

PRELIMINARY REPORT & CHARTBOOK:

The 2010 Biennial *AHEAD* Survey of Disability Services and Resource Professionals in Higher Education

Prepared by:
Devva Kasnitz, PhD
July, 2011



The Association on Higher Education And Disability (*AHEAD*)
107 Commerce Center Drive, Suite 204
Huntersville, NC 28078
www.AHEAD.org

Acknowledgements

AHEAD gratefully acknowledges all disability resource and service professionals who responded to the 2010 *AHEAD* survey, as well as everyone who assisted in recruiting study participants. We particularly thank Dr. Wendy Harbour who oversaw the initial creation of the survey and wrote the 2004 and 2008 reports. *AHEAD* especially thanks the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 *AHEAD* Board members, who developed the 2010 survey instrument, assisted with its implementation, and supervised the data collection period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SURVEY BACKGROUND	4
Purpose.....	4
The Chartbook	4
The Preliminary Report.....	5
Notes on the Reliability of the 2010 Data	5
Table: Response Rates by Question, 2010.	8
II. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON RESPONDENTS	10
Table: Characteristic of survey respondents by gender, disability status, AHEAD membership, ethnicity, 2004, 2008, 2010.	10
Table: Disability experience of disabled respondents by impairment area, all and US only, 2008 & 2010.....	11
Table: Geographic location of respondents by regions of US, 2004, 2008, 2010.	12
Table: Most advanced education completed by respondents, US and Canada, 2010.....	13
Demographic Characteristics Recommendations	14
III. RESPONDENTS' CAMPUS CONTEXT OR WORK SETTING	15
Table: Summary of number of students on respondents' campuses, 2010.	15
Table: Campus Context: Type of school by disability services office structure and size of school, 2010	16
Table: Type of campus by type of degrees offered, 2010.	17
IV. RESPONDENTS' OFFICE SETTING OR WORKSITE	18
Table: Disability services office structure by type and size of school, 2010.	18
Table: Summary of respondents' office placement in its larger institutional organization, 2010.....	19
Table: Summary of titles of respondents' offices, 2010.....	20
Table: Use of key words in titles of respondents' offices, 2010.....	21
Table: Number of employees by type (full, part time, contract, and student) in respondents' offices, 2010.	21
Number of staff by student body size in respondents' workplace.	22
Table: Total annual budget of respondents' office, 2010.	22
Table: Budget data by range and average of general and accommodation budgets, 2010.	23
V. RESPONDENTS' JOB AND WORK EXPERIENCE.....	24
Table: Respondents' current descriptive job title, all, 2010.....	24
Table: Proportion of respondents' jobs devoted to disability services and resources, 2010.	26
Table: Respondents' experience supervising professional staff by years of experience, US and Canada, 2010.....	27
Table: Minimum education required for respondents' current job, 2010.....	27
Table: Respondents' education meets the stated minimum for their job, 2010.	28
Table: Number of years of respondents' experience in their current job, 2010.....	28
Table: Respondents' experience working in disability services at the college level, all and Canada, 2010.....	29
Table: Respondents' experience working in higher education at the tertiary level, all and Canada, 2010.....	29

Table: Respondents' additional years of relevant work experience by the field of such experience, US and Canada, 2010.	30
VI. RESPONDENTS' SALARY AND COMPENSATION	32
Table: Funding source for respondents' positions, 2010.	32
Table: Position basis, year round or academic year, 2010.	32
Table: Remuneration BASIS, Salary, hourly, contract, 2010.	33
Table: Respondents' non-salary compensation, US, 2010.	33
Table: Full-time and part-time respondents by salary range and average, all and US only, 2010.....	34
Table: Full-time respondents by minimum educational level needed for the job, job funding, job payment basis, average and range of earnings, All, 2010. ..	35
Table: Descriptive job title by percent full time and average salary, 2010.....	36
VII. DISABILITY SERVICES AND RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND THE PEOPLE THEY SERVE	37
Table: Basic data on number of schools (respondents) serving disabled staff, students, or both, 2010.	37
Table: Disability experience by impairment of the faculty and staff served by respondents from two year, four year, and graduate schools, 2010.....	38
Table: Student consumers served by type of impairment and types of school and number of staff, US, 2010.	39
Table: Graduation and student retention rate of respondents' offices as compared to the whole school.	40
Table: Programs and services offered by respondents' offices, with and without a fee, 2010.	40
VIII. RESPONDENTS' EXPRESSED RESOURCE AND TRAINING NEEDS	41
Table: Expressed needs grouped and prioritized, 2010.	41

I. SURVEY BACKGROUND

Purpose

This is the third iteration of this survey of people working on disability issues in higher education conducted by the Association of Higher Education And Disability (*AHEAD*). Originally conducted in 2004 and 2008 by Dr. Wendy Harbour, the 2010 questionnaire is shorter than prior years, but most of the questions are from the previous versions with no changes.

The original purpose of the 2004 and 2008 iterations of the survey was to:

- Collect demographic information about a wide variety of disability services office staff, including personal statistics (e.g., age, ethnicity), professional backgrounds, and salary ranges;
- Learn more details about the administration of disability services offices, including the number of students and staff served, the decentralization or centralization of services, and the institutional units (e.g., academic affairs, student affairs) overseeing disability services operations; and
- Find practical information to guide administrators in disability services offices and at *AHEAD*, including which types of compensation, resources, and professional development opportunities would be most beneficial for disability services staff.

In 2008, *AHEAD* decided to make the survey biennial, with the intention of designing two alternating surveys, one for disability services administrators, focused on offices and programming, and a second survey for all disability service professionals, regarding their work, salary, and professional development needs. The 2008 survey was a “bridge” to this plan with five sections: 1) personal and professional information such as age, gender, ethnicity, and education; 2) details about respondents’ current positions, including job titles and degree requirements for the position; 3) salary and compensation information, including non-monetary forms of compensation like flexible work hours; 4) information about the respondents’ campus and disability services’ office information, including setting, type of campus, statistics about consumers, and administrative features of the office – this section was only intended for respondents who were disability services office administrators; and 5) perspectives on disability services, including professional development needs, identification of critical knowledge for staff, and underlying philosophy of disability services service provision.

This ambitious agenda was pared down for the 2010 survey which included only the first four sections with one question on professional development needs. The survey is still quite ambitious as it is interested in tracking trends where the unit of study shifts from the individual respondent (disability service professional), to the respondent’s job, to the office and campus context in which the respondent works, to the overall nature of disability services at the respondent’s campus or workplace, and to characteristics of disabled students or faculty/staff served.

The Chartbook

Traditional long narrative reports are available for the 2004 and 2008 results. This report reflects a slightly different approach to the 2010 data and its presentation. An important goal of this survey was to collect and report descriptive information in a style that would be accessible to people without any statistics background. Another goal was to build a longitudinal data source where users can track whichever trends interest them most. This Chartbook is a simple way for us to publish the results of the survey so that users can quickly find the data they need. In choosing this format, we expect that *AHEAD* members will consult the Chartbook frequently to look up data, as they need it, on overall trends and to compare their situation with that of their peers. We have tried to present data that is reasonably reliable; summarized where it seems appropriate. However, we have left many categories relatively raw to not impose any

particular analytic posture on the data. This is particularly important because of the focus on multiple units of study. At times the Chartbook reports the same data, but organizes it in rows or columns to make differences clear depending on which is most important to readers, the crux of most research. For example, data on office structure by type and size of school is important at the level of the office, whereas, type of school by size and office structure is a better way to look at the data if the unit of focus is the school. For easy reference, each table in the Chartbook has a descriptive title that shows up in the Table of Contents.

The Preliminary Report

This preliminary report contains a small selection of interpretive notes and about half of the data tables that will be available in the final report. In many cases it contains a summary table on data, such as salary or office budget, that is presented in both detail and summarized formats. The next section contains most of the methodological description of the survey necessary for most users to understand the tables. However, the full Chartbook contains copies of the questionnaire, recruitment materials, coding, and the analysis process. Many groups of tables in this report, and all of them in the Chartbook, are accompanied by a short text with basically the same structure covering: how to read the table, the limits of the data, the strongest trends the data suggests, any speculations on the meaning of the trends, and any recommendations the analysis suggests--particularly for future iterations of the survey. This report focuses particularly on the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents.

Notes on the Reliability of the 2010 Data

Because survey participation is self-selected, generalization of the results is limited, and caution is due in making broad assumptions based on the survey's findings. This survey used a basic opportunity sample with snowball recruitment, the most practical approach. Anyone who had the opportunity to participate was welcome, whether contacted directly by *AHEAD* or by referral from another respondent (snowball sampling). *AHEAD* recruited individual respondents from its membership and from people who could be thought of as potential members (recruited from the same networks from which *AHEAD* recruits members). There was no formal statement of eligibility. The introductory/recruitment letters and informed consent documents referred in general to "our profession" and to the goal of understanding "disability service and resource professionals in higher education." This was presumably deliberate to be as inclusive as possible. Respondents in earlier versions of the survey did report some difficulty fitting themselves into some questions because of the newness of the field and the range of their interests, job functions, and how their job fits into its larger context. Data was collected from people working in K-12, adult education, vocational rehabilitation, one stop centers, and many very unique and specialized environments. Therefore, choosing which respondents to include in the analysis of particular questions is difficult. Some of these difficulties were noted in prior years.

The survey itself was anonymous. Data from participants could not be linked to IP addresses, e-mail addresses, institutions, or other identifying information. In all, 916 people completed usable survey responses. To understand sampling issues, consider the following apparent inconsistencies or ineligible respondents: of the 916 respondents, 82 reported no work experience in "higher education," although 5 described the type of campus where they worked as a 2-year, 4-year, or graduate college. Of the 82, 61 also reported no experience with "disability services." Of the 82, 13 reported that they are members of *AHEAD*, and 5 of the 61 also reported that they are members. Some of these seeming inconsistencies are also definitional. Of the 61 people who did not report any experience with disability services, 20 disclosed a hearing impairment and most work with people who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing (HOH), although not all at the postsecondary level. Is Deafness disability? Another explanation for missing data is that many people are hesitant to answer if the choices are not literally correct. Perhaps some skipped the questions on higher education or disability experience because they could not choose "less than one year" when asked how many years experience they have. This is a general problem with most questions where no answer is assumed to mean "not applicable" as a default rather than giving the respondent the chance to tell us why it is blank. This leaves the interpretation to the analyst. The Chartbook uses responses of all of the people who answered the appropriate questions with interpretable answers. Each table clearly states if any records were excluded and how many were left blank, usually referred to as "unstated."

The analysis process included an extensive “cleaning” of the data in an attempt to sort out these and other inconsistencies. This is a process where researchers look at inconsistencies and see if they can figure out what people meant to answer. [e.g., *Did the respondent who said she was an ASL (A for American) interpreter in Texas really mean she was paid in Euros or did she just check the wrong box? This is difficult. Did the person working for an office of “Disabled Student Services” who only listed statistics for faculty/staff disabled consumers mean student consumers, or, in fact, might she be the person responsible for working with staff?*] In cases when it was not possible to interpret responses, even after consultation with AHEAD staff, these responses were deleted from the database for any analysis of the data in question. Some of these interpretive difficulties can be eased in future iterations of the survey by double checking questions such as “Does your office offer services to staff?” before probing for the type of disability experienced by those staff, or conversely, students.

The 2010 questionnaire contained four parts, introduced with the instructions as in the first table below. The response rate varies greatly by section. Everyone answered the questions in part one. In part two, 24% declined to answer the open-ended question on their needs. In part three, people were slightly more likely to leave the salary question blank than to do so when asked other personal information. In part four, 53% of respondents answered the structural and programmatic questions about their office while only 36% had actual statistics on consumers. Data on budget was supplied by less than a quarter of respondents.

Most respondents completed the first three parts of the survey about themselves and their personal experience in some detail, with no apparent hesitation in supplying personal information. The survey questions allowed people to identify more than one title for their work position. For instance, an Office Manager responding to the survey may also be a Project Manager, and could select both titles. Due to validity concerns with overlapping categories, some caution is due, therefore, in interpreting what may appear to be similarities or differences between positions within disability services offices. This is particularly difficult when attempting to separate administrators from direct serviced staff. The three iterations of the survey did this by job title rather than by asking about job function. Earlier analysis assumed that senior administrators would then answer part four of the survey. It is not clear this is always the case.

Between 35% and 60% of respondents completed different parts of the fourth section about their offices, schools, and the students and staff they serve. In most cases where respondents skipped this section, it is likely that they were following instructions -- they were not the senior person in their office. However, it could be they didn't have the information, or didn't have the time to look it up. Because a goal of the survey was to develop a view not only of people but of jobs, offices, and campuses, the survey is complicated. It asks for data that would take a significant amount of time and often multiple people in an office to collect and process into the survey categories. AHEAD is very appreciative of the over 500 people who took the time to do this. For future iterations of the survey it may be advisable to better clarify when the unit of study shifts from people, to jobs, to offices, to campuses, and who should answer what. It is unknown how many people responded from the same schools or worksites. Some people clearly tried to answer as many questions as they could, and in cases where service statistics may be available to many staff members, it is unclear if the same offices were included twice or multiple offices at the same schools were also included. For example, this may well be the case for some of the 19 examples of people who only related statistics on services to disabled faculty and staff. Several of them did report that their office title was one such as “Disabled Students Services,” specifically mentioning students and not staff. Other people in their office may have reported statistics on services to disabled students.

Again, in a potentially significant number of cases it is likely that the questions didn't apply to some people, where others didn't know the answer, or their answer was not an available choice. The respondent didn't have a job, or an office, or work at a school, or work with students, or were consultants, etc. The survey did not give respondents a consistent way to distinguish between the various reasons why they skipped any particular question. Because of this, in most cases, we have been careful to report both the proportion of all 916 respondents with a particular answer, and the proportion with that particular answer who answered that question at all. This is often indicated by the convention (n=) followed by a number. So, n=916, means that the basis of analysis of that bit of

information is all 916 respondents, so all percentages should be read as a percent of 916. A figure such as n=335, for example, means that only 335 respondents answered that question. In this case the percentages reported are a percent of 335.

The survey didn't ask respondents to reveal their actual campus. The likelihood of two people responding from the same school is high, while the likelihood that their answers, even to non-personal service questions, are exactly the same data is slight. Respondents were encouraged to forward the survey information to colleagues at both their own institution and beyond. No duplications of respondents who completed Part Four of the survey, that is people from the same office at the same campus, are obvious. However, it is possible. The results are presented with the assumption that there is no duplication on Part Four data, but it is only an assumption. Please remember that all comparative data is only illustrative of trends and not representative. Also heed this caution from the 2008 report.

As with the 2004 survey, it also became apparent that a lack of centralized information about disability services created validity issues. For example, there are no US organizations that currently collect statistics about all disabled students in higher education. Unlike elementary and secondary school systems, which have mandated reporting and standardized disability categories under IDEA, higher education service providers usually only collect statistics for their immediate supervisors. Because there are no agreed-upon standards, many statistics vary by office. For example, some administrators may count deaf, deaf-blind and hard-of-hearing students as having three different types of disabilities. Other campuses may count these students with blind and visually impaired students, reporting them all under a category of students with sensory disabilities. (Final Report: The 2008 Biennial AHEAD Survey of Disability Services and Resource Professionals in Higher Education, p. 11)

In conclusion, despite these problems, the survey data is a valuable resource. *AHEAD* has done its best to collect and present data that will further the development of the field of not only disability services in higher education, but to a better understanding of disability and education, and disability services in general.

Table 1

Response Rates by Question, 2010

Number of Respondents	Response Rate n=916	Question Number	Question
<i>PART ONE: In this part of the survey, you will answer some questions about your personal and professional background.</i>			
916	100%	1	How many years of experience do you have in your current position?
916	100%	2	How many years of experience do you have working in the field of Disability Services at the college level?
910	99.34%	3	How many years of experience do you have working in higher education (colleges and universities)? Include your years of experience working in disability services offices.
881	96.18%	4	Aside from your current job, do you have other work experience in these fields? If so, please indicate years of experience. If a job was a combination of two or more categories, please choose the category that best fits.
905	98.80%	5	Do you currently supervise professional staff?
556	60.70%	5a	How Many?
908	99.13%	6	Are you currently a member of the Association on Higher Education And Disability (<i>AHEAD</i>)?
914	99.78%	7	What is the highest (most advanced) degree you have completed at this time? Do not include degrees that are in progress.
916	100%	8	Please provide the following demographic information about yourself.
<i>PART TWO: In this part of the survey, we will ask you questions about your current position.</i>			
903	98.58%	9	What is the job title(s) you use to describe your job? Choose the title(s) you use for your current position, whether or not it is the title used by your campus administration for job classification purposes. Select all titles that apply to you.
899	98.14%	10	Are you employed full-time or part-time?
905	98.80%	11	What is the minimum educational level required for your job as indicated on your current job description?
878	95.85%	12	What percentage of your FTE (full time equivalent) is devoted to Disability Services/Resources? _____
709	77.40%	13	At this time, what information or training do you most need related to your job, disability services, or disability?
<i>PART THREE: In this part of the survey, we will ask about your salary and other compensation you receive for your work.</i>			
879	95.96%	14	Is your position funded through permanent funding (hard money) or through grants and other limited funding sources (soft money)? Select one response.
891	97.27%	15	Is your position for the academic year (usually 9-10 months), year-round (12 months), or on a temporary basis?
884	96.51%	16	Are you paid on salary, an hourly wage, or on a contract/temporary basis?
831	90.72%	17	What is your gross annual earnings?
892	97.38%	18	In what monetary units are you paid?
873	95.31%	19	What other forms of compensation are you eligible to receive? Select all that apply.

Continued next page.....

Number of Respondents	Response Rate n=916	Question Number	Question
PART FOUR: In this part of the survey, we will ask about your office and campus. This section is intended for response from Directors, Program Coordinators, Program Managers and other individuals who serve in the overall supervisory capacity of their office. If you are not the highest level staff person in your office, you are welcome to skip Part 4.			
550	60.04%	20	What is the title of your office? Please choose the title that best matches your office's title.
523	57.10%	21	Broken down by the following categories, how many staff members work in your office?
343	37.45%	22	How many students does your office serve with the following disabilities, regardless of whether they are formally registered with your office?
327	35.70%	23	How many faculty and staff does your office serve with the following disabilities, regardless of whether they are formally registered with your office?
323	35.26%	24	What is the graduation/completion rate of students served by your office? What is the graduation/completion rate for all students at your institution?
323	35.26%	25	What is the retention rate (most recent completed academic year) of students served by your office? What is the retention rate (most recent completed academic year) of all students at your institution?
487	53.17%	26	What are some programs and services offered by your office?
200	21.83%	27	Taking into account all personnel costs, overhead, and service related costs, what is the <u>total</u> annual budget for your office including all sources of funding? If you are not sure, leave this blank.
84	9.17%	28	Taking into account all students, faculty and staff with disabilities, what is the total annual budget for your office specifically for accommodations? If you are not sure, leave this blank. If your university pays all accommodations regardless of cost, please check the box for that option. In what monetary units?
241	26.31%	28a	I have no specific accommodation budget.
488	53.28%	29	Is your office located in the United States? Which State?
106	11.57%	30	Is your office located in Canada?
101	11.03%	31	If your office is not located in the US or Canada, please indicate the country where your office is located.
489	53.38%	32	Which category best describes the type of setting where your campus is located?
446	48.69%	33	How many students (undergraduate, graduate and extension) attend your campus?
481	52.51%	34	Please choose the category which best describes the type of campus where you work:
466	50.87%	35	If your institution is in the United States, is it a Historically Black College, Tribal College, a Traditionally Hispanic Serving Institution, or college for one type of disability (e.g. primarily for students who are deaf or students with learning disabilities)?
484	52.84%	36	Is your institution public, private or church-sponsored?
483	52.73%	37	Where does your office fit within the institutional organization?
474	51.75%	38	How is your office structured?

II. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON RESPONDENTS

Table 2

Characteristic of survey respondents by gender, disability status, AHEAD membership, ethnicity, 2004, 2008, 2010

Characteristics Of Survey Respondents	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2008	2008	2010	2010	2010	2010	2010	2010
	US	US	Can.	Can.	UK/ Australia	All	All	US	US	US	US	Can.	Can.	All	All
	People	%	People	%	People	People	% of Known	People	% of Known	People	%	People	%	People	%
Gender		n=963		n=51			n=1106		n=589						
Female	802	83.3%	43	84.3%	72	919	83.1%	466	79.1%	731	81.2%	12	80.0%	743	81.1%
Male	161	16.7%	7	13.7%	19	187	16.9%	122	20.7%	164	18.2%	3	20.0%	167	18.2%
Otherwise Identified	na		na		na			1	0.2%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	0.3%
Unstated	na		1	2.0%	na	247		17	na	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	3	0.3%
Total	963	100%	51	100%	91	1353	100%	606	100%	900	100%	15	100%	916	100%
Disability Status		n=955		n=51			n=1098		n=461						
Nondisabled	733	76.8%	44	86.3%	18	795	72.4%	301	65.3%	523	58.0%	11	73.3%	534	58.3%
Disabled	222	23.2%	7	13.7%	74	303	27.6%	160	34.7%	311	34.5%	4	26.7%	315	34.4%
Unstated	na		na		na	255			na	66	7.3%	0	0.0%	66	7.2%
Totals	955	100%	51	100%	92	1353	100%	461	100%	900	100%	15	100%	915	100%
AHEAD Membership		n=847		n=43			n=957		n=583						
Member	622	73.4%	21	41.2%	9	652	68.1%	512	87.8%	625	69.4%	12	80.0%	637	69.5%
Not a Member	225	26.6%	22	43.1%	58	305	31.9%	71	12.2%	268	29.7%	3	20.0%	271	29.6%
Unstated	na		8	15.7%	na	396		23	na	7	0.8%	0	0.0%	8	0.9%
Totals	847	100%	43	100%	67	1353	100%	606	100%	900	100%	15	100%	916	100%
Ethnicity		n=927		n=51			n=1042		n=585						
White or Caucasian	829	89.4%	44	86.3%	68	943	90.5%	508	86.8%	771	85.7%	13	86.7%	784	85.6%
African-American or Black	43	4.6%	0	0.0%	1	44	4.2%	29	5.0%	63	7.0%	0	0.0%	63	6.9%
Hispanic/Latino/Chicano/Mex.	29	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	29	2.8%	22	3.8%	19	2.1%	2	13.3%	21	2.3%
Multi-Ethnic or Biracial	10	1.1%	1	2.0%	0	11	1.1%	7	1.2%	7	0.8%	0	0.0%	7	0.8%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	0.2%	1	2.0%	0	3	0.3%	7	1.2%	4	0.4%	0	0.0%	4	0.4%
Asian-American, Asian, or Indian	12	1.3%	0	0.0%	0	12	1.2%	6	1.0%	6	0.7%	0	0.0%	6	0.7%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	2	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Unstated	na	na	5	9.8%	na	311	na	26	na	29	3.2%	0	0.0%	30	3.3%
Totals	927	100%	51	100%	979	1355	100%	606	100%	900	100%	15	100%	916	100%

General Demographic Characteristics

Table 2 combines the most standard demographic data from all three years of the survey. In 2010, 919 people participated in the survey. All of these people are from the US with the exception of 15 Canadians and one from Europe. The European respondent answered few questions, so his or her data does not skew the results. The Canadian data is occasionally broken out. Presumably, the Canadian respondents are highly motivated to participate and are slightly more senior in their jobs than the average American respondent. The 2004 survey had more international participation, and the 2008 survey only analyzed responses from the US.

Respondents are overwhelmingly female, and this is quite stable year to year. There appears to be a 7.5% decrease in the proportion of people who disclose personal disability experience from 2008 to 2010, despite a 11.6% increase in people reporting a hearing impairment. This can be both a shift in impairment experience and in disability identity and disclosure. It also probably reflects a large number of respondents from Deaf schools, both secondary and tertiary, as well as increased open identity of hearing impairment. Trends in *AHEAD* membership are interesting and probably reflect changes in survey promotion. In 2004 international respondents were less likely to be members and in 2010 more likely. Meanwhile, 2010 was most successful at recruiting US non-members. At best 14% of respondents are non-white. This appears to not really be changing and could reflect underrepresentation in hiring patterns, or in the survey, or both.

Table 3

Disability experience of disabled respondents by impairment area, all and US only, 2008 & 2010

Impairment	2010 All	2010 All	2010 All	2010 US	2010 US	2010 US	2008 US	2008 US	2008 US	2008 to 2010 US
Disability	People	% of All	% of Disabled	People	% of All	% of Disabled	People	% of All	% of Disabled	% Change Disabled
Hearing	70	7.64%	24.82%	68	7.56%	24.55%	30	4.95%	12.93%	11.62%
Chronic/Other Health	53	5.79%	18.79%	50	5.56%	18.05%	54	8.91%	23.28%	-5.23%
Mobility	37	4.04%	13.12%	37	4.11%	13.36%	43	7.10%	18.53%	-5.18%
Attention/hyperactivity	35	3.82%	12.41%	35	3.89%	12.64%	33	5.45%	14.22%	-1.59%
Psychological/Psychiatric	22	2.40%	7.80%	22	2.44%	7.94%	24	3.96%	10.34%	-2.40%
Learning	20	2.18%	7.09%	20	2.22%	7.22%	30	4.95%	12.93%	-5.71%
Vision	17	1.86%	6.03%	17	1.89%	6.14%	12	1.98%	5.17%	0.96%
Another Area of Life	9	0.98%	3.19%	9	1.00%	3.25%	0	0.00%	0.00%	3.25%
Motor Activity	9	0.98%	3.19%	9	1.00%	3.25%	6	0.99%	2.59%	0.66%
Speaking	1	0.11%	0.35%	1	0.11%	0.36%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.36%
Prefer Not to Say	9	0.98%	3.19%	9	1.00%	3.25%	0	0.00%	0.00%	3.25%
Total Disabled	282	30.79%	100%	277	30.78%	100%	232	38.28%	100%	-7.51%
	n=916	n=916	n=282	n=900	n=900	n=277	n=606	n=606	n=232	Overall % Change

Disability Experience

It is hard to compare 2008 and 2010 because in 2008 people could claim multiple impairment areas but in 2010 they could only choose one. The 2004 results lacked this data completely. This would mean that the 2010 results underemphasize secondary impairments and probably items such as chronic health conditions in favor of items such as hearing or vision impairment that are more commonly accommodated. This population probably would favor an answer related to a more traditional “disability” that might involve overt discrimination and which needs particular accommodation.

This data, with its overall rate of 31% reporting disability undoubtedly reflects trends in the education and employment of disabled people. These people pioneered, chose, or were channeled into this kind of work. There is also a peer reference group phenomena in that there are good reasons why people might want to work with a group of others with whom they personally identify. We are only beginning to understand how people describe their primary versus secondary disability identity. This becomes more complicated with aging. We are also just scratching the surface of understanding aging with disability versus aging into disability and how the two interact. The average age of respondents in 2004 and for 2010 is mid-forties. Age data was collected in 5 or 10 year periods making it difficult to analyze. Better data on age and age at onset of disability could be very illuminating.

Table 4

Geographic location of respondents by regions of US, 2004, 2008, 2010

	2004	2004	2008	2008	2010	2010
Region	People	Percent of All	People	Percent of All	People	Percent of All
Southern Region: AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV	224	16.56%	132	19.94%	186	20.31%
Midwestern Region: IA, IL, IN, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI	211	15.59%	121	18.28%	111	12.12%
Northeastern Region: CT, DE, DC, MA, ME, MD, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT	181	13.38%	103	15.56%	97	10.59%
Western Region, Alaska and Hawaii AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR, UT, WA, WY, Samoa	142	10.50%	79	11.93%	91	9.83%
US Region Unknown	217	16.04%	171	25.83%	415	45.31%
Total US Only	975	72.06%	606	91.54%	900	98.14%

* Due to an error with the 2004 AHEAD database, information about country of origin is missing for 229 respondents.

Location

Because of the large amount of missing data on location, this category should be treated carefully. This data was elicited late in the questionnaire in Part Four. Therefore, the people who did not complete the data on their offices also didn’t reveal their location. The increasing prominence of the Southern region is

interesting. The 2004 and 2008 surveys showed some correlation between salary and state. However, this simple, non-confidential data on state is missing for 45% of respondents.

Table 5

Most advanced education completed by respondents, US and Canada, 2010

EDUCATION COMPLETED	All People	Percent	Canada Only
High School	14	1.53%	1 (6.66%)
Two Years College	1	0.11%	
A Certificate	3	0.33%	
Associates	26	2.84%	
Bachelors	115	12.55%	3 (20%)
Some graduate work	3	0.33%	
Graduate Certificate	4	0.44%	
Masters	630	68.78%	9 (60%)
Masters and Certificate	3	0.33%	
Two Masters	5	0.55%	
Ed.S.	19	2.07%	
Doctoral Candidate	2	0.22%	
Doctorate degree	88	9.61%	2 (13.33%)
UNSTATED	3	0.33%	
Total Responses:	916	100.00%	15 (100%)

Education

Respondents gave detailed information on their education and many stressed multiple degrees, certifications, and degrees-in-progress. As in previous years, it can be concluded that this is a very educated group, who value education. It is unknown how much of this education is directly relevant to their current job or to what degree people sought multiple degrees or certifications to obtain or to advance in their work.

Demographic Characteristics Recommendations

- The obvious recommendations are to find ways to encourage more diversity in *AHEAD* membership and its constituent professions, including recruiting men, people with disabilities, and with varied cultural and ethnic identity and experience.
- The survey goals could also be tweaked to refine how *AHEAD* membership and survey recruitment interact and why.
- It might be useful to think carefully about why this group is so well-educated, female, and disproportionately disabled and relevant policy implications the data could help reveal.
- Future survey design considerations include:
 - The survey assumed respondents in disability services in higher education would self-select to participate but a clearer identification of these respondents, without excluding others would be helpful.
 - The survey would profit from better data on age and data on location from all respondents.
 - The survey could probe more on disability experience and ask about age or career status at onset of disability and about disability experience in respondents' immediate families and households. This would help to better understand professional recruitment patterns.
 - To clarify administrators from direct service staff, or support staff, or to track relative amounts of effort devoted of these job responsibilities and functions, it might be a good idea to ask more directly about job function rather than relying on job title and hints such as salary and number of supervisees. The same is true for professional positions such as teaching and licensed counseling.

III. RESPONDENTS' CAMPUS CONTEXT OR WORK SETTING

To place survey data into context, a snapshot of the schools and campuses where respondents work is presented. To summarize, while data is missing for 47% of all respondents, roughly equal numbers of people reported working in a suburban area or small town or a large urban city, while less than half as many work in a rural area. Similarly, of those who reported the kind of school, the sample contains 323 public or state schools, 142 private schools, and eight church-sponsored schools.

Also, 15 schools identify as a traditionally Hispanic-serving institution, five as a historically black college, and three as a tribal college. Only two identified as serving students with a specific type of disability. The latter is definitely underreporting on this questions as other questions reveal many more. It is likely the data on historically ethnic schools is also underreported.

Table 6

Summary of number of students on respondents' campuses, 2010

How many students (undergraduate, graduate and extension) attend your campus?				
Students	Schools	Percent of those reporting	Grouped	Cumulative Percent
1,000 or less	34	7.69%	Small	Small
1,025-5,000	177	40.05%	211 (47.74%)	211 (47.74%)
5,100-10,000	88	19.91%	Medium	Small-Medium
10,247-20,000	76	17.19%	164 (37.10%)	375 (84.84%)
20,500-30,000	33	7.47%	Large	Small-Large
31,000-40,000	15	3.39%	48 (10.86%)	423 (95.70)
42,000-60,0000	15	3.39%	Extra Large	Small-Extra Large
			15 (3.39%)	438 (99.09%)
100,000	3	0.68%	Huge*	
127,546	1	0.23%	4 (.90%)	
Total	442	100.00%		
Total Responses n=442, 48.25% of 916.		Overall Average 11,000 students.		*Some of these are combined districts of multiple campuses.

Table 7

Campus Context: Type of school by disability services office structure and size of school, 2010

Type of School	Structure	Total Students in These Schools	Average Students per School	Range of Students per School	Percent of Schools n=325	Percent of Schools by Type	Number of Schools
College-University	Centralized	2,043,122	10,985	375-52,000	57.23%	83.41%	186
College-University	Partially Centralized	146,879	8,160	1,200-35,000	5.54%	8.07%	18
College-University	Decentralized	40,450	8,090	2,450-15,000	1.54%	2.24%	5
College-University	No Specific Office	33,851	2,418	400-4,000	4.31%	6.28%	14
Totals		2,264,302	10,154	375-52,000	68.62%	100% n=223	223
Two Year College	Centralized	935,645	11,995	1,600-100,000	24.00%	86.67%	78
Two Year College	Partially Centralized	126,598	18,085	3,000-60,000	2.15%	7.78%	7
Two Year College	Decentralized	36,300	12,100	4,300-25,000	0.92%	3.33%	3
Two Year College	No Specific Office	3,150	1,575	650-2,500	0.62%	2.22%	2
Totals		1,101,693	12,241	650-100,000	27.69%	100% n=90	90
Technical/trade/vocational/professional	Centralized	26,580	3,797	900-6,000	2.15%	58.33%	7
Technical/trade/vocational/professional	Partially Centralized	2,200	2,200	2,200	0.31%	8.33%	1
Technical/trade/vocational/professional	Decentralized	12,313	6,157	3,20-9,113	0.62%	16.67%	2
Technical/trade/vocational/professional	No Specific Office	2,700	1,350	300-2,400	0.62%	16.67%	2
Totals		43,793	3,649	300-9,113	3.69%	100% n=12	12
TOTALS	All	3,409,788	10,492	375-100,000	100%		325

Table 8

Type of campus by type of degrees offered, 2010

Which best describes the type of campus where you work?		N=916	n=478	n=478	n=478
Type of School	Number of Campuses	Percent of all Respondents	Percent of Responding	Grouped	Cumulative
University, PhD/MD/JD.	136	14.85%	28.45%	University 262 (54.81%)	University 262 (54.81%)
University, Bachelors and Masters	126	13.76%	26.36%		
Baccalaureate but not graduate degrees	43	4.69%	9.00%	College 43 (9.00%)	4 Year Schools 305 (63.81%)
Two-year college.	131	14.30%	27.41%	Community Schools 149 (31.17%)	Post Secondary 454 (94.98%)
Technical/trade/vocational/professional school.	18	1.97%	3.77%		
K-12 Public School	12	1.31%	2.51%	Other 24 (5.02%)	
Residential School	3	0.33%	0.63%		
Service Provider	3	0.33%	0.63%		
Voc. Rehab.	3	0.33%	0.63%		
For Profit	2	0.22%	0.42%		
Adult Education	1	0.11%	0.21%		
Sub Total Number Responding	478		100.00%		
Other.	4	0.44%			
No Data	434	47.38%			
Total Responses:	916	100%			

IV. RESPONDENTS' OFFICE SETTING OR WORKSITE

Tables 9 - 13 describe the office context in which respondents work. Survey designers are interested in how disability services are structured on campus. Respondents were asked to choose among the following:

- My office is centralized – there is one disability services office for the whole campus and everyone uses it, regardless of disability.
- My office is partially centralized and partially decentralized. Most students with disabilities go to one office, but there is a separate office or program for some students (e.g. Deaf students or learning disabled students have their own program).
- My campus does not have a disability services office – accommodations are provided by someone who does the job part-time (e.g. someone in the student affairs office or an academic department also provides accommodations to individual students as needed).
- My office is decentralized – each college or department has its own disability resource contact or disability services office.

Table 9

Disability services office structure by type and size of school, 2010

Type of School	Structure	Total Students in These Schools	Average Students per School	Range of Students per School	Percent of Schools n=325	Number of Schools
College-University		2,043,122	10,985	375-52,000	57.23%	186
Two Year College		935,645	11,995	1,600-100,000	24.00%	78
Technical/trade/vocational/professional school		26,580	3,797	900-6,000	2.15%	7
Totals	Centralized	3,005,347	11,090	375-100,000	83.38%	271
College-University		146,879	8,160	1,200-35,000	5.54%	18
Two Year College		126,598	18,085	3,000-60,000	2.15%	7
Technical/trade/vocational/professional school		2,200	2,200	2,200	0.31%	1
Totals	Partially Centralized	275,677	10,603	1,200-60,000	8.00%	26
College-University		40,450	8,090	2,450-15,000	1.54%	5
Two Year College		36,300	12,100	4,300-25,000	0.92%	3
Technical/trade/vocational/professional school		12,313	6,157	3,20-9,113	0.62%	2
Totals	Decentralized	89,063	8,906	1,200-60,000	3.08%	10
College-University		33,851	2,418	400-4,000	4.31%	14
Two Year College		3,150	1,575	650-2,500	0.62%	2
Technical/trade/vocational/professional school		2,700	1,350	300-2,400	0.62%	2
Totals	No Specific Office	39,701	2,206	1,200-60,000	5.54%	18
TOTALS (35.5% of all 916)	All	3,409,788	10,492	375-100,000	100%	325

Table 10

Summary of respondents' office placement in its larger institutional organization, 2010

Where does your office fit within the institutional organization?	N=916		n=484	
	Respondents	Percent of All	Percent of those Reporting	
Student (but not academic, with or without mention of disability) Affairs	282	30.79%	58.26%	
Academic (with or without mention of disability) Affairs	116	12.66%	23.97%	
Counseling (with or without mention of disability) or Advising Services	32	3.49%	6.61%	
General Administration	13	1.42%	2.69%	
Faculty	11	1.20%	2.27%	
Affirmative Action/ Equal Employment Opportunity	4	0.44%	0.83%	
Health services	4	0.44%	0.83%	
Other: Post-Secondary	14	1.53%	2.89%	
Subtotal Post-Secondary	476	51.97%	98.35%	
Other: State Vocational Rehabilitation	3	0.33%	0.62%	
Other: Contractor	3	0.33%	0.62%	
Other: K-12	2	0.22%	0.41%	
No Data	432	47.16%	Na	
Total Responses:	916	100%	484 (100%)	

Table 11

Summary of titles of respondents' offices, 2010

What's in a Name? Summary of selected key answers to "What is the title of your office?"			
Title	Respondents	n=916	n=529
		Percent of All	Percent of those Reporting
(Office of) Disability Services	163	17.79%	30.81%
Office for (Services for) (Center for) Students with Disabilities (Services)	61	6.66%	11.53%
Disability Support Services	55	6.00%	10.40%
Disability Resource Center (Services)	46	5.02%	8.70%
Access/ADA/Accommodation (and Disability) Services (Center)	16	1.75%	3.02%
Disabled Student Services	15	1.64%	2.84%
Student (Support) Services	11	1.20%	2.08%
Student Disability Services	6	0.66%	1.13%
Academic (Support) Services (Center)	5	0.55%	0.95%
Learning (Resources) Center	4	0.44%	0.76%
Office of Accessibility	4	0.44%	0.76%
(Office of) Counseling and Disability Services	4	0.44%	0.76%
Office of Special Services	4	0.44%	0.76%
Student Accessibility Services	3	0.33%	0.57%
Vocational Rehabilitation	2	0.22%	0.38%
<i>Other with none of the Bolded Words Above</i>	<i>130</i>	<i>14.19%</i>	<i>24.57%</i>
Subtotal All Responses	529	57.75%	100.00%
Unstated	387	56.44%	n/a
Total Responses	916	100%	

Table 12

Use of key words in titles of respondents' offices, 2010

What's in a Name? -- Discourse Analysis of Titles		
n=529 for Below	Total	% of 529 Respondents who Answered this.
Titles with a direct reference to " Disability ":	376	71.08%
Titles with " Service ":	335	63.33%
Titles with " Support ":	87	16.45%
Titles with " Resource ":	57	10.78%
Titles with " Access, ADA, Accommodation ":	41	7.75%
Titles with " Student ":	32	6.05%
Titles with " Academic, Educational ":	30	5.67%
Titles with NO REFERENCE TO DISABILITY :	27	5.10%
Titles with " Learning ":	17	3.2%
Titles with " D/deaf, HI, HOH ":	15	2.8%
Titles with " Counseling ":	13	2.5%
Titles with " Technology ":	7	1.3%
Titles with " Career ":	5	0.9%

Table 13

Number of employees by type (full, part time, contract, and student) in respondents' offices, 2010

Broken down by the following categories, how many staff members work in your office?			
Type of Employee	People	Average of those reporting this data	Percent of all Employees
Full-time employees:	2,234	3.16	28.59%
Part-time employees:	1,185	1.68	15.17%
Contract employees:	863	1.22	11.05%
Student employees:	2,907	4.12	37.21%
Volunteers:	624	0.88	7.99%
Total Employees	7,813	Average # Staff per Office: 11.07	
n=706 77% of all 916			

Number of staff by student body size in respondents' workplace

Student body size and staff size data was received from 355 respondents. Some basic aggregates of this data, assuming it is from 355 unduplicated campuses, is as follows:

- Total staff on all campuses combined is 2,034 people.
- The range of staff size is 1-111 people.
- The average number of staff per campus is 5.73 people.
- Total number of all students on all campuses is 3,834,769 people.
- The range of students body size is 250-127,546 people.
- The average number of students per campus is 10,802 people.
- The number of campuses with over 5,000 Students is 187 (55.8% of the 355).
- The average number of students on the 45.2% of the 355 campuses over 5,000 students is 18,320.

Table 14

Total annual budget of respondents' office, 2010

Total annual budget for your office including all sources of funding?				
Budget	Respondents	n=916 Percent of All	n=199 Percent of those Reporting	n=199 Cumulative Percent
0-5,000	9	0.98%	4.52%	4.52%
5-10,000	4	0.44%	2.01%	9.05%
10-20,000	8	0.87%	4.02%	11.06%
20-30,000	6	0.66%	3.02%	15.08%
30-50,000	8	0.87%	4.02%	18.09%
50-70,000	7	0.76%	3.52%	22.11%
70-90,000	7	0.76%	3.52%	25.63%
90-120,000	9	0.98%	4.52%	29.15%
120-140,000	12	1.31%	6.03%	33.67%
140-160,000	8	0.87%	4.02%	39.70%
160-180,000	6	0.66%	3.02%	43.72%
180-200,000	9	0.98%	4.52%	46.73%
200-250,000	13	1.42%	6.53%	51.26%
250-300,000	10	1.09%	5.03%	57.79%
300-350,000	5	0.55%	2.51%	62.81%

Table 14 Continued

Budget	Respondents	Percent of All	Percent of those Reporting	Cumulative Percent
400-500,000	14	1.53%	7.04%	65.33%
500-600,000	12	1.31%	6.03%	72.36%
600-700,000	7	0.76%	3.52%	78.39%
700-800,000	8	0.87%	4.02%	81.91%
800-1,000,000	9	0.98%	4.52%	85.93%
1,000-1,500,000	5	0.55%	2.51%	90.45%
1,500-3,000,000	7	0.76%	3.52%	92.96%
3-4,000,000	3	0.33%	1.51%	96.48%
6,000,000	1	0.11%	0.50%	97.99%
7,000,000	1	0.11%	0.50%	98.49%
Zero	11	1.20%	5.53%	100%
Subtotal of All Responses:	199	22%	100%	
UNSTATED	717	78.28%	n/a	
Total	916	100%		
AVERAGE BUDGET OF THOSE REPORTING		\$ 45,000		

Table 15

Budget data by range and average of general and accommodation budgets, 2010

Budget Data of Respondent Answering both these questions.	# Schools	General Bud Range	Average General Bug	Accommodation Bud Range	Average Accommodation Bud	Average Acc. Bud as % of General Budget
Reporting No Specific Accommodation Bud, Pay All Costs	88	2,900-3,478,436	386,276	n/a	n/a	n/a
Reporting Both	60	2,000-7,067,550	562,210	1,000-2,610,000	206,513	36.73%
Reporting Accommodation Bud Only	12	?	?	1,200-500,000	119,061	
Reporting General Bud Only	35	3,500-4,000,000	500,509	?	?	
Totals	195	2,000-7,067,550	476,807	1,000-2,610,000	162,787	32.52%

V. RESPONDENTS' JOB AND WORK EXPERIENCE

Table 16

Respondent's current descriptive job title, all, 2010

What is the job title(s) you use to describe your job? Choose the title(s) you use for your current position, whether or not it is the title used by your campus administration for job classification purposes. Select all titles that apply to you.		
Titles	People with this Title	Percent of All
Director: Office or Departmental Director, Coordinator or Manager	357	38.97%
Director: Project or Program Director, Coordinator or Manager	128	13.97%
Associate or Assistant Director, Coordinator or Manager	97	10.59%
Sub Group Administrators	582	63.54%
ADA/504 Coordinator	76	8.30%
Specialist: Disability Specialist, Accessibility Specialist, etc.)	189	20.63%
Assistive/Adaptive Technology Coordinator/Specialist	67	7.31%
Advisor or Academic Counselor	108	11.79%
Sub Group Service Staff	440	48.03%
Counselor, Psychologist or Diagnostician	108	11.79%
Sign Language Interpreter	45	4.91%
Professor, Associate, Assistant Professor or Lecturer	66	7.21%
Consultant	31	3.38%
Administrative Assistant or Secretary, Receptionist	7	0.76%
Secretary or Receptionist	7	0.76%
Student Worker	7	0.76%
Other:		
Dean/Vice President/CEO/Executive Director	20	2.18%
Teacher Deaf/Hard of Hearing	12	1.31%
Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor	5	0.55%
Teacher	4	0.44%
Captionist/Transcription	3	0.33%
Instructor of Special Needs	2	0.22%
Career Placement Facilitator	1	0.11%
CTE Student Services/DSS Coordinator	1	0.11%
Educational Administrator	1	0.11%
hearing impaired teacher	1	0.11%
Instructional Designer	1	0.11%

Titles	People with this Title	Percent of All
Instructional Paraprofessional	1	0.11%
Instructor/Adjunct Faculty	1	0.11%
Liaison	1	0.11%
Librarian	1	0.11%
Regional Manager	1	0.11%
Research Assistant	1	0.11%
Research Associate	1	0.11%
Resource Teacher	1	0.11%
Secondary: Educator	1	0.11%
Secondary: high school transition specialist	1	0.11%
Secondary: K-12 Special Education Director	1	0.11%
Secondary: Superintendent	1	0.11%
Secondary: Transition Coordinator	1	0.11%
Secondary: Transition Coordinator for Secondary Spec. Ed.	1	0.11%
Secondary Subtotal	6	0.66%
Software Developer	1	0.11%
Special Needs Support Instructor	1	0.11%
Teacher of the visually impaired	1	0.11%
Veterans' Administration Representative	1	0.11%
Unstated	13	1.42%
n= 916 People Responding with Multiple Answers	2403	Answers, Average 2.66 Answers per person

Job Titles

Respondents were invited to list multiple titles. In response, 903 people listed 2,403 job titles. The hope was to discover what kind of job people have. The prior years' reports broke these into administrative and service staff. It is difficult to make this determination. Nowhere are respondents asked directly what they do for a living. This question asks for a descriptive title, not an occupation or job function, or even if they are the director of their office in a complicated world where, especially in small offices, people have multiple functions. People are asked what their past jobs were, their supervisory experience, and the proportion of their jobs that are related directly to disability services or resources. It is unclear how well asking job title reveals job function. Identifying administrators or administrative functions from direct service is still difficult from this data. Consequently, we present it relatively raw so that the range of answers is clear.

Authors Note: All of the answers above "other" were suggested in the survey; those following were all entered individually. I have collapsed and grouped them where they were almost the same. I believe the questions meant to imply a hierarchy that was not always clear to respondents.

Table 17

Proportion of respondents' jobs devoted to disability services and resources, 2010

What percentage of your FTE (full time equivalent) is devoted to Disability Services/Resources?				
Amount of Time as % of FTE	People	Percent of People	% Quarters	% Cumulative
100	455	49.67%		52.07%
95	22	2.40%		
90	35	3.82%	63.54%	63.54%
85	18	1.97%		
80	21	2.29%		
75	31	3.38%		
70	5	0.55%	8.30%	71.83%
65	7	0.76%		
60	22	2.40%		
55	1	0.11%		
50	41	4.48%		
46	1	0.11%		
45	7	0.76%	7.86%	79.69%
40	20	2.18%		
35	3	0.33%		
30	22	2.40%		
25	19	2.07%		
20	22	2.40%		
15	9	0.98%	9.61%	89.30%
10	19	2.07%		
5	11	1.20%		
Less than 5	27	2.95%		
UNSTATED	98	10.70%	10.70%	10.70%
Total Responses:	916	100%	100%	100%
Average for All Known n=818		79%		

This question could be interpreted to ask respondents to separate other duties, primarily administrative, from direct service and resource provision. Or, it could be interpreted as asking what proportion of time is about disability versus other areas. For example, a vision services counselor may spend 80% of their time on services and 20% on meetings and administration. Whereas, a student services director may spend 20% on disability services administration, and 80% on career, tutoring, housing, etc. services administration. Clearly the half of respondents who said their job is 100% disability services and resources, meant they work in a disability-related only job, not that they have no administrative work. The cumulative totals here are the most interesting; 71% of respondents spend over 50% of their time on disability issues. Similarly, the following data on supervision shows that more than half of respondents do supervise staff and have done so for a while. This is another indication that many are administrators and that the Canadian group is slightly more senior.

Table 18

Respondents' experience supervising professional staff by years of experience, US and Canada, 2010

Any Supervisor Experience	People	Percent	Range in Years	Person Years	Average Years
No	451	49%	1-42	5,276	5.76
Yes	465	51%			
Total Responses:	916	100%			
Canada Only	People	Percent	Range in Years	Person Years	Average Years
No	4	27%	1-25	128	8.53
Yes	11	73%			
Total Responses:	15	100%			

Table 19

Minimum Education Required for respondents' current job, 2010

What is the minimum educational level required for your job as indicated on your current job description?		
Education Level	People	Percent of All
Master's degree	582	63.54%
Bachelor's degree	221	24.13%
Associate's degree	25	2.73%
Doctorate degree	23	2.51%
High School	22	2.40%
None	19	2.07%
Ed. S. Education Specialist	2	0.22%
RID National Certification	5	0.55%
Some College	2	0.22%
Unstated	15	1.64%
Total Responses:	916	100%

Table 20

Respondents' education meets the stated minimum for their job, 2010

Do you have the degree your job requires?		
Answer	People	Percent of All
Yes	611	66.70%
Yes, and I have 1 additional degree.	220	24.02%
Yes, and I have 2 or more additional degrees.	27	2.95%
No	16	1.75%
I have a PhD but did not state job requirements.	24	2.62%
Missing Data	18	1.97%
Totals	916	100.0%

Table 21

Number of years of respondents' experience in their current job, 2010

Years	People	Percent of 916
0-2	210	22.93%
0-5	254	27.73%
10-Jun	179	19.54%
15-Nov	128	13.97%
16-20	74	8.08%
21-25	45	4.91%
26-30	11	1.20%
31-35	10	1.09%
36-40	5	0.55%
Total	916	100%
7570.5	All Person Years in Current Position	
8.26	All Average Years in Current Position	
12.13	Canada Only Average Years in Current Position	

Table 22

Respondents experience working in disability services at the college level, all and Canada, 2010

Years	People	Percent of All	Average # Yrs/Group
0-5 Years	390	42.58%	2.39
6-20 years	432	47.16%	12.06
21-40 Years	94	10%	26.69
Total	916	100%	9.44
8,703.00 Person Years in Disability			Average Canada Only 14.87
9.50 Average All			

Table 23

Respondents experience working in higher education at the tertiary level, all and Canada, 2010

Years	People	Percent of All	Average # Yrs/Group
0-5 Years	253	27.62%	2.306324111
6-20 years	482	52.62%	12.43983402
21-40 Years	181	20%	27.43
Total Responses:	916	100%	12.6
11,486.00 Person Years in Higher Ed			Average Canada Only 17.13
12.54 Average All			

Table 24

Respondents' additional years of relevant work experience by the field of such experience, US and Canada, 2010

All Respondents Field	People	Percent	Range in Years	Person Years	Average Years
Current Job	916	100.00%	1-48	7,570	8.26
Additional Experience					
Law or legal services.	49	5.35%	1-15	280	5.71
Allied health services and medical professions.	70	7.64%	1-46	641	9.16
Vocational or rehabilitation services.	208	22.71%	1-43	1,483	7.13
Business.	222	24.24%	1-39	1,837	8.27
Student affairs or academic affairs in higher education.	293	31.99%	1-40	3,002	10.25
Counseling, psychological services, social work or other mental health services.	306	33.41%	1-43	2,671	8.73
Elementary/primary or secondary (K-12), generally.	320	34.93%	1-38	2,307	7.21
Elementary/primary or secondary (K-12) education with disabled children.	328	35.81%	1-37	2,964	9.04
Teaching in higher education.	347	37.88%	1-37	2,571	7.41
Sub Total of Additional Experience			1-46	17,756	19.38
Total Years Experience n=916			1-48	22,755	24.84
Canada Only - Field					
	People	Percent	Range	Years	Average
Current Job	15	100.00%	1-35	182	12.13
Additional Experience					
Law or legal services.	0	0.00%	0	-	-
Allied health services and medical professions.	2	14.29%	1-12	14	7.00
Vocational or rehabilitation services.	2	14.29%	7-18	25	12.50
Business.	1	7.14%	7	7	7.00
Student affairs or academic affairs in higher education.	2	14.29%	1-5	6	3.00
Counseling, psychological services, social work or other mental health services.	6	42.86%	1-35	92	15.33
Elementary/primary or secondary (K-12).	4	28.57%	1-35	45	11.25
Elementary/primary or secondary (K-12) education with disabled children.	3	21.43%	1-10	20	6.67
Teaching in higher education.	2	14.29%	4-6	10	5.00
Sub Total of Additional Experience	-		1-35	219	14.60
Total Years Experience n=916	-		1-35	401	26.73

This group of tables describes how long respondents have been in their current job. In disability, and in higher education. It then summarizes other additional experience.

Canadian respondents appear to be slightly older and more senior in their job; likely a result that the 15 people who did the survey were highly motivated to do so. Of Canadians, 38% have an average of 7 plus years teaching in higher education and 32% have average of 10 plus years in student affairs. While Canadians have more experience in current job, disability, and higher education, they have changed jobs less often.

For all respondents there is movement between K-12 education and vocational rehabilitation and tertiary disability services. It would seem that as disability service professions develop, the pathway to these jobs may change. It might be relevant to collect this data chronologically.

VI. RESPONDENTS' SALARY AND COMPENSATION

Table 25

Funding source for respondents' positions, 2010

Funding Source						
	All People	All %	US People	US %	Canada People	Canada %
Permanent	728	79.48%	715	79.53%	11	80.00%
Mix	96	10.48%	95	10.57%	1	6.67%
Temporary	55	6.00%	52	5.78%	3	13.34%
Unstated	37	4.04%	37	4.12%	0	0.00%
Total Responses:	916	100%	899	100%	15	100%

Table 26

Position basis, year round or academic year, 2010

Position Schedule	n=891	
	People	Percent of those Responding
Year-round 12-month	711	77.62%
Academic year- summer option	127	13.86%
Academic year only	46	5.02%
Temporary position	7	0.76%
Unstated	25	2.73%
Total Responses:	891	100%

Table 27

Remuneration BASIS, Salary, hourly, contract, 2010

Remuneration Basis	n=916	
	Basis	People
Salary	805	87.88%
Hourly wage	67	7.31%
Contract/temporary basis (e.g. freelance interpreters, consultants)	12	1.31%
Unstated	32	3.49%
Total Responses:	916	100%

Table 28

Respondents' non-salary compensation, US, 2010

Non-Salary Compensation, Select All that Apply	US Only	n=900	n=873
	People	Percent of All US	Percent of those Answering
Medical &/or Dental for Self	741	82.33%	84.88%
Medical &/or Dental for Family Members	668	74.22%	76.52%
Discount/Waivers for Self	592	65.78%	67.81%
Retirement Plan, Mandatory	587	65.22%	67.24%
Professional Development Funding	499	55.44%	57.16%
Retirement Plan, Optional	451	50.11%	51.66%
Tuition Discount/Waivers for Family, Including Children	432	48.00%	49.48%
Flexible hours	233	25.89%	26.69%
Transportation/Parking Plan, Reduced or Waived	105	11.67%	12.03%
Daycare Services, Discounts, and/or Campus	97	10.78%	11.11%
Disability Insurance, Short Term	29	3.22%	3.32%
Life Insurance	25	2.78%	2.86%
Vision Plan	19	2.11%	2.18%
Disability Insurance, Long Term Care	11	1.22%	1.26%
Sick Leave	9	1.00%	1.03%
Time-sharing Job with Other Staff	8	0.89%	0.92%
Vacation	7	0.78%	0.80%
Wellness Program	7	0.78%	0.80%
Fitness Plan	6	0.67%	0.69%

Medical Flex Spending Account	5	0.56%	0.57%
Other	36	4.00%	4.12%
Bold above indicates answer choices from the questionnaire, all the rest are "OTHER."			
Unstated	27	3.00%	Answering
Total	900	100.00%	523.00%

Table 29

Full-time and part-time respondents by salary range and average, all and US only, 2010

Are you employed full-time or part-time?	All		US Only		People Stating Salary		
	FTE	People	People Stating Salary	% Stating Salary	US Only Average Salary	US Only Salary Range	US Only rate per 10% of FTE
Full-time (100%) – 40 hours per week	836	91.27%	712	86.94%	\$54,854.00	\$20,000-141,000	\$5,485.40
Part-time (50%) – approximately 20 hours per week	29	3.17%	27	93.10%	\$23,351.00	\$5,000-60,000	\$4,670.20
Part-time (75%) – approximately 30 hours per week	25	2.73%	20	80.00%	\$35,125.00	\$10,800-96,500	\$4,683.33
Less than half time – less than 20 hours per week	15	1.64%	11	73.33%	\$10,892.00	\$6,000-35,000	\$5,446.00
Total who Answered this Question	905	98.80%	770				
Unstated	11	1.20%	129	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Responses:	916	100%	899	n/a	n/a	\$5,000-141,000	n/a

Table 30

Full-time respondents by minimum educational level needed for the job, job funding, job payment basis, average and range of earnings, All, 2010

Min ED Required for Job: HS= High School, A=Associates Programs, B=Bachelors M=Masters P=PhD	Funds: Grants(G) Permanent(P) Both(B)	# of Months 9 and/or 12	\$ Basis Contract(C) Salary(S) Hourly(H)	AVERAGE Annual Gross	Salary RANGE in 1000's	Number of People % of Full-time
HS3 / AA2 / B12 / M13 / P1	G3 / B8 / P21	9 only	C1 / H6 / S25	\$45,552	\$20-86K	32
HS2 / AA1 / B13 / M68 / P1	G3 / B11 / P70	9, option for 12	C1 / H6 / S77	\$56,841	\$22-132K	84
A1 / M1	B1 / P2	TEMPORARY	H2 / S1	\$39,666	\$30-49K	3
HS18 / A10 / B134 / M12 / P12	B4 / P589	12	C2 / H22 / 569	\$55,138	\$27-135K	593
Totals: HS23 / A13 / B159 / M419 / P14	Totals: G6 / B14 / P680	Totals: 9 OR 12	Totals: C4 / H34 / 672	Totals: \$54,843	Totals: 20-135	Totals: 712
n= 712 Full Time Reporting Salary Data, 77.72% of All 916 Respondents						

Table 31

Descriptive job title by percent full time and average salary, 2010

Descriptive job title by percent full time and average salary.		n=916	Average Salary of FT		n=737
Titles	# People with this in Title	Percent of All	% of this Group Full Time	with this as one of their Titles who Stated a Salary	# of UNDUPLICATED People with this Title
Directors:					
Director: Office or Departmental Director, Coordinator or Manager	357	38.97%	100%	\$53,353	N=353
Director: Project or Program Director, Coordinator or Manager	128	13.97%	99%	\$53,038	N=73
Associate or Assistant Director, Coordinator or Manager	97	10.59%	94%	\$53,843	N=70
Directors Subtotal:	582	63.54%	99%	\$53,376	N=496
Specialists:					
ADA/504 Coordinator	76	8.30%	90%	\$45,076	N=16
Specialist: Disability Specialist, Accessibility Specialist, etc.)	189	20.63%	96%	\$40,858	N=144
Assistive/Adaptive Technology Coordinator/Specialist	67	7.31%	86%	\$44,430	N=15
Advisor or Academic Counselor	108	11.79%	95%	\$53,866	N=18
Specialists Subtotal:	440	48.03%	95%	\$42,698	N=193
Counselor, Psychologist or Diagnostician	108	11.79%	100%	\$89,408	n=19
Sign Language Interpreter	45	4.91%	100%	\$41,658	n=16
Professor, Associate, Assistant Professor or Lecturer	66	7.21%	100%	\$68,548	n=8
Consultant	31	3.38%	71%	\$43,000	n=5
Other Titles	69	7.53%		n/a	n/a
Subtotal People Responding with one or more Title	737	80.45%			
People with Unstated Titles	179	19.54%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Respondents n=916	916	100%			
n= 916 People Responding with Multiple Answers, 1381 answers from 737 People, an Average of 1.87 Titles per Person					

VII. DISABILITY SERVICES AND RESOURCES AVAILABLE AND THE PEOPLE THEY SERVE

Of all 916 respondents, there is some service data for 501 (55%). There is some data on student and faculty/staff impairment experience for a total of 165,493 students, and 6,437 faculty/staff, although those with multiple impairments may have been counted under multiple categories in their schools statistical reporting. Not all of this data is included in the following tables (Tables 32 - 36) which focus on traditional two, four, or graduate schools. It is difficult to know when respondents serve students and/or faculty/staff out of the same office. There is student data for 482 schools, of which 118 report no faculty/staff data, and there is faculty/staff data for 19 schools that report no student data. Some of the data not reflected below is from high schools, unusual experimental schools, and schools for the Deaf that also serve large numbers of Deaf faculty/staff.

Table 32

Basic data on number of schools (respondents) serving disabled staff, students, or both, 2010

Total Students Served= 165,493 Total Staff Served= 5,337			
Serving Students or Staff	n=916	n=916	n=501
	# of Respondents	% of All	% of those Reporting Service Data
People (Schools) Serving Staff Only	19	2.07%	3.79%
People (Schools) Serving Students Only	118	12.88%	23.55%
People (Schools) Serving Both Students & Staff	364	39.74%	72.65%
People (Schools) Serving Staff (with or without students)	383	41.81%	76.45%
People (Schools) Serving Students (with or without staff)	482	52.62%	96.20%
<i>Subtotal of those People (Schools) Reporting Any Staff or Student Service Data</i>	501	54.69%	100%
People (Schools) Reporting No Service Data	415	45.31%	n/a
TOTAL	916	100%	

Table 33

Disability experience by impairment of the faculty and staff served by respondents from two year, four year, and graduate schools, 2010

How many faculty and staff does your office serve with the following disabilities?															
	Learning	Psych	Mobility	ADD ADHD	Hlt./Med. Condition	HofH D/deaf	Vision	Temp.	Intel. Cog. Dev.	Autism Spectrum	TBI	Speech & Lang.	Deaf & Blind	Other	Total
Data from Two Year, Four Year and Graduate Schools (People) that Serve ONLY Staff n=19 Schools -- 2,248 Faculty/Staff															
Staff Consumers	749	449	202	211	144	96	79	53	50	24	37	13	4	137	2248
Percent of Staff Consumers n=2,248	33.32%	19.97%	8.99%	9.39%	6.41%	4.27%	3.51%	2.36%	2.22%	1.07%	1.65%	0.58%	0.18%	6.09%	100%
RANK	1	2	4	3	5	7	8	9	10	12	11	13	14	6	
Data from Two Year, Four Year and Graduate Schools (People) that Serve Staff AND Students n=383 Schools -- 3,098 Faculty/Staff															
Staff Consumers	644	617	395	330	380	329	94	115	40	47	23	24	13	38	3089
Percent of Staff Consumers n=3,098	20.53%	19.67%	12.59%	10.52%	12.11%	10.49%	3.00%	3.67%	1.28%	1.50%	0.73%	0.77%	0.41%	1.21%	98.47%
RANK	1	2	3	5	4	6	8	7	10	9	13	12	14	11	
Data from Two Year, Four Year and Graduate Schools that Serve Staff at All n=383 Schools -- 5,337 Faculty/Staff															
Staff Consumers	1393	1066	597	541	524	425	173	168	90	71	60	37	17	175	5337
Percent of Staff Consumers n=5,337	26.10%	19.97%	11.19%	10.14%	9.82%	7.96%	3.24%	3.15%	1.69%	1.33%	1.12%	0.69%	0.32%	3.28%	100%
RANK	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	7	

Table 34

Student consumers served by type of impairment and types of school and number of staff, US, 2010

% Campuses n=335	Campus	LD	ADD/HD	PSYCH	HEALTH	MOBIL.	HOH DEAF	TBI	VISION	INTELL.	TEMP	AUTISM	Deaf- Blind	Speech Lang.	Other	TOTAL Students
University with Full PhD Programs																
29.25%	Number	12,985	13,731	8,063	5,155	2,628	1,277	877	1,250	336	1,589	838	19	308	1,398	50,454
	Average	132.50	140.11	82.28	52.60	26.82	13.03	8.95	12.76	3.43	16.21	8.55	0.19	3.14	14.27	514.84
# of Staff as % of Student Consumers 5.34%																
	Rank	2	1	3	4	5	7	9	8	11	6	10	13	12		
n=98	% of Di Stu	25.74%	27.21%	15.98%	10.22%	5.21%	2.53%	1.74%	2.48%	0.67%	3.15%	1.66%	0.04%	0.61%	2.77%	74.26%
University with Full Masters Programs, some PhDs																
27.47%	Number	6,325	4,822	2,824	2,290	1,005	447	878	469	174	505	424	51	95	467	20,776
	Average	65.21	49.71	29.11	23.61	10.36	4.61	9.05	4.84	1.79	5.21	4.37	0.53	0.98	4.81	214.19
# of Staff as % of Student Consumers 8.30%																
	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	9	6	8	11	7	10	13	12		
n=97	% of Di Stu	30.44%	23.21%	13.59%	11.02%	4.84%	2.15%	4.23%	2.26%	0.84%	2.43%	2.04%	0.25%	0.46%	2.25%	69.56%
College or University with Full Bachelors Programs, some Masters																
12.45%	Number	2,621	1,292	1,337	580	405	201	96	147	83	129	164	4	27	151	7,237
	Average	59.57	29.36	30.39	13.18	9.20	4.57	2.18	3.34	1.89	2.93	3.73	0.09	0.61	3.43	164.48
# of Staff as % of Student Consumers 11.57%																
	Rank	1	3	2	4	5	6	10	8	11	9	7	13	12		
n=44	% of Di Stu	36.22%	17.85%	18.47%	8.01%	5.60%	2.78%	1.33%	2.03%	1.15%	1.78%	2.27%	0.06%	0.37%	2.09%	63.78%
College with Full Two-year Programs, some Bachelors																
32.29%	Number	13,565	5,633	7,435	3,631	3,779	2,171	1,665	1,428	2,427	311	1,021	40	474	4,022	47,602
	Average	118.99	49.41	65.22	31.85	33.15	19.04	14.61	12.53	21.29	2.73	8.96	0.35	4.16	35.28	417.56
# of Staff as % of Student Consumers 4.57%																
	Rank	1	3	2	5	4	6	8	9	7	12	10	13	11		
n=114	% of Di Stu	28.50%	11.83%	15.62%	7.63%	7.94%	4.56%	3.50%	3.00%	5.10%	0.65%	2.14%	0.08%	1.00%	8.45%	71.50%
All Colleges and Universities																
100%	Total #	35,496	25,478	19,659	11,656	7,817	4,096	3,516	3,294	3,020	2,534	2,447	114	904	6,038	126,069
	Total %	28.16%	20.21%	15.59%	9.25%	6.20%	3.25%	2.79%	2.61%	2.40%	2.01%	1.94%	0.09%	0.72%	4.79%	100%
n=353	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		

Table 35

Graduation and student retention rate of respondents' offices as compared to the whole school

Grad rate office	Grad rate school	Office rate as % of school rate	Range
65% average n=169	64% average n=176	102% average n=143	59 (41%) Offices higher than school 63 (44%) Offices lower than school
Retention rate office	Retention rate school	Office rate as % of school rate	
72% average	71% average	107% average	75 (52%) Offices higher than school

Table 36

Programs and services offered by respondents' offices, with and without a fee, 2010

What programs and services are offered by your office?	No	Yes	Yes w/fee	Total Reporting	% Yes of 487	% Yes of 916
Adaptive technology and/or computer center.	39	428	14	481	90.76%	48.25%
Training for campus faculty and/or staff.	53	412	8	473	86.24%	45.85%
Document conversion (e.g. print to tape, large print, digital or Braille).	63	399	16	478	85.22%	45.31%
Transition services or orientation for new students.	104	355	21	480	77.21%	41.05%
Workshops, seminars or institutes of any kind.	143	313	6	462	65.50%	34.83%
Subject specific tutoring or assistance (e.g. math, reading or etc.)	230	221	14	465	48.25%	25.66%
Resource library.	240	212	5	457	44.56%	23.69%
Career counseling or job placement assistance.	262	197	5	464	41.48%	22.05%
Clubs, cultural groups or student organizations.	265	193	5	463	40.66%	21.62%
Assistance identifying or hiring personal care attendants, tutors, typists or other personal services for disability-related needs.	264	187	8	459	40.04%	21.29%
Lounge or leisure area.	302	151	4	457	31.83%	16.92%
Online educational services or training (Example: online training for faculty about students with disabilities or online orientation for new students; do not include an office website).	305	147	8	460	31.83%	16.92%
Psychological counseling or therapy.	305	142	10	457	31.21%	16.59%
Support groups.	316	131	4	451	27.72%	14.74%
Study abroad/ international student exchange counseling.	330	114	11	455	25.67%	13.65%
Gym, athletic facilities or sports teams for disabled students	371	72	9	452	16.63%	8.84%
Complete psychometric testing, learning disability assessments and/or other diagnostic testing.	371	62	25	458	17.86%	9.50%
Wheelchair, hearing aid or other equipment repair service.	413	29	7	449	7.39%	3.93%
Physical therapy.	422	20	8	450	5.75%	3.06%
Unstated	429					46.83%
Total Responses n=487, 53.16% of 916.						n=916

VIII. Respondents' Expressed Resource and Training Needs

Table 37

Expressed needs grouped and prioritized, 2010

At this time, what information or training do you most need related to your job, disability services, or disability?			
Respondents had multiple responses.			n=916
Need	People	% of All	n=697 %
Law: Legislation, ADA changes, 504, 508, IDEA interpretation and regulatory updates, State Law	200	21.83%	28.69%
AT: Alternative Media Processing Training, Book Conversion	11	1.20%	1.58%
AT: Knowledge and Skills to use AT	28	3.06%	4.02%
AT: Assistive technology, updates, assessment, where to find, evaluation, etc.	160	17.47%	22.96%
Subtotal Assistive Technology	199	21.72%	28.55%
Impairment Specific: Accommodations for particular different types of disabilities/academic situations, unspecified	28	3.06%	4.02%
Impairment Specific: Aspergers/Autism, diagnosis, documentation, accommodations, social integration	22	2.40%	3.16%
Impairment Specific: learning disabilities/ADHD, assessment, accommodations	21	2.29%	3.01%
Impairment Specific: D/deaf/HOH Services Interpreter/ASL Training	20	2.18%	2.87%
Impairment Specific: Psychiatric Disability, under ADA Amendments, assessment, documentation, accommodation	18	1.97%	2.58%
Impairment Specific: Documentation Interpretation/Standards/Requirements	17	1.86%	2.44%
Impairment Specific: Vision Issues, math and science class, foreign language Braille,	8	0.87%	1.15%
Impairment Specific: ADHD/ LD training	6	0.66%	0.86%
Impairment Specific: Impact of Mental Health issues in Higher Ed (PTSD, ADD, etc)	5	0.55%	0.72%
Impairment Specific: Intellectual Disability in postsecondary education	5	0.55%	0.72%
Impairment Specific: Chronic Illness Issues	4	0.44%	0.57%
Impairment Specific: Deaf/blind workshops and possible of payment for services	2	0.22%	0.29%
Impairment Specific: Multiple Impairments/Disability	2	0.22%	0.29%
Impairment Specific: Speech Impairment/Disability	1	0.11%	0.14%
Subtotal Impairment Specific	159	17.36%	22.81%
Administration: Personnel and Advisory Committee Management Skills, Contracts, etc.	21	2.29%	3.01%
Administration: Fiscal, Budgeting, Funding, and Low Budget Financial Management	17	1.86%	2.44%
Administration: Project Management, Evaluation, Organizational Skills Training	13	1.42%	1.87%
Administration: Supervisory Training	10	1.09%	1.43%
Administration: Fundraising to Expand Staff, Grant Writing, Marketing	9	0.98%	1.29%
Administration: Documentation, Record Keeping	7	0.76%	1.00%
Subtotal Administration	77	8.41%	11.05%

Continued next page....

Need	People	% of All	% Responding
Skills: Understanding psycho-educational-medical evaluations	16	1.75%	2.30%
Skills: Leadership Skills Training	6	0.66%	0.86%
Skills: Web Accessibility	6	0.66%	0.86%
Skills: Policy Development	6	0.66%	0.86%
Skills: Access Audits	2	0.22%	0.29%
Skills: Safety Evacuation	2	0.22%	0.29%
Skills: Behavioral Intervention Teams	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: General Training	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: Giving Good Informative Workshops	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: Housing Accommodations	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: Literacy and Language Development Strategies	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: Policy for sign language interpreters and speech-to-text service providers	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: PowerPoints to Train Faculty	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: Public Speaking Skills	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: Teaching Writing, ASL to English Writing Skills	1	0.11%	0.14%
Skills: Independent Living Skills	1	0.11%	0.14%
Subtotal Skills	48	5.24%	6.89%
Best New Practices in the Field of Disability Services	41	4.48%	5.88%
Best Practices for Small Colleges	4	0.44%	0.57%
Subtotal Best Practices	45	4.91%	6.46%
Pedagogy: Online/Distance Learning Accessibility/Accommodation for Courses	23	2.51%	3.30%
Pedagogy: Accessibility of Instructional Technologies	7	0.76%	1.00%
Pedagogy: Disability Studies and Relationship to Student Development	2	0.22%	0.29%
Pedagogy: literature, workshops	2	0.22%	0.29%
Pedagogy: GED Training	1	0.11%	0.14%
Pedagogy: Teaching Students to Learn Independently	1	0.11%	0.14%
Pedagogy: Testing Accommodations	1	0.11%	0.14%
Subtotal Pedagogy	37	4.04%	5.31%
Campus Wide Outreach: Best Practices for Access Improvement & Universal Design	20	2.18%	2.87%
Campus Wide Outreach: Train the trainer to educate faculty/staff	3	0.33%	0.43%
Campus Wide Outreach: Creating institutional change	2	0.22%	0.29%
Campus Wide Outreach: educating faculty; faculty are negative toward ODS	2	0.22%	0.29%
Campus Wide Outreach: Community Education	1	0.11%	0.14%
Campus Wide Outreach: Coordination with other campus units	1	0.11%	0.14%
Campus Wide Outreach: Getting parent to use disability services outside of the school setting	1	0.11%	0.14%
Campus Wide Outreach: Grassroots Organizing	1	0.11%	0.14%
Campus Wide Outreach: Public Events on Campus	1	0.11%	0.14%
Subtotal Campus Wide Outreach	32	3.49%	4.59%

Continued next page....

Need	People	% of All	% Responding
Transition Services: From Secondary School	13	1.42%	1.87%
Transition Services: Career services for students with disability	5	0.55%	0.72%
Transition Services: Veterans with Disabilities	4	0.44%	0.57%
Transition Services: SSI/SSDI Work Incentives/Disincentives	1	0.11%	0.14%
Subtotal Transition	23	2.51%	3.30%
Assessment: Student Needs, Diagnostics	11	1.20%	1.58%
Assessment: Student Outcomes, Student Retention	9	0.98%	1.29%
Subtotal Assessment	20	2.18%	2.87%
Resources: How/Where to find/purchase resources for accommodations	9	0.98%	1.29%
Resources: Continue AHEAD conferences, list serves and other resources, collegueial support	5	0.55%	0.72%
Resources: outside accommodation resources	1	0.11%	0.14%
Resources: Research Findings	1	0.11%	0.14%
Resources: TRIO Student Support Services	1	0.11%	0.14%
Resources: Theory and Social Models	1	0.11%	0.14%
Resources: Writing Terms about Disability	1	0.11%	0.14%
Subtotal Resources	19	2.07%	2.73%
Prof Development: Support Staff getting CEUs, a certification or an advanced degree, MS, MA	16	1.75%	2.30%
Prof. Development.: Professional Ethics	3	0.33%	0.43%
Subtotal Prof. Development	19	2.07%	2.73%
Counseling/Coaching Skills: General	8	0.87%	1.15%
Counseling/Coaching Skills: Academic Advising Disabled Students	3	0.33%	0.43%
Counseling/Coaching Skills: Crisis Intervention, Grief Counseling	3	0.33%	0.43%
Counseling/Coaching Skills: Mentor Programs	3	0.33%	0.43%
Subtotal Counseling	17	1.86%	2.44%
Universal Design: Promotion	17	1.86%	2.44%
Settings: Study Abroad Accommodations	1	0.11%	0.14%
Settings: Networking with other faculty with invisible disabilities	1	0.11%	0.14%
Settings: Working within a medical academic center	1	0.11%	0.14%
Subtotal Settings	3	0.33%	0.43%
No Needs	4	0.44%	0.57%
Don't Know	6	0.66%	0.86%
Total People Responding:	697	76.09%	100%
People Not Responding:	219	23.91%	n/a
Total:	916	100%	