Program Review
Services for Students with Disabilities

Program Description

Mission
Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) is committed to assuring equal access to Honolulu Community College facilities, programs, activities, and services by students with disabilities.

SSD is a coordinated effort by staff in two separate campus offices - the Student Health Office and the College Skills Center - to provide essential services in support of campus ADA/504 compliance.

Goals
1. To provide accommodations that support student success.
2. To foster an informed and barrier-free learning community.
3. To promote ongoing campus-wide ADA/504 compliance.

Program Outcomes
Disability Service Providers will
1. Produce user-friendly information and services for students.
2. Create relevant training opportunities for campus faculty and staff.
3. Implement reasonable options that improve accessibility on campus.
4. Make program improvements based on ongoing assessment and evaluation.

Students who receive disability accommodations through SSD will be able to
1. Follow specified procedures and timelines.
2. Use accommodations effectively.
3. Exhibit self-advocacy skills.
4. Set appropriate short-term and long-term goals.
5. Use study skills effectively.
6. Demonstrate academic responsibility.

Program Data Sources
1. Disability documentation
2. Accommodation request forms
3. Academic records in Banner
4. Midterm progress reports
5. Surveys
   • online student survey
   • faculty/staff training needs survey
   • SSD webpage users survey
6. Service evaluation forms
7. Focus group feedback
Program Demand

1. Number of documented students: 139
2. Demographics:

**Majors 2004 - 2005**

- **N=139**
  - Other: 8
  - UNCL: 1
  - LBRT: 41
  - VOC: 89

**Disabilities 2004 - 2005**

- **N=139**
  - Orthopedic: 66
  - LD: 26
  - EBM: 22
  - Chronic: 17
  - ADHD: 12
  - Other: 12
  - Deaf: 9
  - Visual: 6
  - Dyslexia: 5
  - Head Injury: 4
  - Developmental: 3
  - Speech: 0

(Note: 43 students in multiple categories)
3. Trends:

According to data from the National Center on Education Statistics (The Condition of Education 2003), in 1999 – 2000 the percentage of students with disabilities was higher at public 2-year institutions than at public 4-year institutions. This finding affirmed NCES data from a decade earlier showing that 63% of all public higher education students with disabilities were enrolled in community colleges. The trend over the last 15 years indicates that community college programs like those at HCC with its open-door policy will continue to be the favored post-secondary option for the majority of this population of students.

Over the last 3 years, the number of students with disabilities at HCC has grown by 8%. Direct and indirect factors arising from decisions at the federal level will fuel growth in the local population of post-secondary students with disabilities over the next decade. Specifically, Hawaii’s community colleges will experience an inflow of high school students transitioning to post-secondary education with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004) as well as a new wave of students supported by the Veterans Administration.

At the national level, the 1999 – 2000 data from NCES shows that college students report having the following types of disabilities:

- Mobility  29%
- Mental illness  17%
- Health  15%
- Visual or hearing  12%
- LD or ADD  12%
- Other  15%

In the same categories, students at HCC during the 2004 – 2005 academic year showed the following percentages (31% fell into multiple categories):
Mobility 47%
LD or ADD 31%
Mental illness 16%
Other 14%
Health 12%
Visual or hearing 11%

In comparison to the national statistics, HCC’s number of students with mobility impairments is consistently higher. The reason is related to the pre-1977 construction of several key classroom buildings. Floor to floor access requires a freight elevator key request process which results in a significantly higher than average number of students identifying their disability status for mobility assistance at HCC. Additionally, due to the hands-on nature of its training programs, HCC attracts a large population of students with learning disabilities and attention deficit disorder. With IDEA 2004’s strengthened emphasis on post-secondary transition and its relaxed requirements for identifying students as having specific learning disabilities, continued growth in this population is expected. Moreover, the possibility of a sharp rise in mobility and mental disabilities exists due to the increasing number of VA supported local troops returning from duty in the Middle East with war injuries and related trauma.

In terms of disability services, NCES data shows that 42% of students at public 2-year institutions reported having a disability in 1999-2000, but only half of them were eligible to receive services. Of those eligible, only a quarter received services. At HCC, anecdotal evidence indicates that a significant number of students have disabilities that have not been documented and others with documented disabilities choose not to identify themselves or request services. Currently, there is no systematic mechanism to track this data. Future assessment efforts will need to examine this trend and others as they relate to student retention and success.

**Measures of Efficiency**

1. **Number of FTE staff**
   - 1 full time APT and 1 full time Civil Service staff with multiple, non-overlapping responsibilities

2. **Staff to student ratio**
   - 2:90 on average per regular semester

3. **Number of courses supported**
   - **Summer 2004:** 16
   - **Fall 2004:** 248
   - **Spring 2005:** 262

4. **Number of students served**
   - **Summer 2004:** 13
   - **Fall 2004:** 97
   - **Spring 2005:** 102

5. **Retention and Success Rates**
70% of Fall 2004 students (68/97) continued in Spring 2005
Students passed 50% (8/16) of their Summer 2004 classes with a “C” or higher
Students passed 71% (177/248) of their Fall 2004 classes with a “C” or higher
Students passed 71% (186/262) of their Spring 2005 classes with a “C” or higher

6. Average time to completion of degree
   - Mean: 8.3 semesters for 11 May 2005 graduates
   - Shortest time: 4 semesters
   - Longest time: 16 semesters

7. Budget allocation 2004 - 2005
   a. General
      - Student assistants: $4,796 (CSC)
      - Sign language interpreters: $8590.35 (HO)
      - Materials and supplies: $609 (CSC) + $935.65 (HO)
      - Equipment: $200 (HO)
   b. Perkins
      - Student assistants: $14,624 (CSC) + $22,020 (HO)
      - Sign language interpreters: $18,068 (HO)
      - Materials and supplies: 0
      - Equipment: 0

8. Cost of program 2004 – 2005
   a. General
      - Student assistants: $4,506.73 (CSC)
      - Sign language interpreters: $8,590.35 (HO)
      - Materials and supplies: $599.59 (CSC) + $935.65 (HO)
      - Equipment: $171.86 (HO)
   b. Perkins
      - Student assistants: $15,769.74 (CSC) + $17,876.83 (HO)
      - Sign language interpreters: $16,767 (HO) + $50,347 (DVR)
      - Materials and supplies: $228.13 (CSC) + $951.00 (HO)
      - Equipment: $2,836.47 (CSC) + $309.23 (HO)

2004 – 2005 Assessment

2004 - 2005 Program Outcomes to be Assessed
1. Students will follow specified procedures and timelines.
2. Students will use accommodations available through the College Skills Center effectively.

Subjects
Assessment efforts for the first year focused on Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 students who were appropriately documented with the Health Office and requested CSC accommodations such as notetaking, testing, or lab assistance. 52 students fell into this
category. Of the 52 students receiving services, 38 were enrolled in fall and 39 in spring. 24 were enrolled both semesters.

Measures of Effectiveness
1. P.O. 1: 75% of students will make contact with CSC disability service staff before the first week of school.
2. P.O. 2a: 75% of midterm evaluations will document that students are making satisfactory progress (“C” grade or higher) in their courses.
3. P.O. 2b: 75% of final grades will document that students have achieved satisfactory completion (“C” grade or higher) of their course requirements.
4. P.O. 2c: 75% of students will give a satisfactory rating to the overall impact of their accommodations on their academic progress.

Methods of Assessment
1. Contact logs
2. Midterm progress reports
3. End of term grade checks
4. Online student survey

Activities in Support of Target Program Outcomes
1. Post signs with disability office contact information in every classroom.
2. Expand disability web page and brochure to include timelines.
3. Mail procedural letters to documented students one month before semester begins.
4. Phone/email students who have received CSC accommodations for one week to check on attendance and satisfaction with accommodations.
5. Phone/email notetakers/lab assistants to encourage timely notes and attendance.
6. Send out midterm evals to instructors to document students’ performance at mid semester.
7. Evaluate completed midterm evals for red flags (students performing at C- or below).
8. Call red flag students in for counseling and possible intervention strategies including referral to faculty tutoring.
9. Check end of term grade reports for progress.
10. Keep records of accommodations requests, midterm reports, and final grade reports.
11. Summarize program results at end of academic year and report to campus-wide committee on disability access (CODA-H).

Resources to Support Designated Assessment Activities
1. Two disability service providers
2. One ream of paper
3. 100 envelopes
4. Photo copier access
5. Computer access (Word)
6. Designated phone lines (x272 and x282)
7. Email access
8. Banner access to grade reports
Wish list:
1. Shared database of student information with Health Office.

2004 – 2005 Assessment Results
The Disability Service Providers at HCC identified four measures by which to assess the effectiveness of their program during the 2004 – 2005 academic year. Their first year goal was to attain a 75% success rate for all four measures.

The first measure examined the timeliness of students’ accommodation requests. Results in Table 1 show that in Fall 2004, 38 students requested academic accommodations through the CSC. Of the 38 students, 11 (29%) contacted CSC before August 23, 2004, the first day of classes for fall, to arrange accommodations. 27 students contacted CSC after classes began.

In Spring 2005, 39 documented students with disabilities requested academic accommodations through the CSC. Of the 39 students, 16 (41%) contacted CSC before January 10, 2005, the first day of classes for spring, to arrange accommodations. 23 students contacted CSC after classes began.

Between fall and spring, there was a 12% increase in timely contacts; however, by the end of the academic year, disability services still fell short of its first year goal by 34%.

Table 1
Initial Contacts with SSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Number of documented students</th>
<th>Contacted SSD before first week of classes</th>
<th>Contacted SSD after first week of classes</th>
<th>Early contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 04</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 05</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second measure assessed the progress students had made in their courses by midterm. Midterm evaluation results in Table 2 show that as of early October 2004, fall students were earning a “C” or higher in 79% of their classes. As of the end of February 2005, spring students were scoring at a “C” or higher in 71% of their classes.

Between fall and spring, there was a 68% increase in the number of midterm evaluations completed; however, the number of satisfactory midterm evaluations decreased by 12%. By the end of the academic year, disability services had fallen short of its first year goal by 4%.

Table 2
Midterm Course Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Total midterm evals</th>
<th>Satisfactory course evals</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory course evals</th>
<th>Courses on track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 05</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third measure focussed on students’ final course grades. In Table 3, end of semester grade reports show that fall students earned satisfactory final grades (“C” or higher) in 82% of their courses. Spring students earned satisfactory final grades in 68% of their courses.

Between fall and spring, the number of final grade evaluations increased by 68%; however, disability services had fallen short of its first year goal by 7% at the end of the academic year.

Table 3
Final Course Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Total final evals</th>
<th>Courses with “C” grade or higher</th>
<th>Courses below “C” grade</th>
<th>Course success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 05</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth measure assessed students satisfaction with disability services and the impact those services had on their academic progress. Data collection from the online student disability access survey is ongoing. Results will be reported at the end of the academic year.

Analysis

Services for Students with Disabilities staff began its assessment activities with the following assumptions:

- Students who request accommodations early will perform more successfully in their courses than those who request accommodations late.
- If disability staff keep abreast of students’ progress in their courses, staff can better support student success.

Early initial contacts from students allow SSD staff the necessary time to prepare for students’ individual needs in consultation with their instructors and arrange for the most appropriate and best quality accommodations. Time is a crucial factor in securing sign language interpreters, brailled, taped or digitized textbooks, adaptive equipment, and in-class assistants. Because time impacts the effectiveness of SSD operations, staff assumed that it also played a key role in student success.

For 2004 – 2005, data indicate that less than half of the students served made early contact with SSD. Based on SSD’s assumption that early requests support student success, data should show that less than half of the students performed satisfactorily in their courses. In terms of student performance, SSD learned that fall students who submitted accommodation requests late were slightly less successful in passing their courses (61%) than those who submitted requests early (69%); whereas, spring students who requested late were markedly less successful (29%) than their counterparts who requested early (78%). SSD believes that its response time in filling students’ requests
helps to mitigate the problem of late requests. However, to sustain effective operations that increase student success over the long-term, SSD will need to improve students’ ability to submit accommodation requests early.

SSD’s midterm evaluation process serves to monitor students’ performance in their courses by the semester halfway mark. SSD sends evaluations forms to instructors asking them to rate students in terms of attendance, assignment quality, quiz and test performance, and basic skills. Students who are performing below “C” grade level (labeled “red-flagged”) are called in for counseling. Both fall and spring results indicate that the midterm evaluation process effectively predicts whether students will be successful in their courses in a given semester. Data show a $\pm 3\%$ difference between students’ course performance rating at midterm and their final grades. Data also indicate that SSD will need to strengthen intervention efforts to help red-flagged students improve their performance by the end of the semester. End of quarter evaluations may provide the necessary lead-time for SSD staff to identify struggling students and implement support measures.

Planning

Based on the analysis of the assessment results from the 2004-2005 academic year, SSD plans to implement the following changes in the 2005-2006 academic year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Completion Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail SSD procedures to returning students earlier.</td>
<td>SSD staff</td>
<td>6 weeks before each semester begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify timelines for accommodation requests in web and brochure info.</td>
<td>SSD staff</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct course evaluations at the end of the first quarter.</td>
<td>SSD staff, instructors</td>
<td>End of first quarter for each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop college disability policy handbook. Include as a project in strategic plan.</td>
<td>SSD staff, Administration</td>
<td>End of 2005 – 2006 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for campus-wide disability response fund to be included in strategic plan.</td>
<td>SSD staff, Committee on Disability Access</td>
<td>End of 2005 – 2006 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study feasibility of mentoring/tutoring services for possible inclusion in strategic plan</td>
<td>SSD staff</td>
<td>End of 2005 - 2006 academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

For the first year of program review, SSD purposely focussed on action plan items that do not incur additional costs to the college. The disability service providers felt that the initial review should focus on evidence gathering to identify the areas needing
support and improvement and then determining which activities are immediately achievable within the program’s locus of control. Additional time can then be spent prioritizing the needs that surface and adequately investigating potential solutions before requesting additional resources.

Inherent challenges for college disability programs include accurate budget projections as well as the timely provision of quality services. To allay these challenges, incoming students must self-identify and communicate their needs for the upcoming academic year early in the budget process. The findings in this report underscore that most HCC students do not identify their disability status or submit accommodation requests until after the semester has begun. Thus, SSD’s efforts to increase the likelihood of early student contacts are valid and will continue to be important.

In addition to the non-cost action steps listed above, significant improvements can be made by way of administrative support for the establishment and enforcement of clear, systematic disability policies. The discussion surrounding program technical standards implementation is a case in point. Student retention and success are positively impacted by students’ selection of courses and programs that match their potential. The need is evident for an authorized protocol to inform students of program technical standards during the admissions process and to properly handle cases in which students do not meet technical standards for admission. Decisive leadership and support for interdepartmental cooperation would smooth the way for such policy implementation. SSD will work to include the goals of disability policy development and enforcement in the HCC strategic plan.

Finally, administrators need to incorporate disability funding as a standard line item in the overall college budget in order for the college to appropriately respond to unexpected high cost accommodation requirements in a timely manner. The current reactive nature of disability funding can then be replaced with a responsive program that effectively maintains the college’s program standards while ensuring program access. SSD will make a concerted effort to have this critical issue addressed in the HCC strategic plan.