Evidence of Inclusion on College Websites: Academic Accommodations and Human Support

Vanessa A. Costello-Harris[1]

Abstract

The number of students with disabilities continues to rise within college and university populations. Therefore, institutions have aimed to present a welcoming campus of inclusion with adequate resources. For many prospective students with disabilities (learning, psychological, and physical), the campus website will be the first resource used to assess the campus climate regarding disabilities. The present study analyzed the websites of 26 Midwestern colleges and universities and evaluated their evidence of providing an inclusive environment for students with disabilities. Three researchers were trained to individually search and code each campus website based on their evidence of inclusion (i.e., EoI = number of resources out of 25 resources). Two major resource categories were analyzed (1) academic accommodations (n = 14 resources) and (2) human support (n = 11 resources). Schools were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 = inadequate evidence to 5 = exceptional evidence, based on the percentage of resources found (out of 25) on each website. For the total number of resources, only 46% of the schools scored at adequate or above (≥ 70% of 25 resources). Across campuses, the strongest evidence was for human support. In general, public institutions showed greater evidence than private institutions. While it is likely that the actual on-campus accommodations and types of support are plentiful, they are unlikely to be evident to prospective students based on the information provided online. Therefore, efforts should be made to increase the visibility of resources on campus websites. Recommendations are provided for website improvements.

Keywords: disability, accommodations, belonging, websites, support

Colleges and universities are continuously working to meet the needs of their increasingly diverse student population. Students with disabilities (SWD) are a growing subgroup that contributes to campus diversity; a subgroup that not all campuses are prepared to assist. Raue and Lewis (2011) conducted a national study of two- and four-year degree-granting institutions that assessed the number of SWD that used accommodations. The sample included 1,420 public and private institutions. Ninety-nine percent of the public institutions and approximately 75% of the private institutions reported enrolling SWD (approximately 707, 000 self-disclosed students). The majority of institutions reported enrolling students with a specific learning disability (86% of institutions), attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADD/ADHD; 79%), physical impairments (76%), and mental illnesses (76%). Statistics were based on self-disclosed numbers; therefore, the number of SWD was likely greater than reported. Many of these students will search online for campus resources prior to visiting the campus, thus increasing the importance of the type and amount of information presented on campus' websites.

In fact, students have rated the campus website as the most frequently used, and the most useful technology employed during the college search process (Lindbeck & Fodrey, 2010). The campus website allows prospective students to learn about available resources and formulate their first impression of the campus climate. Wilson, Getzel, and Brown (2000) suggested that advertising about available academic resources for SWD would help improve the campus climate. Thus, offering services is not enough; services also need to be clearly advertised and easy to find (Noel-Levitz, 2009). Academic accommodations are just one group of resources that require clear advertisement on the campus website.

[1] *Indiana University–Kokomo*

Campus Resources: Academic Accommodations and Human Support

Access to academic accommodations typically requires a diagnosis of a mental, physical, or developmental impairment that impacts one's academic abilities. Appropriate documentation must be submitted to the campus Office of Disability Services (ODS). For the purpose of the present study, academic accommodations were operationalized as academic supports that assisted in learning (e.g., arranged seating, early access to classroom notes, and audio recordings), or showing evidence of learning (e.g., submitting audio responses or receiving extended time for testing). The definition only included academic accommodations that were available to students who had self-disclosed their disability. The definition did not include academic support that required human assistance (i.e., human supports such as a scribe; see Table 3). Examples of common accommodations not included in the present study under academic accommodations included but were not limited to: access to a scribe, a reader, or sign language interpreter. These accommodations were defined under human support. All resources defined under human support required assistance from a person; the definition has been partially adapted from Schreuer and Sachs (2014). Resources included under human support may or may not have required self-disclosure in order for students to receive the resources. Similar to academic accommodations; human support resources assisted in learning (e.g., Communication Access Realtime Translation; CART) showing evidence of learning (e.g., writing center); or provided students with emotional, psychological, or social support (e.g., advocacy assistance, support groups for SWD, or counseling services).

Accessing Campus Resources: Knowledge and Usage

Academic accommodations and human support are common resources available to SWD. According to Raue and Lewis (2011), the main resources provided by public and private institutions have included additional exam time (93%), class note-takers (i.e., scribe, 77%), faculty provided course notes (72%), study skill training (72%), and adaptive equipment/technology (70%). While institutions must offer certain accommodations, they are not required to advertise them. SWD have reported being unaware that accommodations are available in college (Cawthon & Cole, 2010). Lack of knowledge may contribute to limited resource usage; therefore, advertising about campus resources to assist SWD can increase the likelihood of the resources actually being used. If resources are not advertised (e.g., presented on the campus website), then prospective students may perceive the resources as being unavailable and thus give them the impression that the campus is not prepared for, or inclusive of SWD.

Even with the large number of SWD and the proportion of institutions offering academic accommodations; only a small proportion of SWD actually apply for and use the available resources. A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2; Newman et al., 2011) assessed the post-high school outcomes of SWD. Of the students who enrolled in some form of postsecondary education, 87% reported receiving some form of academic accommodations in high school, yet only 19% (of the 87%) received accommodations in college. The likelihood of disclosure varied based on the disability. Students with learning disabilities (24%) or mental illnesses (27%) were the least likely to disclose, perhaps due to the fear of potential stigma. Unfortunately, nondisclosure due to fear of stigma has been a common trend in the SWD literature (Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Stein, 2013; Thompson-Ebanks, 2014). Nondisclosure inhibits students from being able to access academic accommodations and some human support resources. Therefore, it is important that campuses create a campus climate that welcomes disability disclosure, to ensure students access the resources, reduce their chances of academic failure, and increase campus belonging.

SWD have reported lower institutional attachment when adjusting to college (Adams & Proctor, 2010). SWD who experienced academic failure (Vaccaro, Daly-Cano, & Newman, 2015) or feelings of inadequacy (Thompson-Ebanks, 2014) were more likely to feel that they did not belong in college. Unfortunately, some of these students have attributed their academic failures to their disability or being inadequately prepared for college. While many students experience difficulties when transitioning from the academic expectations of high school to college, this can be especially challenging for SWD who may not have access to the same degree of academic support. When students transition from high school to college, their academic accommodations do not transfer with them. Students must then assess which accommodations are offered, determine the accommodations they need, understand the process to receive services, and then learn to advocate for their needs to faculty and staff (Hamblet, 2009). The task is more difficult when students lack knowledge regarding which accommodations they had in high school or which accommodations are available in college (Dowrick et al., 2005; Lightner, Kipps-Vaughan, Schulte, & Trice, 2012). Therefore, it is necessary for campuses to clearly present the different types of academic accommoda-

tions available to all students with disclosed disabilities. For example, by providing an accommodation manual on the campus website, both students and faculty would be informed about the available resources (Wilson et al., 2000).

Due to the reduced disclosure observed in college, institutions must also present available resources to students regardless of their disclosure status (e.g., students with non-disclosed disabilities). Various human support resources available to students who disclose include readers, scribes, and sign language interpreters. Fortunately, there are many human support resources, such as writing centers and counseling services that are available to all students, regardless of their disability or disclosure status (Hamblet, 2009). In addition, resources such as departmental tutoring and student organizations provide academic and social support to all students. SWD who have participated in student organizations have reported that it provided them with an opportunity to build social relations and learn how to self-advocate (Agarwal, Calvo, & Kumar, 2014), which could enhance their feeling of being connected, as a student, at the university.

Students with resource knowledge and thus resource access may have a greater chance of academic success and feelings of campus belonging and inclusion. Having social support, academic success, or being able to, "master the student role," all enhance campus belonging in SWD (Vaccarro et al., 2015, p. 677). Therefore, campuses would benefit from advertising online about their resources that help SWD to master the student role (e.g., academic accommodations and human support resources) or provide avenues for social support (e.g., human support resources). The present study assessed the websites of 26 Midwestern colleges and universities and measured their evidence of providing an inclusive environment (i.e., evidence of inclusion [EoI]) for SWD. EoI was operationalized as the frequency with which schools exhibited evidence of supporting students with disabilities (e.g., learning, psychological, and physical), through providing a range of academic and social support resources (e.g., counseling services), thus supporting inclusive education.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2005) has defined inclusion as:

> **a process** of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education. It involves changes and modifications in content, approaches, structures and strategies, with a common vision which covers all children of the appropriate age range and a conviction that it is the responsibility of the regular system to educate all children. (p. 13)

Mitchell (2015) proposed a model of inclusive education that took into consideration the multiple factors that impact inclusion. The model of inclusive education emphasized the importance of placement, adapted assessment, vision, leadership, adapted curriculum, adapted teaching, access, acceptance, resources and support, all of which are necessary for inclusion to occur. The present study has referred to these different factors of the model as "criteria" for inclusion. Part of Mitchell's model of inclusive education included indicators (i.e., examples) that primary and secondary schools were addressing each criterion and suggested that school leaders use the model to develop and assess inclusive education.

For the purpose of the present study, Mitchell's (2015) criteria of placement (i.e., students with and without disabilities are educated in the same classroom) and adapted assessment (i.e., adjustments for national testing) have not been applied due to less applicability to the postsecondary setting. The eight additional criteria of Mitchell's model of inclusive education can be extended to postsecondary institutions. In some cases, indicators of each criterion can be assessed through campus promotional materials (e.g., printed material or websites). To achieve the criteria of vision and leadership, institution leaders must have an agreed upon philosophy for inclusion of diverse groups and create a culture of inclusion. Postsecondary institutions typically present their campus vision through their mission statements. Wilson, Meyer, and McNeal (2012) reviewed the mission and diversity statements of 80 institutions to assess if diversity and inclusion were viewed as a priority (based on the amount and type of presented information). While 59 institutions included diversity in their mission statement, only 3% and 16% (of the 59) mentioned disability or inclusion (not disability specific), respectively. Further examination of institutions' diversity statements found that of the 52 institutions with diversity statements, only 8% mentioned inclusion. Therefore many of these institutions would not have met the criterion for vision proposed by Mitchell (2015).

Postsecondary institutions can work towards a culture of inclusion by providing educational opportunities to the leaders in their educational community (e.g., faculty, staff, peer-mentors). When provided with supportive staff, students with psychological

disabilities reported feeling less alone (Stein, 2013). Unfortunately, student-service staffs have reported feeling unprepared to meet the needs of SWD due to their limited knowledge about disabilities and available resources (Burgstahler & Moore, 2009). To create an inclusive classroom, SWD felt that faculty and staff needed greater sensitivity towards the needs of their students and receive training on how to adapt classroom materials (Camacho, Lopez-Gavira, & Díez, 2017; Wilson et al., 2000). To present evidence of an inclusive campus, institutions that provide training opportunities to their faculty and staff may benefit from advertising about these efforts to their prospective and current students. Campus training efforts would also go to support the next criterion of adapted curriculum.

Adapted curriculum includes providing students with necessary academic accommodations or implementing universal design to allow students equal access to instructional material (Mitchell, 2015). The criterion of adapted teaching requires teachers to be educated and informed on ways to adjust the classroom to meet the needs of the diverse student population. Both criteria of adapted curriculum and adapted teaching could be achieved through providing training opportunities for faculty. Training can include different ways to implement academic accommodations or ways to adapt their courses to meet universal design standards. Informed faculty have reported greater positive attitudes towards SWD and inclusive teaching (Dallas & Sprong, 2015; Dallas, Sprong, & Upton, 2014; Murray, Lombardi, & Wren, 2011), participating in more inclusive practices, such as inviting disability disclosure and greater willingness to provide necessary accommodations (Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008).

The criteria of access and acceptance are viewed as institutions providing all students with the same resources for necessary educational, social, and emotional support (Mitchell, 2015). Access also includes being able to access the educational space (i.e., campus, classrooms, and recreational spaces), campus events, and academic content through necessary accommodations. Students with mobility impairments have reported poor access due to old campus buildings without accessibility updates or poor maintenance of accessibility equipment (Emong & Eron, 2016; Hadjikakou, Polycarpou, & Hadjilia, 2010). Indicators of acceptance for SWD can include providing them resources for opportunities for campus involvement and developing social relationships, such as having student organizations for SWD, peer-mentoring programs, or student-faculty programs (Vaccaro et al., 2015).

Lastly, to provide an inclusive education institutions must work to meet the criteria of resources and support (Mitchell, 2015). The institution must have and be willing to put financial resources towards providing and maintain necessary physical, educational, and psychological support. Mitchell defined support as having collaboration between the multiple professions and parents who work to support the student. College students are responsible for obtaining their own resources, therefore, the definition has been adjusted to; collaboration between multiple professionals and the student in need of services. Resources include having necessary support staff to address students' diverse needs (e.g., ODS, counseling and psychological services, advocacy staff, and technology support). Indicators of resources for inclusion can be extended to financial efforts to support the recruitment of SWD (e.g., offering scholarships, producing high-quality recruitment materials including information about ODS services; Haller, 2006).

Achieving inclusive education is an on-going process that requires reviewing campus' indicators of providing an inclusive environment. The present study used the inclusive education criteria proposed by Mitchell (2015) to review college and university websites for EoI of SWD. Due to the complexity of the inclusive education model, only a portion of the criteria were addressed in the present study, which was part of a larger project. For the present study, websites were coded across two major categories (1) academic accommodations and (2) human support, with services in each category providing indicators of inclusive education. Schools that exhibited evidence of providing academic accommodations would be providing indicators for the criteria adapted curriculum, adapted teaching, and access. Schools that exhibited evidence of providing human support would be providing indicators for the criteria of access, acceptance, resources, and support. The present study addressed four questions based on the number of resources that were presented on campuses' websites. When appropriate, hypotheses were provided:

1. Collectively, how adequate (operationalized as exhibiting at least 70% of the 25 resources) was the EoI (i.e., total number of resources out of 25) within the two major categories (academic accommodations and human support)?
2. Which major category had the strongest EoI? Providing reasonable accommodations has been legally mandated, therefore all campuses must offer a range of services that would qualify as academic accommodations or human support. Therefore, it was hypothesized that

both categories of academic accommodations and human support would be adequately presented on the majority (>50%) of the campus websites, with academic accommodations exhibiting a greater amount of resources.

3. Is there a difference between public and private institutions regarding their EoI?
   On average, a greater number of public institutions reported offering a greater variety of academic accommodations compared to private institutions (Raue & Lewis, 2011). If public institutions offered a greater range of accommodations, they likely presented a greater range on their campus websites. It was hypothesized that a larger percentage of public institutions would exhibit greater EoI than private institutions.
4. Exploratory question: Within the two major categories, what were the most and least common types of resources advertised on campus websites?

Method

Website Selection

A list of public and private institutions in the Midwestern United States was compiled and only included not-for-profit schools. Disproportionate stratified sampling was employed, using a random list generator (https://www.random.org/lists/) 13 of each type of school (public and private; see Table 1 and Table 2) was selected and their websites reviewed. Institutions were grouped based on their size and setting, as reported by the 2013-2014 Carnegie Classification System (2017). To reduce negative views towards institutions with poor EoI campus names have not been included. Instead, non-connected abbreviations have been assigned to each institution (e.g., Public-A and Private A). Twenty-six websites were originally coded and reported, though one website was no longer available by fall 2018. The website was no longer available due to the unification of two campuses; Public-I (included in the sample) officially unified with Public-M (not included in the study) during July of 2016. The unification resulted in the two websites transitioning into one, during the data collection process (website transition occurred during and after July of 2016). Schools with multiple campuses, but different websites, were viewed as separate schools. Schools with multiple campuses but one website were coded as one campus.

Materials

A coding manual was created and included operational definitions of the major EoI categories and examples of potential resource variations (i.e., subcategories). The EoI major category definitions have been provided below with examples of the subcategories presented in Table 3.

The major category of academic accommodations included 14 subcategories (see Table 3). Academic accommodations included access to adaptive equipment needed to assist in learning or to show evidence of learning; academic adjustments to show evidence of learning (e.g., submitting assignment in alternative format), or adjustments to material to increase one's potential for learning (e.g., audio-recording lectures). Academic accommodations that included support from other individuals (e.g., scribe) were coded as human support. The major category of human support included 11 subcategories (see Table 3). Human support included employed or student volunteers (e.g., readers), and staff who assisted students in learning or to show evidence of learning. Human supports provided to students in the form of emotional, psychological, or social support (e.g., counseling services) were also included.

Procedures

Websites were coded between August 2016 and March 2017. All three coders reviewed approximately 27% of the 26 websites. Coding dyads made from different combinations of the three coders (e.g., 1 and 2, 1 and 3, 2 and 3) were randomly assigned to code the remaining 73% of websites. All coders made use of a list of accessibility and resource terms (see Table 4). Specific search terms were determined after reviewing the literature for common services available to SWD (e.g., assistive technology). The names of specific disabilities were not searched; instead, search terms were selected that would generate resources to benefit individuals with a range of disabilities (e.g., counseling center and study strategies). Additional terms helped to identify groups of students who may require disability services but might look for them in a different location (e.g., Veteran students; not reported in the present study). Lastly, search terms that helped to identify the university's view of disabilities were also employed (e.g., diversity and disability training; not reported in the present study).

Coders put each term through the search engine of each campus website and every link on the first page of results was accessed. Evidence of each of the 25 subcategories of academic accommodations and human support were coded as being present or absent. When enough details were provided on the websites, additional information pertaining to the subcategories was coded. After opening and reviewing information

within a webpage, if additional links were presented on the webpage (e.g., PDFs, videos, additional urls) then those links were opened and coded for EoI. For example, the term "accommodation" was searched using the campus' search engine; all links on the first page of the results were viewed and EoI coded. If a webpage included additional links and downloads, such as a PDF for a student manual; the link was opened and all EoI coded (e.g., writing center). Within the previous example, the major category was coded as "human support" and the subcategory as "writing center" access. The campus website of Public-F was randomly selected and used for training purposes. Coders did not begin coding additional websites until no more than five discrepancies occurred across the 25 subcategories.

Any EoI that did not clearly fit a subcategory was marked as "other" and later discussed between the coders. Coders met weekly to discuss any discrepancies and all discrepancies were reconciled prior to coding the next website. Coder dyads reviewed discrepancies by reviewing the website and resource in question. The resource was then recoded. All schools were rated on a five-point scale based on their **total percentage** of resources across the two major categories (total possible resources = 25). Based on total EoI percentage, schools were ranked as either: inadequate (< 60% of the 25 resources), slightly below adequate (< 70% of the 25 resources), adequate (< 80% of the 25 resources), above adequate (< 90% of the 25 resources), or exceptional (≥ 90% of the 25 resources). These percentages are not based on any standards proposed by Mitchell (2015), but have been created for the purpose of the present study as a form of EoI measurement.

Results

The results have been divided into two sections. The main research questions were addressed regarding levels of EoI across the major categories. Next, details were provided regarding the most and least common examples of coded resources within the major categories. Non-connected abbreviations for each campus have been provided when discussing specific EoI examples (see Table 1 and Table 2); thus offering validity for the results. Please note that the absence of a campus abbreviation associated with a specific resource does not indicate that the specific resource (or some variation) was not advertised on the campus website. Some campuses exhibited unique examples of EoI (e.g., student organizations), while some EoI was common across multiple campuses with little variation (e.g., extra time on tests) resulting in a random selection of campuses to connect with the resource locations. For EoI details of individual institutions, please contact the author.

Levels of EoI

As a whole, the 26 campus websites exhibited poor EoI (see Table 1 and Table 2). Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported; only 12 websites (46%) were rated as having adequate EoI (offering at least 70% of the 25 resource subcategories). One school (Public-D) exhibited exceptional EoI (at least 90% of the 25 resource subcategories), and only six scored above adequate (at least 80% of the 25 resource subcategories; all public). The major category of human support had the strongest EoI, with approximately 71% of the 11 subcategories being observed across campuses (combining public and private). Across the human support subcategories, 100% of the public institutions exhibited resources for study strategies/tutoring, writing center, scribe, and counseling services. One hundred percent of the private institutions exhibited resources for study strategies/tutoring, while 92% of the private institutions exhibited resources for a writing center, scribe, and counseling services. Human support provided the strongest EoI for both public (81% of the 11 resource subcategories) and private (60% of the 11 resource subcategories) institutions. The major category of academic accommodations had the weakest EoI, with approximately 60% of the 14 subcategories being observed across campuses. Extended time for testing was the strongest subcategory for academic accommodations, with 91% and 92% of public and private institutions presenting resources, respectively. Support was provided for the third hypothesis in that public institutions exhibited greater EoI. Specifically, 74% of public institutions were scored as adequate, whereas 54% of private institutions were scored as inadequate. Public and private institutions exhibited large differences across specific academic accommodation subcategories. The greatest differences were observed for arranged seating (75% of public versus 23% of private), submitting audio responses (75% of public versus 38% of private), modified deadlines (41% of public versus 7% of private) and taping of lectures (91% of public versus 53% of private). Public and private institutions exhibited large differences across fewer human support subcategories. The greatest differences were observed for advocacy/mediation (91% of public versus 69% of private), readers (91% of public versus 23% of private), and support groups for SWD (100% of public versus 69% of private).

Exploratory: Most and Least Common Resources

The number of schools that exhibited each of the 25 subcategories is presented within Table 3 and will not be restated here. The following sections present specific examples of the most and least common resources. For resources with little to no variation in how they were presented on the campus websites (e.g., being able to have a scribe) no additional details or examples were provided.

Academic accommodations. Within the major category of academic accommodations, the most common subcategory included receiving extended time for testing (time-in-a-half, double time, and unlimited time), and in rare cases the option to complete tests in multiple sessions/days (due to fatigue). However, flexibility with in-class discussions (e.g., providing discussion posts due to a speech impairment; Public-D), and the option of modified assignment deadlines were rarely reported (Public-B and Private-L). A variety of EoI were coded as the subcategory "other" for example, disability-specific assistance with studying abroad (Public-A, Private-D, Private-B, and Private-G). Private-D provided SWD a checklist of study abroad considerations, such as, checking the type of curriculum and available accommodations at the international institution.

Private-G also provided disability-specific resources to assist students with accommodations through their internships and clinical experiences. Additional EoI that contributed to the "other" subcategory included course substitutions (when possible Public-L and Private-L), use of a dictionary or spell checker on tests, and being able to claim full-time student status while having a reduced course load (Private-G and Private-M). Some schools also provided speech-recognition software on lab computers (Public-J) and alternative keyboards (e.g., braille; Public-H and Public-I).

Human support. Within the major category of human support, the most common subcategories included mediation resources; help with learning, writing centers, finding a scribe, support groups for SWD, and counseling services. For advocacy and mediation, many schools offered ways for students to report their grievances (e.g., incidents of discrimination or challenges with faculty; Private-E). Schools also offered forms for students to request assistance with mediation with faculty and other students (Public-D). Campuses such as Public-G provided training to students in self-advocacy. Additional campuses provided educational resources in advocacy (Private-G), or developed student/faculty organizations that focused on education and advocacy (e.g., Public-H).

Peer tutoring (Private-A, Private-H, and Private-J) or programs designed to assist in improving one's study skills were the most common resources to assist in student learning. Public-B offered a Study and Learning Skills Program that provided individual meetings focused on time management, study skills, reducing procrastination, and learning to set personal and academic goals. Private-M offered math tutoring by trained students at their Quantitative Skills Center. Public-K offered a set of tutoring videos that covered note-taking, study skills, test anxiety, and offered peer and professional (i.e., tutors with degrees) tutoring. Private-E offered one-on-one tutoring to any student with a documented learning disability, and Private-I offered an academic support team with faculty members for struggling students regardless of their disability status. The majority of schools advertised about having a writing center that assisted students along different means of the writing process. Many writing centers provided in-person services, while a few provided the opportunity for online consultations (Public-C).

Common EoI included various support groups, student organizations specific to SWD, or some form of mentorship (Private-C). Private-K Learning Disabled (BUILD) program was a pay-for-service program that offered additional resources beyond the ADA-required accommodations. BUILD resources included two-hour weekly meetings, individual tutoring by tutors with at least a bachelor's degree (across multiple areas), and study skills training. Public-C offered the National Alliance for Mental Illness (NAMI) organization that aimed to increase awareness and educate others about mental health issues. Multiple schools had an Active Minds chapter; a national organization focused on educating college communities on mental health topics, teach mental health advocacy, and help reduce mental health stigma. Public-F offered an honor society for students with disabilities, Delta Alpha Pi. Public-B offered a Peer Undergraduate Mentor Program (PUMP), to help incoming students with disabilities transition to college. Incoming students were paired with upper-class mentors with disabilities who offered one-on-one mentorship. A similar peer-mentoring program was offered at Public-H. In some cases, schools offered campus-community programs such as SuperSibs (Private-L, Private-I, and Private-F), which worked with children in the community who had siblings with disabilities.

Counseling and psychological services (CAPS) were common resources reported on the websites, though the number of services varied across campuses. Individual counseling was most often provided. In some circumstances group therapy, substance abuse

resources, mental health screening, sexual abuse, domestic violence, and crises resources were advertised (Private-B offered a wide range of services). Public-H offered psychiatric services. A few schools offered specialty programs, such as the Mindfulness/Meditation Group offered at Public-I, which helped to reduce stress, anxiety, and depression.

One of the least reported resources was having routine check-ins for students to assess any potential challenges, needs, or successes. The Achieve, Connect, Engage, Succeed (ACES Program) offered at Public-E helped students with stress and time management, study skills, and career planning. Students in the ACES program routinely met with a success coach and peer mentor. Public-J advertised about their Student Disability Advisory Committee (SDAC), which aimed to enhance accommodations and remove barriers. The SDAC consisted of the director of counseling, ADA coordinator, architect, administrators, faculty members, and students.

Discussion

Hamblet (2009) recommended that prospective SWD search the campus website for commonly offered accommodations and other forms of support. Mitchell (2015) proposed that such information and opportunities could be seen as indicators of inclusive education. Unfortunately, many of the institutions in the present study are currently not providing informative websites for these prospective students nor offering strong indicators of inclusive education. Collectively, campus websites showed limited EoI, with 54% of campuses not showing adequate EoI. While presented EoI on campus websites does not equate to actual services available at each institution; prospective students may not know what is available if it is not presented. While human support had the strongest EoI across the 26 institutions, the category barely met the required threshold to be viewed as adequate (71% of the 11 resource subcategories), suggesting that campuses would benefit from promoting more of their human support resources. Nonetheless, a positive finding was that one of the most commonly advertised human support resources (found on 20 websites) included advocacy and mediation.

Presenting resources for self-advocacy and mediation would show prospective students that the university values their opinions and concerns, and that they want students to speak-up for themselves. Successful self-advocacy requires the individual to identify their needs and determine the resources they require to have those needs met. When SWD have the necessary knowledge and skills to self-advocate, they have the ability to better identify the types of accommodations and resources that would best help them to succeed (Walker & Test, 2011). Thus, resources to help students self-advocate for their needs and gain social support contributes to Mitchell's (2015) criteria of access, acceptance, and support. SWD who can self-advocate report greater feelings of campus belonging (Vaccaro et al., 2015) and college adjustment (Adams & Proctor, 2010). SWD also report having a more positive view of the campus climate when feeling a strong sense of belonging and having skills to advocate for their needs (Fleming, Oertle, Plotner, & Hakun, 2017).

Twenty campuses advertised a range of student organizations that focused around the needs of SWD (e.g., information, social support, community education, and advocacy). For students who lack the skills or confidence to self-advocate, having a student organization or designated staff member to help in student advocacy would be a beneficial form of human support (Vaccaro et al., 2015). Offering student organizations or designated staff would provide indicators of Mitchell's (2015) criteria for access, acceptance, resources, and support. Student organizations can help enhance campus belonging by providing opportunities for social involvement and peer networking (Agarwal et al., 2014). Student organizations could range from larger groups to smaller peer-mentoring programs; depending on the needs and resources of the campus. Having a student organization such as the honor society for SWD, Delta Alpha Pi, would provide a means for academically strong SWD to meet and help reconfirm their status as a legitimate student, due to showing evidence of mastering the student role.

First generation students report needing, but not using campus-counseling services due to not knowing that services are available. Therefore, Stebleton, Soria, and Huesman (2014) recommended that counseling services increase their visibility to students and offering a greater presence on campus. According to O'Keefe (2013), "mental health of students is leading to student attrition, and the perception that the university is not well equipped to support the emotional and mental health needs of students may impact upon enrollments" (p. 607). Therefore, it was not surprising to find that 24 of the 26 campuses presented details of offering some form of counseling services. Unfortunately, the amount of information presented about available services varied greatly. Some campuses only stated that services were available, while others presented a list of potential resources and activities. Students who access counseling services show greater rates of college retention than students who do

not access such services (Wilson, Mason, & Ewing, 1997), thus providing students continued access to their education. Campus sense of belonging is related to self-reported rates of stress and depression (Stebleton et al., 2014), suggesting the impact that offering these services have on student belonging. Campuses that present a greater amount of counseling resources may be viewed as being more prepared and accepting of SWD in general, and mental illnesses in particular. Offering a range of counseling services also indicates that the institution has the resources and wants to support the needs of their students.

Like all students, SWD want to be academically successful, with or without the support of accommodations (Lyman et al., 2016). To support all students, institutions must offer and advertise about various academic supports available to students regardless of their disclosure status. All of the reviewed campuses advertised about some form of resource that could help students learn either through study skill training or tutoring (online video, peer, or professional). Online resources for study strategies would be beneficial to advertise for students who may not feel comfortable with face-to-face tutors, cannot make it to campus, or are completing online courses. Institutions could offer and advertise employing professional tutors who have experience working with SWD, thus indicating that they accept and support SWD, which may help decrease students' fear of stigma.

Additional human support resources such as a campus writing center or having access to a scribe were commonly presented (at least 24 out of 26 schools), which suggest the importance that campuses place on helping students academically. Fortunately, all of the resources, except for the scribe, were available to students with or without a disability. Unfortunately, additional human support resources that are typically used by SWD tended not to be advertised as frequently. Resources such as real-time captioning (nine of institutions), having access to a reader (15 of institutions), and routine check-in meetings (three of institutions) were rarely offered at institutions included in the present study. Routine meetings to assess any challenges or concerns SWD may be experiencing would require a greater amount of resources than the institutions likely have available. To remedy this problem, institutions could set-up peer or faculty mentorships to allow for a one-on-one support network. Offering peer or faculty mentorships would reduce the burden of a typically small ODS staff, while offering personalized support.

There was little variation in the types of academic accommodations advertised on institutional websites. Most websites (at least 21 institutions) advertised the options for receiving course materials in alternative formats (e.g., large print, extended time for testing, and being able to complete tests in an environment with reduced distractions). While institutions are required to offer these options, by advertising about them they show that they actually want students to access and benefit from the services. Seeing these commonly offered services; students may feel less concerned about accessing them. Increased student usage will result in greater faculty knowledge and experience in implementing these services. Faculty familiarity with the services would help to improve the disclosure process for students by presenting a more welcoming environment. SWD have reported on the importance of faculty being aware of available services to help students feel more included (Moriña, Cortés-Vega, & Molina, 2015). Advertising the accommodation services will also give faculty a clear place to find details on how to implement those accommodations within their classrooms.

Alternatively, there are many resources that were not commonly advertised and could make it more difficult for students to access or increase challenges with having faculty implement services. Flexibility with class discussions was the least advertised academic accommodation. Students with severe anxiety or who are unable to communicate clearly through oral discussion, would benefit from knowing about alternative discussion formats (e.g., submitting comments via assistive technology). A flexible absence policy was advertised on half of the websites. Advertising about the policy would suggest to students that the campus is prepared to work with students with chronic illnesses who may require this resource. Therefore, campuses need to make sure that they are prepared to implement and answer questions regarding all of the resources they offer. They would also benefit from informing faculty of the most commonly used resources to help the faculty be better prepared to implement.

Lastly, a unique resource included information to help SWD study abroad. Integrated (students with and without disabilities) study abroad trips have contributed to enhanced peer-relationships, and the opportunity to have a range of culturally diverse experiences (Kelley, Prohn, & Westling, 2016). Therefore, advertising about the different resources available to help students participate in these opportunities would help prospective students feel that they are truly part of the campus and able to participate in on-campus and off-campus activities. Soneson and Fisher (2011) recommended that campuses create a welcoming environment of disclosure to help SWD participate in study abroad. Evidence to indicate a welcoming en-

vironment would include, providing images and testimonials on the website from SWD who participated in study abroad.

While limited resources were presented on campus websites, a few study limitations must be considered. One thing to consider was that EoI could have been greater across campuses if the miscellaneous resources in the "other" subcategories for academic accommodations and human support were counted as individual points towards the overall EoI rating. For the present study, if one campus had five resources in the "other" category, they were only counted as one point. On the other hand, great lengths were made to find all sources of potential EoI for each institution. On average, the three coders spent 2.5 hours searching each institution's website; which is likely a significantly greater amount of time than what the average prospective student would spend. It can also be assumed that the amount of EoI found by prospective students would be substantially less than what was found by the coders, especially as coders accessed additional embedded links. Erickson et al. (2013) found that one difficulty prospective students have with finding information on campus websites is due to unfamiliarity with institutional terminology. An additional limitation was that the only institution to receive an EoI score of exceptional (Public-D) was a campus that the coders were familiar with and had more experience with their website and terminology. Specific recommendations for website implementation are listed below:

Website Implications for Public and Private Institutions

1. Advertise opportunities for students to learn how to self-advocate for their needs. Offer online or face-to-face training, have a designated staff member to address issues and help students develop a plan of action, or provide opportunities to learn from fellow peers through student organizations.
2. Advertise about available student organizations for SWD or the possibility to create an organization.
3. Advertise resources for studying abroad to help SWD see what is possible, which may help them feel that they will not be viewed as an inconvenience.
4. Advertise about counseling and psychological services and the diverse reasons people may seek services. Present resources on webpages for students with and without disabilities to help normalize the use of services. Present examples of the different types of services available: individual and group counseling, substance abuse resources, mental health screening, crises resources, or stress relief training.
5. Present services that are used by students with and without disabilities (i.e., do not require disclosure). Showing that all students can use and therefore benefit from the services could help normalize their usage. Clearly list services that require a diagnosed disability (i.e., requires disclosure), which would help to ensure that not commonly used but necessary resources are still advertised (e.g., real-time captioning).
6. List common difficulties that SWD experience (e.g., easily distracted by noise during tests, challenges quickly processing written information) so that students may identify their need for services via academic or performance challenges versus due to a disability status.
7. Advertise a range of tutoring services and whether any tutors have experience working with SWD.

Conclusions and Future Directions

While not tested in the present study, the amount of EoI that each school offers could impact the sense of belonging for SWD, therefore, institutions would benefit from clearly advertising their available resources. Public and private institutions should review their websites for examples of the different EoI they offer and consider the ways in which they indicate the opportunity for an inclusive education. Private institutions would especially benefit from reviewing their websites, due to having the least amount of EoI. Students who attend or hope to attend these schools with inadequate EoI may feel less welcomed or feel that the campuses are less prepared to assist them. Increasing the amount of EoI for a prospective student could not only increase enrollment rates, but could increase the feeling of belongingness for SWD, thus helping to increase retention. Future research (currently underway) will assess which types of EoI students feel should be advertised on campus websites. Lastly, future research should assess whether the amount and type of EoI presented on campus websites influences students' sense of belonging or view the campus as an inclusive environment.

References

Adams, K. S., & Proctor, B. E. (2010). Adaptation to college for students with and without disabilities: Group differences and predictors. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 22*, 166-184.

Agarwal, N., Calvo, B., & Kumar, V. (2014). Paving the road to success: A students with disabilities organization in a university setting. *College Student Journal, 48*, 34-44.

Burgstahler, S., & Moore, E. (2009). Making student services welcoming and accessible through accommodations and universal design. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 21*, 155-174.

Camacho, B. M., Lopez-Gavira, R., & Díez, A. M. (2017). The ideal university classroom: Stories by students with disabilities. *International Journal of Educational Research, 85*, 148-156.

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2017). *Institution lookup.* Retrieved from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/lookup/lookup.php

Cawthon, S. W., & Cole, E. V. (2010). Postsecondary students who have a learning disability: Student perspectives on accommodations access and obstacles. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 23,* 112-128.

Dallas, B. K., & Sprong, M. E. (2015). Assessing faculty attitudes toward universal design instructional techniques. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 46*, 18-28.

Dallas, B. K., Sprong, M. E., & Upton, T. D. (2014). Post-secondary faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching strategies. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 80,* 2-20.

Dowrick, P. W., Anderson, J., Heyer, K., & Acosta, J. (2005). Postsecondary education across the USA: Experiences of adults with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 22*, 41-47.

Emong, P., & Eron, L. (2016). Disability inclusion in higher education in Uganda: Status and strategies. *African Journal of Disability, 5*, 1-11.

Erickson, W., Trerise, S., Lee, C., VanLooy, S., Knowlton, S., & Bruyère, S. (2013). The accessibility and usability of college websites: Is your website presenting barriers to potential students?. Community College *Journal of Research and Practice, 37*(11), 864-876.

Fleming, A. R., Oertle, K. M., Plotner, A. J., & Hakun, J. G. (2017). Influence of social factors on student satisfaction among college students with disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development, 58*, 215-228.

Hadjikakou, K., Polycarpou, V., & Hadjilia, A. (2010). The experiences of students with mobility disabilities in Cypriot higher education Institutions: Listening to their voices. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 57*, 403-426.

Haller, B. A. (2006). Promoting disability-friendly campuses to prospective students: An analysis of university recruitment materials. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 26*(2).

Hamblet, E. C. (2009). Helping your students with disabilities during their college search. *Journal of College Admission, 205*, 6-15.

Kelley, K. R., Prohn, S. M., & Westling, D. L. (2016). Inclusive study abroad course for college students with and without intellectual disabilities (practice brief). *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 29*, 91-101.

Lightner, K. L., Kipps-Vaughan, D., Schulte, T., & Trice, A. D. (2012). Reasons university students with a learning disability wait to seek disability services. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 25*, 145-159.

Lindbeck, R., & Fodrey, B. (2010). Using technology in undergraduate admission: A student perspective. *Journal of College Admission, 208*, 10-17.

Lyman, M., Beecher, M. E., Griner, D., Brooks, M., Call, J., & Jackson, A. (2016). What keeps students with disabilities from using accommodations in postsecondary education? A qualitative review. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 29*, 123-140.

Mitchell, D. (2015). Inclusive education is a multi-faceted concept. *Center for Educational Policy Studies, 5*, 9-30

Moriña, A., Cortés-Vega, M. D., & Molina, V. M. (2015). Faculty training: An unavoidable requirement for approaching more inclusive university classrooms. *Teaching in Higher Education, 20,* 795-806.

Murray, C., Lombardi, A., & Wren, C. T. (2011). The effects of disability-focused training on the attitudes and perceptions of university staff. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*, 290-300.

Murray, C., Wren, C. T., & Keys, C. (2008). University faculty perceptions of students with learning disabilities: Correlates and group differences. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 31*, 95-113.

Newman, L., Wagner, M., Knokey, A. M., Marder, C., Nagle, K., Shaver, D.,…Schwarting, M. (2011). *The post-high school outcomes of young adults with disabilities up to 8 years after high school. A report from the national longitudinal transition*

study-2 (NLTS2) (NCSER 2011-3005). Retrieved from https://ies.ed.gov/ncser/pubs/20113005/pdf/20113005.pdf

Noel-Levitz, R. (2009). *Scrolling toward enrollment: Website content and the e-expectations of college-bound seniors.* Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED541572.pdf

O'Keeffe, P. (2013). A sense of belonging: Improving student retention. *College Student Journal, 47*, 605-613.

Raue, K., & Lewis, L. (2011). *Students with disabilities at degree-granting postsecondary institutions* (NCES 2011–018). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Schreuer, N., & Sachs, D. (2014). Efficacy of accommodations for students with disabilities in higher education. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 40*, 27-40.

Soneson, H. M., & Fisher, S. (2011). Education abroad for students with disabilities: Expanding access. *New Directions for Student Services, 134*, 59-72.

Stebleton, M. J., Soria, K. M., & Huesman, R. L. (2014). First-generation students' sense of belonging, mental health, and use of counseling services at public research universities. *Journal of College Counseling, 17*, 6-20.

Stein, K. F. (2013). DSS and accommodations in higher education: Perceptions of students with psychological disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary education and disability, 26*, 145-161.

Thompson-Ebanks, V. (2014). Personal factors that influence the voluntary withdrawal of undergraduates with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 27*, 195-207.

UNESCO. (2005). *Guidelines for inclusion: Ensuring access to education for all*. Paris: Unesco. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED496105.pdf

Vaccaro, A., Daly-Cano, M., & Newman, B. M. (2015). A sense of belonging among college students with disabilities: An emergent theoretical model. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*, 670-686.

Walker, A. R., & Test, D. W. (2011). Using a self-advocacy intervention on African American college students' ability to request academic accommodations. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26*, 134-144.

Wilson, K., Getzel, E., & Brown, T. (2000). Enhancing the post-secondary campus climate for students with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 14*, 37-50.

Wilson, S. B., Mason, T. W., & Ewing, M. J. (1997). Evaluating the impact of receiving university-based counseling services on student retention. *Journal of counseling psychology, 44*, 316.

Wilson, J. L., Meyer, K. A., & McNeal, L. (2012). Mission and diversity statements: What they do and do not say. *Innovative Higher Education, 37*, 125-139.

About the Author

Vanessa A. Costello-Harris received her B.A. degree in psychology from California State University Fullerton and Ph.D. from Miami University. She is currently a professor in the Department of Psychology at Indiana University Kokomo. Her research interests includes inclusive practices in higher education, executive functioning, and attention/deficit-hyperactivity disorder in college students. She can be reached by email at: vacostel@iuk.edu and Vaharris09@gmail.com.

Acknowledgement

The author was a recipient of the Indiana University Kokomo Summer Faculty Fellowship and would like to acknowledge the Office of Academic Affairs for providing support during the completion of this work.

Table 1

Public Institutions: Percentage of Evidence of Inclusion (EoI) for Academic Accommodations and Human Support

Carnegie Classification	Academic Accommodations Percent	Human Support Percent	Level of EoI
Four-year, Large, Primarily Residential			
Public-A	71.43	90.91	4
Public-B	85.71	90.91	4
Public-H	85.71	90.91	4
Public-K	57.14	72.73	2
Four-year, Medium, Primarily Residential			
Public-J	71.43	72.73	2
Four-year, Medium, Primarily Nonresidential			
Public-E	28.57	72.73	1
Public-F	78.57	81.82	4
Public-G	78.57	81.82	4
Public-I	71.42	90.91	4
Four-year, Small, Primarily Nonresidential			
Public-C	64.23	81.82	3
Public-D*	100.00	90.91	5
Two-year, Very Large			
Public-L	57.14	81.82	2

Note. Institutions have been grouped based on their 2013-2014 Carnegie Classification. The classification has been based on the size and setting of the institution. Level of Inclusion: 1 = inadequate, 2 = slightly below adequate, 3 = adequate, 4 = above adequate, 5 = exceptional. *Researchers utilized Public-D's resources as a source of finding familiar resources to use for the purposes of this study. Consequently, Public-D may be a potential affect because it was the only school to rate as "exceptional."

Table 2

Private Institutions: Percentage of Evidence of Inclusion (EoI) for Academic Accommodations and Human Support

Carnegie Classification	Academic Accommodations Percent	Human Support Percent	Level of EoI
Four-year, Large, Highly Residential			
Private-L	71.43	81.82	3
Four-year, Medium, Highly Residential			
Private-B	42.86	81.82	2
Four-year, Medium, Primarily Residential			
Private-K	71.43	54.55	2
Four-year, Small, Primarily Residential			
Private-A	64.29	72.73	2
Four-year, Small, Highly Residential			
Private-D	85.71	54.55	3
Private-G	64.29	81.82	3
Private-J	28.57	54.55	1
Four-year, Very Small, Highly Residential			
Private-E	35.71	63.64	1
Private-F	71.43	45.45	2
Private-M	50.00	54.55	1
Four-year, Very Small, Primarily Residential			
Private-I	14.29	54.55	1
Four-year, Very Small, Primarily Nonresidential			
Private-C	50.00	63.64	1
Private-H	0.00	27.27	1

Note. Institutions have been grouped based on their 2013-2014 Carnegie Classification. The classification has been based on the size and setting of the institution. Level of Inclusion: 1 = inadequate, 2 = slightly below adequate, 3 = adequate, 4 = above adequate, 5 = exceptional.

Table 3

Major EoI Categories and Subcategories with Campus Frequency (number of schools with EoI)

EoI Category	**Campus Frequency**
Academic Accommodations	
Alternate Testing Format	16
Arranged Seating	12
Extended Time for Class Assignments	10
Extended Time for Testing	25
Flexible Absence Policy	13
Flexibility within Class Discussions	1
Materials in Alternative Format	23
Modified Deadlines	7
Reduced Distraction Testing Environment	21
Submitting Audio Responses: Assistive Technologies	13
Taping of Lectures	18
Use of Calculator for Test	10
Word Processor to Give Class Responses: Assistive Technologies	15
Human Support	
Support Groups for Students with Disabilities	20
Advocacy/mediation	20
Help with Learning and Study Strategies or Tutoring	26
Writing Center	24
Note-Taking/Scribe	25
Counseling Services	24
Routine Check-In Meetings	3
Readers	15
Real-time Captioning	9
Sign Language Interpreter	19
Other	10

Table 4

Individual Search Terms Used to Find Resources

Disability Center or Services
Assistive Technology
Disability Training
Gluten Free
High school transition
Handicap accessible
Veteran students
First year experiences
Accessibility Center or Services
Braille
Service Animals
Study Strategies
Campus Map
Handicap
Student organizations
Housing
Accommodation Center
Interpreter
Counseling Services
Writing Center
Academic Support Services
Accessible Restroom/Bathroom
Diversity