusion or exclusion and were, therefore, not included in the final version of the assessment tool (see Appendix for guidelines and exemplars rated essential by the expert panel). Eight of nine (89%) participants responded to round 3 of the survey.

Discussion

What is a Guideline? What is an Exemplar?

The intent of the iEvaluate OSD evaluation tool is to provide OSD professionals with a practical means of assessing office or program performance. OSD professionals typically report that while they understand and value the need to evaluate their programming, they are often too overwhelmed with the daily needs of individual students to find the time to engage in program evaluation (Goodin et al., 2004). One of the primary functions of iEvaluate OSD is to streamline the process of program evaluation, thus making this

vital task a manageable and consistent component of the OSD professional's office practice.

The iEvaluate OSD assessment tool includes Guidelines and Exemplars across 9 domains. The domains are as follows: *Campus / Community Collaboration, Information Dissemination, Office Administration, Office Policies and Procedures, Office Evaluation, Self Determination, Universal Design, Educational Access, and Educational Preparation and Professional Development*. Included in each domain are both guidelines and exemplars. A Guideline is a general statement that articulates a practice in which any OSD should be engaged. Exemplars spell out the means by which an OSD implements each guideline. Exemplars are examples of each guideline *in practice*. As a component of the tool, a rating scale follows each exemplar. It must be pointed out that these exemplars will not be relevant for every OSD. Those that are not relevant may simply be marked by the instrument user with the rating "NA" for *Not Applicable*.

What Do I Do With the iEvaluate OSD Evaluation Tool?

As Parker et al. (2003) stated in their article, "Program Evaluation for Postsecondary Disability Services," OSD professionals should begin by clarifying the purposes of the evaluation. Service providers are encouraged to consider whether there are any immediate issues that require attention or whether there are aspects of the program that are not fully understood (Parker et al., 2003). Once the evaluation purpose has been identified, the OSD professional is in a position to pinpoint the specific iEvaluate OSD domains that apply to the specified evaluation purpose. Given the potential time and personnel commitment necessary to conduct a thorough office evaluation, it may be sensible to break the evaluation up into segments that are completed across an entire year. Given that a detailed account of the necessary steps to conduct a full office evaluation is beyond the scope of this manuscript, readers are strongly encouraged to see the aforementioned article by Parker et al. (2003), and the AHEAD publication, *Program Evaluation of Postsecondary Disability Services: From Theory to Practice* (Goodin et al., 2004). These two resources both provide a detailed account regarding how to make a tool such as iEvaluate OSD a part of the larger process of comprehensive office evaluation. Instructions for use of the iEvaluate OSD assessment instrument are provided as part of the Appendix.

Limitations

The study outcomes must be considered in light of the methodological concerns associated with the Delphi research method. Given that the expert panel determines the product of the study, it is imperative that it includes a set of well-qualified experts. In the present study, expert panelists all met specific criteria for participation that included a national reputation for presentations, training and / or consultation in disability services. Demographic data provided by participants indicated that the vast majority of the expert panel had between 10 and 14 years of experience. In addition, the author attempted to ensure that the panel represented a diversity of institutions (e.g., public / private, large / small, competitive / non-competitive).

Consideration must be given to the fluctuation in response rate across each round of the study. The significant time commitment and motivation required to fully participate in a Delphi study has the potential to impact expert involvement across all rounds of the process (Anderson, 1998). The multiple rounds of the current study took approximately nine months to complete. Additionally, completion of each round reportedly took anywhere from 30 to 90 minutes. Thus, fluctuation in sample size is not uncommon in studies that employ the Delphi method. Average response rate for all rounds of the survey was 78% indicating that in spite of the time and thought necessary to participate the vast majority of the panel took the obligation seriously.

Clarity and comprehensiveness are also possible limitations of the Delphi method. One objective of the Delphi process is to allow respondents to question item language and also suggest changes. Based on panelist remarks, 58 items had language changed and 28 items were added to the survey for subsequent rounds. The multiple-round procedure used in a Delphi study should assist in minimizing language ambiguity as a function of the opportunity to clarify meaning and suggest different terminology. Comprehensiveness can also be considered a potential limitation. It is reasonable to assume that there are services provided by some offices that are not reflected in the iEvaluate OSD survey instrument. All efforts were made (e.g., extensive literature review, examination of current OSD standards and indicators) to ensure the questionnaire spanned the universe of content.

Conclusion

It is worth pointing out that the *iEvaluate* OSD Guidelines and Exemplars are fundamentally different than the AHEAD Program Standards and Performance Indicators. The Standards and Indicators "... represent service components that are fundamental for ensuring equal educational access for postsecondary students with disabilities" (Shaw & Dukes, 2006, p. 25). The Guidelines and Exemplars, on the other hand, are service components that the expert panel thought were essential for inclusion in a tool for office / program evaluation. The study charge *did not* include a need to identify "... minimum supports that must be available to provide equal access..." (Shaw & Dukes, 2006, p. 16) Yet, there is significant overlap between the two documents. One of the stated purposes of the AHEAD Program Standards and Indicators was to help disability service professionals evaluate the effectiveness of their programs and services, while this is the explicit purpose of *iEvaluate* OSD. To that end, the *iEvaluate* OSD instrument includes instructions for use and is provided in a format that facilitates its use as an evaluation tool.

It should also be pointed out that this is but one aspect of a comprehensive office or program review. Program or office review could include other elements such as assessment of student satisfaction; surveying recent graduates, faculty and other student service program impressions of the OSD; and even the survey of students without disabilities. Program evaluation is often a popular topic at professional conferences for disability service professionals. Both the annual AHEAD conference and the annual Postsecondary Disability Training Institute, sponsored by the Center on Postsecondary Education and Disability at the University of Connecticut, are popular venues for these useful sessions. OSD personnel considering program or office evaluation are strongly encouraged to take advantage of these valuable professional development opportunities.

References

- Anderson, P. L. (1998). *Essential support service components for students with learning disabilities at postsecondary institutions in North America: A consensus based determination*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Cameto, R., Levine, P., & Wagner, M. (2004). *Transition planning for students with disabilities*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Carnavale, A. P., & Fry, R. A. (2000) *Crossing the great divide: Can we achieve equity when generation Y goes to college?* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Custer, R. L., Scarcella, J. A., & Stewart, B. R. (1999). The modified Delphi technique: A rotational modification. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 15(2), 1-10.
- Dean, L. A. (2006). *CAS book of professional standards for higher education*. Washington DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.
- Delbecq, A.L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D. H. (1975) *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to nominal groups and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Dukes III, L. L. (2006). The process: The development of the revised AHEAD program standards and performance indicators. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability* 19(1), 5-15.
- Dukes III, L. L., McGuire, J. M., Parker, D. R., Refsland, L., & Reustle, M. (2007, June). *Kicking it up a notch: A recipe for fine-tuning your program evaluation*. Presentation at the 19th Annual Postsecondary Disability Training Institute. Saratoga Springs, N.Y.
- Dukes III, L. L., & Shaw, S. F. (1998). Not just CHIL-DREN anymore: Personnel preparation regarding postsecondary education for adults with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 21, 205-213.
- Dukes III, L. L., & Shaw, S. F. (1999). Postsecondary disability personnel: Professional standards and staff development. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 23(1), 26-31.
- Friend, J. G. (2000). *A Delphi study to identify the essential tasks and functions for ADA coordinators in public higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

- Gable, R. A., & Wolf, M. B. (1993). *Instrument development in the affective domain: Measuring attitudes and values in corporate and school settings*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Goldstein, T., Riccardi, R., Manglitz, E. Mann, K., Robillard, S., Goodin, S., & Parker, D. (2006, July). Program evaluation and assessment: Symposium #2. Presentation at the Association on Higher Education And Disability International Conference. San Diego, CA.
- Goodin, S., Parker, D. R., Shaw, S. F., & McGuire, J. M. (2004). *Program evaluation for postsecondary disability services: From theory to practice*. Waltham, MA: The Association on Higher Education And Disability (AHEAD).
- Henderson, C. (1999). *1999 college freshmen with disabilities: A biennial statistical profile*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Linstone, H. L. (1978). The Delphi Technique. In: J. Fowles, Ed. *Handbook of Futures Research*. London: Greenwood Place.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Retrieved on January 21, 2010, from <http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/>
- Madaus, J. W. (1996). *Administration of postsecondary offices for students with disabilities: Perceptions of essential job functions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Mull, C., Sitlington, P.L., & Alper, S. (2001). Postsecondary education for students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of the literature. *Exceptional Children*, 68(1), 97-118.
- Parker, D. R., Shaw, S. F., & McGuire, J. M. (2003). Program evaluation for postsecondary disability services. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 27, 2-10.
- Shaw, S. F., & Dukes III, L. L. (2001). Program standards for disability services in higher education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 14(2), 81-90.
- Shaw, S. F., & Dukes III, L. L. (2006). Postsecondary disability program standards and performance indicators: Minimum essentials for the office for students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability* 19(1), 16-26.
- Shaw, S. F., McGuire, J. M., & Madaus, J. W. (1997). Standards of professional practice. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 12(3), 26-35.

About the Author

Dr. Lyman Dukes III, is an Associate Professor of Special Education at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. He is also Principal Investigator of Project 10: Transition Education Network, which provides technical assistance and professional development for secondary-level special education personnel throughout Florida. His current research interests include transition from school to adult life, the Summary of Performance, and the evaluation of postsecondary disability services. He can be reached via email at: ldukes@mail.usf.edu.

Author's Note

The author would like to acknowledge the significant contribution made by Dr. David Parker, current editor of the Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, to this work. It was Dr. Parker's willingness to share his extraordinary understanding of OSD evaluation with me that served as the foundation and inspiration for this project.

Appendix

The iEvaluate OSD Assessment Instrument Instructions

A. Explanation of the iEvaluate OSD Assessment Instrument

The purpose of the iEvaluate OSD assessment tool is to provide disability service professionals with an instrument for self-evaluation of the office for students with disabilities (OSD). Users of the survey instrument can determine areas of strength and weakness in order to effectively plan for program or office improvement.

This section of the tool describes the organization of iEvaluate OSD and provides directions for use of the survey instrument. It is comprised of the following two parts: A. Explanation of the iEvaluate OSD assessment instrument, and B. How to use the iEvaluate OSD assessment instrument. Following this section is the iEvaluate OSD assessment instrument, which comprises the items to be rated by the disability services professional.

The survey instrument is made up of nine domains. Included in each domain are both Guidelines and Exemplars. A Guideline is a general statement that articulates a practice in which any OSD should be engaged. Exemplars spell out the means by which an OSD implements each Guideline. Exemplars are examples of each Guideline in practice. It is important to bear in mind that not all Exemplars will apply to every institution. If the evaluation team determines that an Exemplar does not apply to their particular program, then it is appropriate to respond “NA” for “Not Applicable” to the respective survey item. A rating scale and text box follows each Exemplar. Users rate performance with regard to how well the office is meeting that particular responsibility. The text box is used to document evidence of the assigned item rating. In addition, under each Guideline is a text box that is labeled “Additional Exemplars to be measured.” This is where raters may add any additional Exemplars to be rated that are not reflected in the iEvaluate OSD instrument. The nine domains that make up the instrument are as follows:

- I. Campus and Community Collaboration
- II. Information Dissemination
- III. Office Administration
- IV. Office Policies and Procedures
- V. Office Evaluation
- VI. Self Determination
- VII. Universal Design
- VIII. Educational Access
- IX. Educational Preparation and Professional Development

B. How To Use the iEvaluate OSD Assessment Instrument

- Identify any critical questions you may have regarding program / office operations.
 - Identify the Guidelines / Exemplars that apply to the critical questions. For example, are there any immediate issues that require attention or aspects of the program that are not fully understood?
- Determine how much time you have to complete an evaluation.
 - Determine which Guidelines / Exemplars you will examine in light of the time available. If you have ample time, you may wish to conduct an evaluation of all 9 iEvaluate OSD domains or you may decide to focus only on those about which you have critical questions.
 - Develop a timeline for Guideline / Exemplar assessment.
- Determine who will participate in the assessment process.
 - Identify the rating team. You may wish to include only OSD personnel or you may wish to include people from outside your office or you may even decide that an evaluator outside of your institution may be best.
 - Identify any helpful campus resources (i.e., persons or offices who may be positioned to provide evalua-

tion assistance). For example, there may be graduate students on campus who are interested in assisting with the process of completing the iEvaluate OSD survey and examining the survey outcomes.

- Train the rating team
 - Ensure all participants understand the team charge (e.g., critical questions to be addressed).
 - Ensure all participants understand the meaning of the items to be rated.
- Complete the evaluation.
 - Rate each Exemplar and include evidence for the item rating.
 - Further examine or discuss items with a rating discrepancy or items with a low score among all raters.
- Use the data to develop a plan of action / report.
 - Identify office / program strengths and weaknesses.
 - Identify possible office / program action items (i.e., changes).
 - Identify due dates / persons responsible for action items.
 - Identify any staff development needs and identify potential professional development resources.
 - Revisit progress on action items quarterly.
- Distribute report to relevant campus constituents.
 - Highlight the office / program strengths.
 - Highlight the plan for improvement.
 - Highlight any resources necessary to meet the plan for improvement.
 - Highlight those areas in the report that may be important to each respective constituency who receives the report.

iEvaluate OSD Guidelines and Exemplars Evaluation Tool

Campus / Community Collaboration

1.1 The Office maintains relationships with institutional personnel in order to ensure equal access to the institutional community for persons with disabilities.

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution’s legal counsel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution’s ADA compliance officer.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution’s registrar.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution’s administrators (e.g., President, Provost, Deans).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with college administrative personnel (e.g., office staff).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution’s faculty.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution’s admissions office personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution’s counseling and mental health services personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution's student health services personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution's student academic assistance program personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution's career services personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution's IT services personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution's parking and transportation services personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution's facilities personnel (i.e., for purposes of physical access).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the institution's library personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with relevant community agencies (e.g., vocational rehabilitation, medical professionals, psychologists, social service organizations, secondary schools).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with academic advising personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with residential life program personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with the diversity affairs personnel

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains an effective working relationship with health and fitness service personnel

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

1.2 The Office promotes a collaborative approach among institutional personnel in order to implement its policies and procedures.

- The office collaborates with campus administrators (e.g., President, Provost, Deans) regarding disability issues that impact institutional policies and procedures.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with institutional faculty and college administrators (e.g., Deans) especially as it relates to the provision of reasonable and appropriate course accommodations and/or services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office consults with academic departments and/or faculty regarding effective instructional and assessment techniques for students with disabilities (e.g., universal design approaches).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with facilities personnel regarding physical access (e.g., OSD ensures new campus construction accessibility).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with all appropriate institutional administrators and/or staff (e.g., academic affairs) regarding policy for course substitutions.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with IT services personnel (e.g., IT provides technical assistance with disability specific software, campus website access for students with disabilities, distributed access to campus technology labs, OSD participation in new technology purchases).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with the office(s) related to student discipline.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with the office(s) related to student activities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains representation on an institutional committee on diversity.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office participates in an institution-wide disability advisory committee on which students, faculty, campus administrators, campus staff, and community members may hold positions.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with the office(s) that oversee e-learning services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Information Dissemination

2.1 The Office disseminates information regarding disability relevant matters through all existing institutional media.

- The office ensures all its policies and procedures are current, clearly delineated, and provided through all relevant institutional media (e.g., catalogs, programmatic publications, student and faculty handbooks, electronic media).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available, to all members of the institutional community (e.g., students, faculty, staff, administration), its policies and procedures.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available, through appropriate institutional media, its location hours of operation, contact points, and availability of services, equipment, and technology relevant to students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available, to all members of the institutional community, policies and procedures regarding referral of students suspected of having a disability.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available, to all members of the institutional community, policies and procedures regarding appropriate documentation of a disability.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available, to all members of the institutional community, policies and procedures regarding how to access reasonable and appropriate accommodations, services, equipment, and technology.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available, to all members of the institutional community, information regarding the rights of students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office ensures that electronic media provided through the OSD website meet appropriate accessibility standards.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available information and provides referral services to students with disabilities regarding institutional and community disability resources.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available, to all members of the institutional community, information regarding grievance and complaint procedures.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office ensures all relevant institutional publications (e.g., recruitment materials, OSD website) include a statement regarding self-disclosure for students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Office Administration

- 3.1 The office adheres to established institutional administrative procedures.

Mission

- The office develops, disseminates, and implements a mission statement.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office mission is consistent with the mission of the institution.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains, as a component of its mission, a set of annual goals and objectives.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office serves as a source for training regarding services for students with disabilities (e.g. intern training, faculty research).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Staff Selection

- The office is lead by at least one full-time professional.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office hiring practices are non-discriminatory.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office has a process for identifying potential interns, volunteers, and/or student employees (e.g., exam readers, scribes, readers for books to CD, note takers).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office has a process for the identifying and maintaining part-time OSD staff (e.g., sign language interpreters, real-time captionists).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office ensures its hiring practices promote application by qualified persons with disabilities

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Fiscal Management

- The office has sufficient funding to meet its mission and goals.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office administration effectively manages its fiscal resources.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office administration develops and implements a program budget.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office lobbies for additional fiscal resources as the need arises.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office has the fiscal resources to hire necessary personnel (e.g., administrative assistant, student employees, interpreters, note takers).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Ethics

- The office administrator consistently promotes and exhibits ethical behavior.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- All office personnel consistently exhibit ethical behavior.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office adheres to a relevant code of ethical principles.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office periodically reviews the code of ethical principles.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office adheres to a set of established OSD Guidelines or Standards.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office provides periodic staff development training to all office personnel in the practice of ethical behavior.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office understands and practices ethical behavior in the use of technology.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office administrator periodically evaluates and provides feedback on the ethical practice of office personnel (e.g., AHEAD ethics code).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Leadership

- The office administrators' vision, in collaboration with appropriate office staff, is evident in the written office mission.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office administrator, along with appropriate office staff, and in consultation with appropriate institutional officials, sets OSD goals and objectives.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office administrator develops and maintains written job descriptions and performance expectations for staff.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office administrator participates in broader institutional activities that promote attainment of the office mission.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office administrator is regarded as an institutional expert on access for individuals with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Office Policies and Procedures

- 4.1 The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, develops, reviews, and/or revises a clear set of policies and procedures regarding service provision for students with disabilities.

Accommodations / Services

- The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, develops, reviews, and/or revises the documentation guidelines that define who may receive reasonable and appropriate accommodations and/or services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define the disability documentation review process.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define the steps for acquiring reasonable and appropriate accommodations and/or services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define the process for receiving provisional services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, collaborates with relevant institutional personnel to develop, review, and/or revise policies and/or procedures for resolving disagreements with respect to reasonable and appropriate accommodations and/or services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, collaborates with relevant institutional personnel to develop, review, and/or revise policies and/or procedures for the drop off and pick up of exams taken in alternate testing sites.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures for the loan of equipment to students with disabilities (e.g., laptop computer, wireless microphone).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, on a regularly scheduled basis, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define the process for the review of documentation for prospective students.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Institutional Responsibilities

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define institutional responsibilities regarding the provision of reasonable and appropriate accommodations and/or services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with relevant academic programs to develop, review, and/or revise policies and/or procedures for requesting and obtaining program modifications (e.g., course substitution).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures for obtaining services (e.g., interpreter services, scribe, note taker, lab assistant).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with relevant institutional entities to develop, review, and/or revise policies and/or procedures for requesting and obtaining priority registration.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with relevant institutional personnel to develop, review, and/or revise policies and/or procedures that spell out faculty responsibilities with respect to students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with IT personnel to develop, review, and/or revise policies and/or procedures with respect to technology and equipment for students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, in collaboration with institutional legal counsel, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and procedures that ensure the privacy, based upon applicable law, of all communications and educational records related to students served through the office.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define the process by which students with disabilities will be informed of their right to privacy and the circumstances under which their documentation may be accessed by others within the institutional community.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office defines and follows a consistent and reasonable timeline for the review and revision of all office policies and procedures.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office ensures all policies and procedures are readily accessible to the institutional community.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures for the selection, training, and evaluation of office personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures, as necessary, in collaboration with institutional legal counsel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures for student disclosure of disability status.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Student Responsibilities

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define student responsibilities with regard to disability documentation (e.g., recency, contents).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define student responsibilities for requesting and obtaining reasonable and appropriate accommodations and/or services (e.g., auxiliary aids).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, in collaboration with appropriate academic administrators, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that define student responsibilities for requesting and obtaining program modifications (e.g., course substitution, waiver).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures with respect to notification of appropriate office staff (e.g., interpreter, note taker) when a student will not attend a class.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office holds students with disabilities to the same standards as all other students in the receipt and delivery or reasonable and appropriate accommodations and services (e.g., honor code, student misconduct).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Privacy

- The office, in collaboration with institutional legal counsel, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures regarding access to educational records by other institutional entities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures for obtaining written consent to share student educational records with appropriate institutional personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, in collaboration with appropriate institutional personnel, develops, reviews, and/or revises policies and/or procedures that identify when access to student educational records is necessary under emergency circumstances.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office makes available the documentation regarding rights and responsibilities of students with disabilities regarding privacy and access to records pertaining to disability.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Office Evaluation

- 5.1 The office periodically assesses its performance with regard to its office mission as well as its goals and objectives.

- The office evaluates itself against an established set of OSD Guidelines or Standards.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office regularly conducts a systematic evaluation of its programs and services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collects both quantitative and qualitative data in order to assess its effectiveness.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office evaluates the degree to which it is meeting its both its mission and goals and objectives.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collects student feedback data as part of its evaluation.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office uses valid and reliable measures in the evaluation process.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collects data from all relevant institutional community members as part of its evaluation (e.g., institutional staff and faculty).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office uses the evaluation data to modify and improve future programming and services for students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collects data on institutional physical access.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collects data on trends in the use of programming and services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collects data on attrition and graduation rates for registered students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collects evaluation data that demonstrates its impact upon student learning and development (e.g., academic growth, student institutional involvement).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office uses evaluation data to request funding and to meet any office growth demands.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office prepares a comprehensive report of its evaluation findings.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office submits the comprehensive report of findings to appropriate administrative personnel.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office conducts a regular evaluation of office staff performance.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Self-Determination

- 6.1 The office articulates and implements a service delivery model that promotes the development and practice of student self-determination.

- The office mission clearly articulates the development and practice of self-determined behavior on the part of students served through the office.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office policies and procedures support the development and practice of self-determined behavior on the part of students served through the office.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office encourages the development of strategies that promote success in higher education.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office facilitates the inclusion of students with disabilities in all aspects of campus life.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office provides training to the institutional community regarding the development and promotion of self-determined behavior in students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office encourages collaborative interaction between itself and the entire institutional community for the purpose of advocating for interests relevant to students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office encourages students to access the OSD website when gathering information.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office website provides clear direction to students who are looking for relevant institutional and community resources.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office staff employs practices that are aligned with self-determination competencies.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office promotes and encourages student choice, when and where appropriate.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office provides clear direction to students regarding the protocol for accessing services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office ensures students are held accountable for following relevant OSD policies and procedures.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Universal Design

- 7.1 The office promotes and practices a comprehensive set of universal design approaches (e.g., instruction, communication, facilities access).

- The office promotes the use of universal design practices in instructional environments.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office promotes the use of universal design practices in all communication practices.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office promotes the use of universal design practices in all campus facilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office policies and procedures reflect the principles of universal design.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office trains its staff to practice the principles of universal design.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Educational Access

- 8.1 The office determines with students and in collaboration with faculty reasonable and appropriate accommodations and services.

Accommodations / Services

- The office ensures the provision of reasonable and appropriate accommodations for the purpose of providing equal educational access to students with disabilities.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office reviews, with students, disability documentation (e.g., diagnostic evaluation, summary of performance) for the purpose of determining reasonable and appropriate accommodations and/or services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office determines, with students, the effectiveness of the reasonable and appropriate accommodations and services currently in use.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office cultivates the student’s ability to articulate, based upon strengths and needs, necessary reasonable and appropriate accommodations and/or services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office uses a procedure for determining reasonable and appropriate accommodations and services that includes consideration of the environment, task, and unique needs of the student.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office will consider providing time-limited, provisional disability support services to students who are pending receipt of a diagnostic evaluation.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office will, as necessary, collaborate with faculty to determine reasonable and appropriate accommodations and services so as not to modify the technical standards of a student’s chosen academic program or course.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office maintains documentation of the recommendations made regarding reasonable and appropriate accommodations and services.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office, when possible, requests student information regarding accommodation and service needs in advance of the beginning of the term.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Assistive Technology / Adaptive Equipment

- The office collaborates with the appropriate institutional constituencies to identify and purchase necessary assistive technology and adaptive equipment.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office collaborates with the appropriate institutional constituencies to ensure a suitable percentage of new institutional technology purchases are compatible with assistive and adaptive technology (e.g., hardware, furniture, supplemental input and output devices).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The institution has a person on staff with the requisite training and/or experience in the use of assistive and adaptive technology.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office provides or arranges for training for students to operate assistive technology and adaptive equipment.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office periodically evaluates the assistive technology and adaptive equipment needs of its students.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office assistive technology and adaptive equipment provided is in compliance with all applicable legal regulations.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Educational Preparation and Professional Development

- 9.1 The office employs personnel with appropriate professional skills and provides those personnel with ongoing staff and professional development opportunities.

Staff and Professional Development

- The new office personnel are provided orientation training (e.g., disability awareness training).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office personnel are provided ongoing staff development training.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office personnel are provided ongoing professional development opportunities (e.g., professional conferences).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office personnel are provided staff development and training opportunities based upon office/personnel evaluation data.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured:

Educational Preparation

- The office administrator(s) must have the appropriate educational credentials, training, and work experience necessary for the position held.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office support staff is selected based upon the demonstration of appropriate education, training, and work experience.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office interns, volunteers, and student employees must have appropriate educational experience and/or be provided relevant disability orientation/staff development training.

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

- The office student support staff (e.g., interpreters, assistive technology personnel) must have the necessary qualifications and/or experience (e.g., training, certification).

1 2 3 4 NA

Evidence of fulfillment:

Additional Exemplars to be measured: