CHAPTER 33

Using Universal Design for Administrative Leadership, Planning, and Evaluation

David Arendale and Robert Poch
University of Minnesota

Abstract

Universal Design (UD), Universal Design for Instruction (UDI), and Universal Instructional Design (UID) provide practical models to guide more inclusive learning practices within student affairs and also to serve as a useful evaluation measure for student outcomes. This chapter extends the utility of these approaches for a variety of settings within student affair units, addresses dynamics of change, identifies institutional and community assets that can support sustained change, presents a planning and assessment tool, offers several real-world scenarios for within student affairs, and concludes with several case studies of change at the institutional and state level.

Universal Design (UD) and have often been adopted to reduce barriers within the classroom to increase learning for all students, especially those with visible and invisible disabilities. UD also is a powerful approach to increasing learning for students outside the formal classroom within other units such as student affairs (Burgstahler, 2007b; Higbee, 2003). This chapter is devoted to exploring this new opportunity within postsecondary education.

Together we served as small-group facilitators for a group of student affairs administrators and higher education faculty members during summer 2006. This was part of the larger group convened through the Pedagogy and Student Services for Institutional Transformation (PASS IT) grant project described elsewhere in this book and through the project Web site (PASS IT, 2007). This chapter describes some of the conversations among these administrators and higher education faculty members concerning the application of UD and UID to their work as leaders and the creation of an assessment tool to guide and evaluate UD practices. In addition to the coauthors of this chapter, this team included Deborah Casey (then at Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton), Robert Fox (Fresno City College), Sue Kroeger (University of Arizona), Karen Myers (Saint Louis University), and Erin Sember (Cornell University). Additional conversations continued during summer 2007 with several members of this group along with Alfred Souma, a counselor at Seattle Central Community College. Dr. Casey was appointed Assistant Dean of Students Affairs at Green River Community College during the past year.

This chapter extends the utility of UD for a wide variety of settings within student affairs units, addresses dynamics of personal and instructional change, identifies institutional and

community assets that can support sustained change, presents a planning and assessment tool for use regarding UD, offers several real-world scenarios for UD use within student affairs, and concludes with several case studies of change implementing UD at the institutional and state levels. The next section explores the history and theoretical basis for UD and its application to units within student affairs.

Review of the Professional Literature

UD focuses on a transformative process of making systemic changes within the learning environment to reduce potential barriers for all students. An enriched learning environment meets the needs of not only students with disabilities, but all students within the class (Higbee, 2003; Pliner & Johnson, 2004; Silver, Bourke, & Strehorn, 1998). Elsewhere in this book a more detailed overview of the background and theoretical models of UD is presented. This chapter focuses on use of UD within student affairs.

A number of chapters that explored Universal Design within the classroom and also student affairs are reprinted in this volume. Kalivoda and Totty (2003a) proposed that the institution's disability services office can be more than an advocate for students with disabilities; it can also be a resource for the entire institutional community to improve access for all students. Higbee and Kalivoda (2003) explored the use of UD in services for prospective and new students, including traditional student affairs units such as admissions, orientation, registration, and first-year experience courses. Wisbey and Kalivoda (2003) detailed opportunities to apply UD within residential living and learning environments. Higbee and Eaton (2003) described how implementing UD helps to achieve the mission and objectives of a learning center. In an article published elsewhere and reprinted in this volume, Opitz and Block (2006) identified principles for the use of UD for learning support defined much more broadly than a learning center. Uzes and Connelly (2003) highlighted the use of UD within counseling center service areas. Previously, Kalivoda and Totty (2003b) examined the issues of accessibility to technology, both computer hardware and online materials. That information has been updated for the appendix of this volume. Shapiro (2003) also examined the issue of accessibility of online materials and provided numerous recommendations. This is an important issue for student affairs units due to their heavy reliance upon the institution's Web pages for delivery of information to students.

Burgstahler (2007j) identified six major areas where UD could be implemented within units in student affairs,

> 1. Planning, policies, and evaluation. Consider diversity issues as you plan and evaluate services. 2. Facility and environment. Assure physical access, comfort, and safety. 3. Staff. Make sure all staff are prepared to serve all students. 4. Information resources. Assure that publications and Websites welcome a diverse group and that information is accessible to everyone. 5. Computers, software, and assistive technology. If used, make technology accessible to all visitors. 6. Events. Assure that everyone feels welcome and can participate in events sponsored by the organization. (p. 5)

In addition, Burgstahler has applied these principles to a wide variety of areas in student services including: (a) advising (2007a), (b) career services (2007b), (c) computer labs (2007c), (d) financial aid (2007d), (e) housing and residential life (2007e), (f) registration (2007f), student organizations (2007g), and (g) tutoring and learning centers (2007i).

While this section of the chapter has sought to identify the underpinnings of UD and UID, the next identifies a historic model for effectively engendering change within a system. Success with implementing UD will require a systematic and sustained effort. Attention must be carefully paid to organizational dynamics and incentives for sustained innovation.

Employing an Effective Change Model

College administrators have a wide variety of responsibilities that are very demanding, including budget manager, strategic planner, student learning leader, personnel manager, and catalyst for positive change. In regard to UD implementation at the institution, change is often difficult not because of lack of interest by others, but rather because of the energy and resources needed for change itself. Every day new management books are published with a subset focused on higher education management. A key issue for a successful leader is not only leading others to a desired outcome, but also understanding the complicated stages of change that must occur before arriving at that destination. In this chapter we are relying on a classic model of change theory to guide implementation of UD within student affairs units.

Kurt Lewin was one of the early leaders in social psychology and focused his research heavily on organizational dynamics. Lewin's (1947, 1951) Force Field Analysis provides a model for understanding the forces that either foster or hinder change. He described a multistage process. The first stage requires the early leaders of the innovation to help engender dissatisfaction with the present system. Lewin argued that people would not even consider change unless the status quo was demonstrated to be seriously lacking. Applying this principle to higher education, this activity might include reports about the number of students with disabilities enrolled at the institution, drop-out rates for students, student satisfaction survey data, and so on.

The second stage occurs when people "unfreeze" from customary behaviors and implement new ones. Activities at this stage might include a few people at the institution experimenting with several practices as a pilot test. Data are collected from this pilot test, such as student survey data, changes in grade performance, and increase in utilization by students. The next stage builds upon the pilot stage by the change agents, in this case senior student affairs administrators, presenting a comprehensive model for implementing UD. This stage requires not only advocacy from the administrators for change, but sustained attention and resources such as training.

The final stage, according to Lewin, is the most important and also the most challenging. "Refreezing" occurs when people have deeply adopted the new behavior and feel as

comfortable with it as they were with the previous behaviors before the change model began. It requires continued support and rewards for people to sustain the new behaviors. Lewin argued that this stage is the one where well intentioned pilot programs sometimes are not continued. Applying this principle to postsecondary education, practices could include supplemental pay for additional work outside of the normal job scope or work week, recognition for performing the new UD practices through the annual performance review system, and so on. The UD practices must not only be advocated, but valued in a practical way from the perspective of the front-line implementers of the practice.

This comprehensive model of change is reflected in the following sections of this chapter. It is not enough to advocate for adoption of new practices and policies. The entire cycle of change, especially the final stage of supporting ongoing implementation, is essential for systemic and sustained change. The next section of the chapter explores the assets that may be commonly available at the institution that could help support and sustain the change process.

Assets for Implementation, Extension, and Sustainability

The investments for implementation of change within an institution are often more heavily dependant upon human resources than financial resources. As the previous chapter section identifies, the change process requires a comprehensive approach. Additional partners are needed for the effective implementation of practices and policies within the institution. Evans, Assadi, and Herriott (2005) described an approach to gaining more advocates for support of students with disabilities. Evans et al.'s article provides a foundation for the rest of this section for identifying potential assets for supporting change. We encourage readers to conduct an inventory of potential resources within their institution and community. The availability of these preexisting resources may guide which UD practices can be most practically and successfully implemented initially. Additional funding and external grants could be explored for more challenging areas. These resources are essential for dealing with Lewin's (1947, 1951) stages of change as described in the previous section.

Gatherings of Faculty and Staff

Change often begins with awareness of an issue of concern or importance. Where could UD be first introduced? What are venues for training workshops? Rather than creating additional meetings, one might consider the following venues: (a) new employee orientation; (b) employee retreats, meetings, and workshops at the beginning of academic year; (c) periodic employee meetings during the academic term; (d) teaching and learning professional development seminars; and (e) online professional development venues provided by the institution for its employees.

Institutional Offices

UD requires a comprehensive approach for its effectiveness. Not only does an institutional priority for reducing barriers for learning require change by many, it also requires the expertise of faculty and staff at the institution. Where are these experts located? Larger

institutions will have entire offices dedicated to these functional areas. Smaller institutions may have delegated these responsibilities to a single individual as just one part of the person's job scope. Offices that often have people with expertise include the following: (a) office for students with disabilities; (b) center for teaching and learning, which often hosts professional development resources and seminars for faculty members; (c) center for technology, which has staff responsible for Web page redesign, podcasting, and adaptive computer hardware; (d) learning center, which is primarily focused on providing learning assistance for students; and (e) department or school of education. Implementing a UD initiative through a preexisting department is a more natural venue than creating another place for faculty and staff to learn about it. Also, hosting the UD pilot program within a willing unit that receives additional resources increases the likelihood of continued support after the initial promotion and pilot phase.

Offices Outside the Institution

Additional resources are external to the institution within the local community. A formal or informal partnership with the local school district office for students with disabilities could provide needed expertise. A wide variety of Internet-based resources are available. The PASS IT project has a Web site (2007) with rich content and practical recommendations. DO-IT (2007b), another program funded through the U.S. Department of Education's (2006) Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students With Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education program, also has free resources. A free weekly Internet radio podcast series features interviews and practical recommendations for reducing barriers at the institution (Case, 2007). A Google search of the Internet as well as a search of online ERIC documents will identify many more.

Institutional Leaders and Influencers

Systemic change within the institution requires not only involvement, but also active promotion by others. "Buy in" by many is essential for long-term success. Who are the champions for instructional and service improvement? These are individuals who often are the first to attend optional talks and training seminars. They are often the early adopters of practices, whether those activities are within the classroom or elsewhere at the institution. Seek out these individuals to solicit their interest and support with a pilot test of the new UD practice. These individuals are often the unofficial leaders of institutional change.

It is also helpful to solicit involvement from administrators, staff, and faculty who are highly visible at the institution, and have formal leadership roles. Some of the following groups are ones that have what appears to be a more clear interest in UD: (a) the institution's retention taskforce members, (b) student affairs officers, (c) academic affairs officers, (d) academic department chairs, (e) enrollment management team members, (f) multicultural affairs office staff, and (g) disability services staff. Another group of leaders are formal representatives of students or employees: (a) student senate, (b) faculty senate, (c) staff bargaining unit, and (d) faculty bargaining unit. Too often the perception of these groups is that their interests circulate around student fees, job scope responsibilities, and annual

salary increases. Although those responsibilities are high priority, the leaders from these groups can also be powerful partners for institutional change. Increased student graduation rates and higher tuition revenues as a result are helpful outcomes for everyone at the institution. Involving these individuals early in the UD change process can not only gain valuable allies but also help avert the inevitable call for maintaining the status quo.

Building and Classroom Assessment

Understanding the environment at the institution is essential for implementing some UID approaches. The most common inventory is a careful analysis of the physical environment regarding physical barriers and challenges for those with a disability. An outside evaluation may be necessary, because it is often difficult to detect small barriers that most people would not notice. This is more than just compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990). For example, those responsible for admissions and orientation need to ascertain any difficulty for students with mobility impairments, including those using wheelchairs, with navigating a tour of the institution. Administrators must determine the utilization of scarce resources such as computer classrooms and those with adaptive equipment and software. Can the existing resources be maximized further to serve more students than presently? Due to institutional procedures, sometimes such resources are restricted because they have been placed under departmental or unit access and not made available to the larger community at the institution.

Institutional Policies

Senior administrators can make several strategic decisions that can have a systemic impact on the learning environment. Textbook adoption guidelines can require that alternative formats are available by the publisher before purchases are permitted. Boilerplate language included in course syllabi can describe services for students with a disability and to whom appeals can be made. Course curriculum guidelines or requirements could require instructors to provide diverse modalities for both instruction and assessment. Student affairs units could be required to provide various means for completing tasks or accessing services.

Professional Development and Reward System

In addition to awareness presentations, short workshops, and distribution of training materials, the following activities may be essential for sustained adoption of UD practices: (a) travel to professional conferences related to UD, (b) purchase of materials such as books and journals related to UD, (c) summer stipends for those not employed at that time of year to attend workshops and work with one another on UD, (d) overload pay for faculty and staff to work on UD during their contract period, and (e) meaningful impact on annual evaluation and merit raise criteria.

Linking Change Theory With Needed Resources

As Lewin (1947, 1951) indicated, providing support for adoption of the new behaviors requires changes in the current system. Most faculty and staff already have extensive responsibilities. They need support during the process until they internalize the change

and feel as comfortable with the new practice as they did with the previous one. This section of the chapter has focused on a wide array of possible resources for successful and sustained UD implementation. Obviously not every resource is needed for every UD pilot. However, careful identification of resources may not only provide greater support, but also more recommendations from stakeholders regarding other UD changes. The next section of this chapter provides an assessment and planning tool that could be used within student affairs or other parts of the institution.

Assessment and Planning Within Student Affairs

The Student Affairs Administrative Working Group during the PASS IT 2006 summer institute engaged in a variety of activities to contextualize UD for programs and services outside the classroom and within their areas of responsibility. Using UD within student affairs is certainly not a new concept (Burgstahler, 2007h; Higbee, 2003). The Working Group determined that assessment was a critical issue, both for identifying opportunities for integration of UD and also for assessing its effectiveness. The group decided that an assessment and planning tool was needed that could bring together the elements necessary for thoughtful management decisions. The following tool was created by the Working Group, with the assessment criteria based on the model for Universal Design of Instruction (UDI) proposed by Scott, McGuire, and Shaw (2003).

For purposes of this chapter, the tool appears as a one-page form to save space within this book. For actual use, it is suggested to recreate the form as a table through a word processing software program, permitting expansion of the size of the boxes to allow more or less space as needed to type or write responses. It would also enable sharing of the document with others as an e-mail attachment. To help illustrate use of the instrument, the following scenario will be used:

> One part of the new student orientation program is learning the locations and functions of buildings at the institution. Because students are not required to disclose a disability during the admission process, orientation leaders may not have any advance knowledge regarding participating students with disabilities, and in the case of invisible disabilities, may not at any point be aware of students' disabilities. How could the tour of the institution be designed to be inclusive for all students?

Top Section of the Tool

The top section of the tool provides a place to record the current situation regarding the activity under review. First, the program or service is succinctly described (e.g., tour of the institution for prospective students). The next item asks for a description of the goals of this program or service. This is a critical piece, because clearly identifying goals may permit the administrator to explore alternative ways to achieve the same goals through diverse means that present fewer barriers to students. The third item identifies who is currently being served. This item could include both demographic information and the number of students served. Continuing with the example of the tour, this could be the number of students who participate annually. The final item in this set identifies which resources are used currently. This item might include the types and numbers of students

Figure 1. Planning and assessment tool for higher education programs and services

Program/Service Description:			
Program/Service Goal(s):			
Who Involved and Served Currently:			
Existing Resources, Staff, and Policies Used Currently to Implement Program/Service:			
Program/Service Analysis by Assessment Criteria:			
Assessment Criteria	Rating (1 to 7)	Success Indicators	Barriers/Challenges
1. Equitable use			
2. Flexible use			
3. Simple and intuitive use			
3. Simple and intuitive use			
4. Perceptible information			
5. Tolerance for error and provision for contingency			
6. Low physical effort			
7. Size and space for approach and use			
8. Supportive community of learners (students, faculty, staff)			
9. Positive learning climate			
Current Overall Evaluation Rating of the Program/Service Circle one: 1 (lowest) 2 3 4 5 6 7 (highest)			
Recommendations for Change:			
Existing Resources, Staff, and Policies Needed to Implement Program/Service:			
New Resources, Staff, and Policies Needed to Implement Program/Service:			
Benefits of Implementing Program/Service:			

or staff who conduct the tours, the means and route for the tour, and what materials are used during the tour (e.g., handouts, audio and visual aids).

Middle Section of the Tool

The middle section of the assessment tool can serve two purposes for the administrator or evaluator of the program or service. On one hand the assessment criteria can be used to analyze a policy or practice to decide if it is a candidate for change. The second purpose is to apply the same criteria again after the change has occurred to analyze the outcomes to discern if significant improvement has occurred.

Each of the nine assessment criteria are drawn from the professional literature describing UDI (Scott, McGuire, & Shaw, 2003). As noted elsewhere in this book, UDI is a model that evolved during the same time frame as UID and Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Comparable assessment forms could also be developed using UID principles or the guiding principles proposed by Opiz and Block in Chapter 16 for learning support, or by Higbee in Chapter 15 for student development programs and services. Each of the criteria presents an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the policy or practice. Column one allows for rating of each criterion. The next column asks the respondent to identify success indicators and milestones. The final column identifies the barriers and challenges with the practice before the introduction of UD, UDI or UDI. Continuing our example of the tour, some of the items in this section might be the following: One success indicator for "equitable use" would be that 95% of students become acquainted with the institution's environment. "Perceptible information" success indicator would be achieved through making all information regarding this activity available in a variety of forms (e.g., print, audio, computer text readable). A "barrier or challenge" under the "low physical effort" criterion might be that the tour cannot be easily conducted during inclement weather or is difficult for some students with a physical disability or is not inclusive of family members who do not speak English. Finally, the person completing the assessment is asked to make an overall evaluation rating of the program or service.

Final Section of the Tool

The final section of the assessment and planning tool focuses attention on effective implementation of the UDI activity. With the example used thus far, under "recommendations for change" one or more of the following might arise: (a) providing golf-cart type vehicles for campus tours, (b) using a bus with wheelchair accessibility to transport all students around the institution, (c) creating a narrated tour that could be played in the listener's choice of language via audio player while moving along the route or listened to alone, and (d) developing a narrated three-dimensional virtual tour using the institution's Web site or a Web site such as Second Life (Linden Research, 2007). Each of these potential responses should be keyed to fulfilling one or more of the nine assessment criteria of the middle section of the planning tool. The second item identifies existing resources that are being used to support delivery of the program or service. The next item in this section identifies "new resources and policies needed to implement" the revised program or service. In the previous section in this chapter we identified a wide range of UD assets

that could be accessed to implement the desired practice or policy decision. Achievement of the desired student outcomes may require a combination of old and new resources. The final item in this section asks for identification of the benefits for implementing this program or service. Clearly identifying the tangible benefits to the students, staff, and institution of the UD or UDI practice or policy helps to ensure its continued support and implementation.

Reuse of the Tool as Assessment for Progress

After the program or service has been modified through the use of UD or UDI best practices, it is recommended that the form be used again. This time the primary purpose of the tool is assessing the modified practice. This step in the process provides feedback essential for further improvement and refinement. As with any other practice within academic or student affairs, the cycle of assessment, revision, and improvement is continuous. The members of the Student Affairs Working Group have taken the planning tool home to their institutions. Several case studies for transformation at the institutional or state level are presented at the end of this chapter.

Scenarios Involving Student Affairs

During the 2006 PASS IT summer institute, the Student Affairs Working Group explored the use of UD in general and the Assessment and Planning Tool in particular with a number of possible scenarios that related to student affairs, some of which are now provided here. Each presents a real-world scenario that is followed by several probing questions and finally several recommendations to consider that are consistent with UD principles. The recommendations are not intended to serve as comprehensive responses, but rather as catalysts for deeper consideration by the reader. In conjunction with most of the scenarios, we provide references to publications that explore that particular topic in more depth and provide additional practical recommendations.

Scenario #1: Expanding Access and Service to More Students

Professor Johnson's class is known for being extremely challenging for most students, especially regarding note taking, because the professor speaks so quickly and presents so much new content not covered by the text in each lecture. A student with a diagnosed learning disability received an accommodation for a note taker. Other students in the class learn about this and request copies of the notes, because their student fees help fund disability services. The issue is on the agenda for the next student senate meeting for discussion about a resolution demanding more assistance for students enrolled in classes with high failure rates.

This scenario prompts the following questions: How can the needs of the one student with a learning disability be met through an action or service that is also available for all students within the classroom? How can the institution leverage the limited budget to serve more students? Possible responses for this situation include the following: (a) copies of the note taker's lecture notes posted on the Web; (b) placement of the professor's PowerPoint slides on the Web; and (c) audio recording of the class lecture using

Podcasting technology, to be posted to the Web.

Scenario #2: Leveraging the Intellectual Assets of Those With Special Expertise
The institution has invested heavily in establishing an Office for Student Disability Services. The dedicated staff work one-on-one with students with diagnosed disabilities. The staff has considerable expertise in learning pedagogies that would be helpful for other faculty and staff members, but little interaction occurs due to the heavy caseload and priorities of the disability services staff members. They often argue that they cannot do more if more full-time qualified staff members are not hired.

The following questions can naturally arise from this scenario: How can the institution encourage knowledge transfer between the disability services staff members and the rest of the institution's community? How should work load priorities and expectations be changed through collaborative discussion? What would a new mission statement look like for the disability services office if dissemination was a high priority? Some possible solutions include the following: (a) staff with responsibilities for students with disabilities become regular presenters for in-service professional development workshops, and (b) these same staff spend 20% of their work time out of their office providing individual consultations and making presentations to faculty and staff (e.g., at departmental meetings) with a reallocation of their job responsibilities as a result. See Kalivoda and Totty (Chapter 22) for more ideas on this topic.

Scenario #3: Fostering Change and Innovation Among Faculty and Staff
The Office for Student Disability Services eagerly seeks to share information about mainstreaming accommodations within the classroom. However, some faculty and staff are reluctant to embrace change, because they perceive themselves as overworked and underpaid, and are therefore uninterested. Institutional budgets have been slashed and workloads increased in the past couple of years. Labor negotiations are contentious and morale is shaken. Questions that naturally emerge include: How do leaders encourage others to become dissatisfied enough by the current environment that they are open to change? How are others motivated to change? What are the motivators for individuals? What are the barriers that have to be overcome?

A clear understanding of how to encourage successful change is essential. The previous section of this chapter describing Lewin's (1947, 1951) approach provides the theory. Possible solutions were explored in the previous section on UD assets. Depending upon the individual, some of the incentives and support could include: (a) release time from some job responsibilities to work on the UD activity, (b) additional conference travel funds for professional development related to UD, and (c) supplemental summer pay for independent or group work on a UD practice. See Ouellett (2004) for more ideas on this topic.

Scenario #4: Sustaining Innovation
Early last semester Assistant Dean Mathers invested in new computer hardware and software, furniture, and space reconfiguration for the Student Information Center in the

student affairs unit she leads. She now senses in staff meetings that her primary unit manager and staff believe that all necessary changes and innovations have been accomplished and that relief, comfort, and a commitment to the status-quo are becoming part of the professional office culture. Dr. Mathers is anxious to inspire an ongoing commitment to innovation in service to all students, but is uncertain how to do so while encountering staff resistance. Several questions are prompted by this scenario: How can a sense of need for ongoing innovation and change be inspired among staff who may tire or grow resentful of such change? What can Assistant Dean Mathers do? Is she facing complacency or possibly something else?

Some possible solutions include the following: (a) fully involve staff in the discussion and conceptualization of changes to inspire ownership of the need for change and innovation; (b) explore with staff how innovations in the past have assisted in developing learning and growth for all students and thus have produced meaningful change; (c) examine fully the rate at which such change and innovation have occurred and whether staffing patterns and the distribution of responsibilities have been adequate within the unit to sustain such changes as well as future needs; and (d) examine methods of creating a sense of dissatisfaction with the status quo through student survey data, persistence rates, and other measures. See Burgstahler (2007c), Kalivoda and Totty (2003b), and Shapiro (2003) for more ideas.

Scenario #5: Communicating Between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

The director of a student services unit discovers that several faculty members who are teaching first-year courses in his college require students to explore careers relative to the subject matter that they are covering in the respective courses. The students are now coming to the career services office in the student services unit in sizeable numbers with the intent of meeting these course expectations. Although pleased to have the student interest, the director does not have all of the resources or physical space to enable all of the students to meet the class expectations. There are 95 students in these courses and only space to accommodate 7 students at a time in the career center with work stations separated by only one narrow passageway. Further, the computers are 5 years old and the software has not been upgraded in 3 years due to budget reductions. Career assessments and exploratory software available do not match up with the course requirements established by the faculty. This scenario prompts the following questions. How can this director respond? Is there anything that he can do to implement better communication patterns and resource attainment? What UD issues are present in this scenario? How might they be addressed?

There are a variety of possible solutions to the overwhelming response to accessing services from this student affairs unit. Communication is the first step in this process. The director needs to meet regularly with faculty and academic leadership. Based on current resources available, expectations need to be mutually established. Secondly, this situation presents an opportunity for the director to gain key sponsors for change in the career center by linking with faculty and student interests and demonstrating the value that

can emerge from connecting academic and student services to UD. At many institutions, more resources are available from academic affairs than student affairs. Acquiring more access to classroom space, computers, and career software that is accessible for students with disabilities will be easier if the director within student affairs can gain key supporters and advocates within academic affairs. See Burgstahler (2007a, 2007b) for advising and career services, Uzes and Connelly (Chapter 18) for counseling centers, and Higbee and Kalivoda (Chapter 20) for first-year experience programs.

Scenario #6: Supporting Student Choice in Education and Work Venues

A graduate student in a college student personnel program who uses a wheelchair refuses an internship in Disability Services and requests placement in Student Activities or Residence Life instead. How might the administrator in charge of internship placements respond? How might the Directors of Student Activities or Residence Life respond? Key questions are: What are the requirements or essential components for internships in different areas? What systemic changes would be needed to enable wider participation in internships? UD best practices could include one or more about the following: (a) ensure that job descriptions include reasonable physical requirements to complete essential work tasks, (b) be vigilant about eliminating stereotypes of work assignments, and (c) distinguish between essential and secondary work tasks for positions and reallocate secondary tasks to others as needed and reengineer the essential tasks so that there are few or no barriers.

With each of these scenarios, the student affairs administrator is presented with an opportunity to draw upon preexisting resources within the institution and community to provide a creative solution. While the prompt for the administrative review was to meet the needs of an individual or a small group, the opportunity is presented to make systemic changes in the learning, working, and living environments that benefit all students and staff and faculty as well. This cumulative result of many small changes contributes to a transformative impact for the institution and the students who are served.

UD Use at Several Institutions

The following section focuses on two case studies of how UD has been implemented by several PASS IT grant participants at their home institutions and has even influenced an entire postsecondary system within a state. Both individuals serve at different institutions in the state of Washington.

Green River Community College

Dr. Deborah Casey is Dean for Student Affairs at Green River Community College (Auburn, WA). Nearly 9,500 students are enrolled at this public, 2-year institution in both academic transfer and vocational programs. The college employs nearly 700 faculty and staff members.

Dr. Casey is working with colleagues at different levels within the institution to engender interest and implementation of UD in various academic and student affairs units. She intentionally uses UD-related language and concepts when communicating with

faculty, staff, and fellow administrators. After hearing about the PASS IT grant and reading relevant professional literature, senior academic and student affairs administrators have become champions for the initiative as well. Working with senior academic leaders, Dr. Casey has sponsored several UD awareness workshops with both faculty and staff members. The past year has been spent cultivating interest in change among these individuals. This approach is consistent with the first phase of Lewin's (1947, 1951) multistage model for engendering change. To aid in sustainability for the UID initiative, Dr. Casey has placed day-to-day responsibility for UD training with the Center for Teaching Excellence established in 2007. This effectively moves UD from a special project in the Dean's Office to an ongoing activity within a department that is supported by academic and student affairs. Plans are to provide more detailed follow-up UD professional development workshops as more resources are generated through the PASS IT grant. Dr. Casey returned with an institutional team for the 2007 PASS IT summer institute. Changes will naturally emerge as individuals and departments experience Lewin's change cycle and continue improving their practices and, as a result, student outcomes with the incorporation of UD principles.

Seattle Central Community College

Alfred Souma is a counselor at Seattle (WA) Central Community College. Approximately 10,000 students are enrolled at this public, 2-year institution. Students enroll in both academic transfer and vocational programs. Souma advocates for adoption of UD practices within academic and student affairs at his institution. This case study focuses on his work that influences postsecondary institutions across the state.

Due to his interest, past role as a coordinator for the institution's student disability services, and current vocation, Souma has served on the Washington State Disability Services Council. Partially influenced by the PASS IT grant and also by life-long interest, he has been advocating for UD as another way to reduce barriers for students with disabilities. Under his leadership, the Council recommended to the Washington Community College System of 33 institutions an important policy requirement that could make a significant impact. The policy would require all bid procedures for the 33 institutions to also require consideration of UD principles before purchasing instructional materials. This action potentially can require alternative and accessible formats being readily available from the publisher for all books, curriculum materials, and computer software programs. These are requirements above and beyond those of the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990). The potential impact for this policy decision may influence other institutions in Washington and throughout the U.S. As vendors incorporate best practices into their materials for sale to the State of Washington, those same materials may also be purchased elsewhere. Just as when textbooks are changed to meet the particular requirements of a state such as Texas (McInerney, 1991), the same materials are purchased elsewhere.

Different Institutions, Common Goals

Both Casey and Souma share similar goals for their institutions regarding the widespread implementation of UD: (a) increase awareness of UD knowledge among faculty, staff, and

administrators; (b) create accountability of UD to respective outcome models, ensuring access to opportunity, engagement, and higher student outcomes; (c) implement effective UD practices within both classrooms and student services activities; (d) increase student retention; (e) build partnerships throughout the institution to aid in sustainability and support for UD; (f) tie UD to the institutional mission to ensure more resources for sustainability and wider impact on student outcomes; and (g) reduce cognitive and physical barriers at their respective institutions. These two case studies illustrate the multilevel approach that is needed to transform the learning environment for students. Casey has included in her implementation plan a "bottom-up" approach that is building desire for change and encouraging innovation at the individual and departmental levels. Souma has adopted among his strategies a "top-down" approach that influences state-level policy that can have a systemic impact on postsecondary institutions throughout the state. True and lasting change will require innovation and policy changes throughout the educational system.

Summary

U.S. postsecondary education continues its transformation with increasing access to education options and diversity of the student body. During the 1960s the Civil Rights Movement contributed to opening more widely the doors of higher education institutions to more students from families that had not attended college before. The 1990s saw the college doors open more widely to students with disabilities who had been accustomed to accommodations in elementary and secondary education through federal legislation. The 21st century has expanded this concept of reducing barriers for those with a disability by establishing principles of UD that create a more inclusive environment for all students within the classroom. This chapter and others in this book and other publications extend this work again by applying UD to student services and throughout the institution. This takes us all one step further in creating a supportive and productive learning community for all our students.

References

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. (1990). Public Law No. 101-336, § 2, 104 Stat. 328 (1991)

Burgstahler, S. (2007a). Equal access: *Universal Design of advising.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_adv.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007b). *Equal access: Universal Design of career services.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_cs.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007c). *Equal access: Universal Design of computer labs.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/comp.access.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007d). *Equal access: Universal Design of financial aid*. Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_fa.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007e). *Equal access: Universal Design of housing and residential life.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_hrl.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007f). *Equal access: Universal Design of registration*. Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_reg.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007g). *Equal access: Universal Design of student organizations.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_so.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007h). *Equal access: Universal Design of student services.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_ss.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007i). *Equal access: Universal Design of tutoring and learning centers*. Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_tlc.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2007j). *Universal Design in education: Principles and applications.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/ud_edu.pdf

Case, B. (Host). (2007). *Disability411 podcast*. [online]. Retrieved September 7, 2007, from http://disability411.jinkle.com/

DO-IT. (2007a). *Equal access: Universal Design of recruitment and undergraduate admissions.* Seattle: University of Washington, DO-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/Brochures/PDF/equal_access_rua.pdf

DO-IT. (2007b). *Web homepage.* Seattle: University of Washington, Do-IT (Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.washington.edu/doit/

Evans, N. J., Assadi, J. L., & Herriott, T. D. (2005). Encouraging the development of disability allies. In R. D. Reason, E. M. Broido, T. L. Davis, & N. J. Evans (Eds.), *Developing social justice allies.* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 110, pp. 67-79). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Higbee, J. L. (Ed.). (2003). *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved

September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html
Higbee, J. L., & Eaton, S. B. (2003). Implementing Universal Design in learning centers. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 231-239). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html
Higbee, J. L., & Kalivoda, K. S. (2003). The first-year experience. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 203-213). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html
Kalivoda, K. S., & Totty, M. C. (2003a). Disability services as a resource: Advancing Universal Design. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 187-201). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html
Kalivoda, K. S., & Totty, M. C. (2003b). Universal Design and technology. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 251-263). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html
Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 459-473). New York: Holt.
Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science.* New York: Harper & Row.
Linden Research. (2007). *Second Life Web page.* Retrieved September 11, 2007 from http://secondlife.com/
McInerney, J. D. (1991). A biologist in wonderland: The Texas biology textbook adoption hearings. *American Biology Teacher, 53*(1), 4-5.
Opitz, D. L., & Block, L. S. (2006). Universal learning support design: Maximizing learning beyond the classroom. *The Learning Assistance Review, 11*(2), 33-45.
Ouellett, M. L. (2004). Faculty development and Universal Instructional Design. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*(2), 135-144.
PASS IT. (2007). *Web homepage.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, College of Education and Human Development, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, PASS IT (Pedagogy and Student Services for Institutional Transformation). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/passit/
Pliner, S. M., & Johnson, J. R. (2004). Historical, theoretical, and foundational principles of Universal Instructional Design in higher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 37*(2), 105-113.
Scott, S. S., McGuire, J. M., & Shaw, S. F. (2003). Universal Design for Instruction: A new paradigm for adult instruction in postsecondary education. *Remedial and Special Education, 24,* 369-379.
Shapiro, B. (2003). Technology transformation and disability: Universally accessible Web tables. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal*

Design in higher education (pp. 265-284). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html

Silver, D., Bourke, A., & Strehorn, K. C. (1998). Universal Instructional Design in higher education: An approach for inclusion. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 31*(2), 47-51.

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *Demonstration projects to ensure students with disabilities receive a quality higher education*. Retrieved August 27, 2006, from http://www.ed.gov/programs/disabilities

Uzes, K. B., & Connelly, D. O. (2003). Universal Design in counseling center service areas. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 241-247). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html

Wisbey, M. E., & Kalivoda, K. S. (2003. Residential living for all: Fully accessible and "livable" on campus housing. In J. L. Higbee (Ed.), *Curriculum transformation and disability: Implementing Universal Design in higher education* (pp. 215-229). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, General College, Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy. Retrieved September 6, 2007, from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/crdeul/books-ctad.html