



Disability Service Providers' Perceptions about  
Implementing Universal Design for Instruction (UDI)  
on College Campuses

**Technical Report Number 03**

David R. Parker  
Priscilla B. Embry  
Sally S. Scott  
Joan M. McGuire

University of Connecticut

Universal Design for Instruction Project  
Center on Postsecondary Education and Disability

**To Cite:** Parker, D.R., Embry, P.B., Scott, S.S., & McGuire, J.M. (2003). *Disability service providers' perceptions about implementing Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) on college campuses* (Tech. Rep. No. 03). Center on Postsecondary Education and Disability, University of Connecticut.

This report has been developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education (#PR333A990036). The opinions contained in this manuscript, however, do not necessarily reflect the viewpoints or policies of the USDOE.

## Abstract

Two focus groups were conducted with 16 disability service providers from two-year and four-year, public and private postsecondary institutions. Service providers reported increasingly diverse student populations on their campuses and a broad range of concerns from faculty regarding the inclusion of students with learning disabilities (LD) or Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in higher education. When asked to share their perspectives on Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) as a proposed model for addressing these concerns, service providers noted strengths and weaknesses. Participants also described their role in promoting UDI on campus and identified resources and support they would need to carry out this role.

## Disability Service Providers' Perceptions about Implementing Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) on College Campuses

### Issue

As increasing numbers of students with diverse learning needs enroll in postsecondary education programs, inclusive instructional methods offer a proactive approach to equal academic access. In order to better identify such methods, it is important to determine the challenges and barriers to equal access to instruction as perceived by key stakeholders. Adding to research involving postsecondary students with learning disabilities (LD) and university faculty members (Madaus, Scott, & McGuire, 2002a, 2002b), service providers who work in Offices for Students with Disabilities (OSD) can provide unique perspectives about faculty-student interactions that promote inclusion. Two groups of service providers from two-year, four-year, public, and private colleges in the United States and Canada participated in focus groups in order to offer insights about these issues.

### Research Questions:

- What are the perceptions of service providers about the strengths and weaknesses of UDI as an approach to faculty development that will enhance inclusive teaching?
- What are the perceptions of service providers about their role in promoting UDI as a campus initiative?

- What are the perceptions of service providers about the supports that would be needed by OSD to implement UDI as a means of faculty development?

### Method

As an activity related to overall project goals of the Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) Demonstration Project at the University of Connecticut, two focus groups were conducted with 16 disability service providers. The focus group method was chosen because it allows researchers to collect data on participants' perceptions and beliefs about complex experiences and issues (Carey, 1994). UDI Project team members recruited the focus group participants from disability service providers who attended the 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Postsecondary Learning Disability Training Institute, sponsored by the University of Connecticut Center on Postsecondary Education and Disability. Interest in the topic of UDI may have been enhanced by the Institute's keynote presentation about the development of the concept of UDI. All focus group participants attended the keynote presentation and thus were exposed to the construct of UDI before the focus group sessions began.

Each focus group consisted of eight participants and a UDI Project team member who served as facilitator. Participants gave permission for the focus groups to be recorded. Two other Project team members were present in the sessions in order to keep written and audiotaped records of the discussion, but they did not participate in the dialogue. The focus group protocol, developed specifically for this initiative, is included in Appendix A.

Establishing trust is an important element in the implementation of focus group research (Carey, 1994). This goal was addressed by the initial protocol question, which asked participants to identify questions faculty members frequently ask about teaching students with LD and/or attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Subsequent protocol items were designed to collect data about the research questions. Audiotapes of the focus group sessions were transcribed for analysis, producing a rich data stream that also included field notes, artifacts, and a log. A rich data stream is associated with a verifiable analysis (Krueger & Casey, 2000).

Demographic data were obtained from all participants (three males and 13 females). Their years of experience in the field of Disability Services ranged from 2.5 years to 31 years, with an average of 14.2 years. Four participants worked in public four-year institutions of higher education, five worked in private four-year institutions, and seven worked in public two-year institutions. Fifteen of the campuses were in the U.S., and one was in Canada.

Transcripts of the focus group sessions were analyzed and coded separately by two of the Project team members who were present at both sessions. Results of their analysis were compared to identify coding decisions that were incongruent. Code definitions were then refined in a multi-step process until 100% congruence was reached. The process used in reaching coding decisions was documented in a research log as the data were analyzed. A codebook was developed containing the codes used for transcript analysis, the

definition for each code, and all focus group data relevant to each code. A listing of codes and definitions is included in Appendix B.

In order to enhance the reliability of the interpretation of focus group data, the research team then applied a multi-step inter-rater reliability process to the coding procedure. Analysis procedures that are systematic and sequential help ensure that the findings are an accurate reflection of what participants said in the group (Krueger & Casey, 2000). A third member of the UDI Project team reviewed the transcript of one focus group session to examine specific elements of the codebook, identifying areas that needed more precise definition. Based upon this process the codebook was further refined. The inter-rater reliability process was completed with a review of the remaining focus group session transcript. An inter-rater reliability rate of 91% was reached.

### Findings

An overview of responses to the focus group questions follows. Illustrative responses from participants are included for each question.

#### *Interactions with Faculty Members*

As a rapport-building activity, participants in both focus groups were asked an initial question about interactions with faculty members. When asked to describe questions from faculty members about teaching students with LD or ADHD, service providers reported six categories of concerns including: (a) how students with disabilities could be “otherwise qualified” to participate in higher education; (b) providing effective instruction to students with disabilities; (c) providing accommodations to students with disabilities; (d) maintaining academic

standards when students with disabilities participate in higher education, including issues of fairness; (e) characteristics of students with disabilities; and (f) compliance with legal obligations to assure equal access to higher education for students with disabilities.

Faculty members' questions, as reported by service providers, reflected a range of knowledge and attitudes. Some questioned the legitimacy of an LD or ADHD diagnosis. One service provider, for example, reported: "They'll say things like, 'Anybody can come to your office and get a diagnosis.'" Others expressed a desire for information about instructional strategies. As a service provider commented: "The biggest question I get is, 'What do I do with them?' They don't understand the disorder and if they did they're not sure what strategies to use." Another service provider described examples of over-accommodation: "I've had some faculty say, 'Well, just tell me what you want me to do and I will make sure the student will pass.'" Reporting these concerns allowed participants to become more comfortable in contributing to the group process and provided a context for discussing their insights about the use of UDI as an alternative means for ensuring equal academic access.

### *Strengths and Weaknesses of UDI*

When asked to consider the strengths and weaknesses of UDI as a new approach to inclusive instructional design to ensure equal academic access, service providers' responses could be sorted into three categories. These included: (a) strengths; (b) weaknesses; and (c) hypothetical situations. Comments about strengths and weaknesses were characterized by definitive

beliefs. Hypothetical situations that participants mentioned were characterized by the identification of a variable that could influence the acceptance of UDI. All three response categories are described in detail.

*Strengths.* Service providers believed that UDI offered benefits congruent with existing goals and interests of their institutions, faculty, and students.

Several described UDI's ability to assist the institution in attracting and retaining a diverse student body. One participant told faculty who were working with an influx of students from a non-Western culture, "Guided notes, using Power Point, all of those things, not going off on tangents all of the time, are really something that *all* students could benefit from, not just our ESL students or our students with various disabilities." Several service providers described faculty members' desire to provide effective instruction as a strong reason for adopting UDI. As one commented, "I think if they, professors, were able to reach out to their entire class, they may get more satisfaction out of their teaching." Another noted that faculty would be interested in UDI's empirical foundation, adding "with the UDI coming in, it's coming from faculty and they're going to respect that a little more than they are from me."

Service providers also identified students' needs that could be met by UDI. Several discussed the normalizing effect of UDI. As one said, "I think the obvious [strength of UDI] is certainly the breakdown of the stigmas associated with the disabilities." Another participant linked diverse instructional methods to diverse learning styles, adding that "students are unhappy with a one-model approach. Straight lecture is not cutting it and they become savvy consumers."

In addition to these strengths, one service provider associated the “intuitive” nature of UDI with her own approach to working with students.

*Weaknesses.* Service providers described six categories of weaknesses related to UDI. Many of these perceived limitations addressed the need to make changes to current knowledge, behaviors, or resources. Identified weaknesses included (a) faculty resistance, (b) training issues, (c) technology, (d) students, (e) service providers’ lack of expertise, and (f) the lack of a legal mandate. Several participants described faculty members’ reluctance to replace current, accepted practice with a new instructional approach that lacks empirical support. One service provider imagined the following exchange with professors: “What’s the evidence that you can show me that says this is going to work?’ Right now they don’t have that. Hopefully, in the future, they will.” Several service providers identified the difficulty in training adjunct instructors and graduate teaching assistants due to the transient nature of these positions. As one participant noted, “There is no time in their involvement with the college to do any kind of training. They’re here, they teach, they leave.” One service provider identified the lack of classroom technology as another weakness, noting, “There are classrooms that have everything right there, but the university doesn’t have the money to have the laptop and the projector, so that takes away the Power Point presentation.” Two service providers commented that UDI could adversely affect students by limiting their need to develop self-advocacy skills and by exposing them to some instructors who embrace UDI and some who do not. As one participant from a community college stated:

I know when I have students, I put them through an exercise, how to become proactive, how to talk about their learning style. And I don't think that they would have as much of an opportunity to be as proactive in their own education at this point.

One service provider identified the lack of expertise as another weakness. As she noted, "The other issue, too, is the whole issue of staff versus faculty politics of an institution. Me as the staff person, I don't necessarily feel I could talk to a whole group of faculty about this." Finally, several service providers identified the legal mandate to provide accommodations as an important source of decision-making authority. Conversely, they identified the lack of a legal mandate as a weakness for the implementation of UDI. As one service provider succinctly noted, "I think with disability, even though my main mantra is to educate faculty, I always have in my back pocket, 'This is the law.'"

*Hypothetical situations.* Several participants described hypothetical situations involving variables that could positively influence the acceptance of UDI. These included (a) the need to build a collaborative relationship with faculty, (b) presenting UDI in a convincing manner, (c) addressing faculty's concerns about work load and class size, (d) the role of campus type in determining the amount of time service providers have to work with students, and (e) the manner in which faculty create curriculum. Most comments in this category underscored the central importance of a collaborative relationship between service providers and faculty in the acceptance of UDI. One participant captured this by stating, "I think again, how it's [UDI] presented makes a huge

difference to the faculty...it's a great deal in the presentation and relationship that is developed." Another service provider identified a key point to include in faculty presentations, adding that, "If you could get them [faculty] to buy into it, they would realize that they're not teaching to a classroom of the same students, whether they have a disability or not, they're individual learners."

### *Service Providers' Role in Promoting UDI*

Service providers were asked to describe roles that the OSD could undertake to promote UDI as a campus initiative and the types of resources or support they would need to do so. In many cases, participants expressed the belief that strong administrative leadership would be essential to the development of UDI. One participant voiced the opinion that promoting UDI in her role as a service provider would not be effective, stating:

It could not come from my office. I think all credibility would be lost if it came from my office...because then it would be seen as an accommodation, again, for students with disabilities. It would not be seen as the Universal Design that it truly is.

Several service providers described providing information to influential campus leaders as a way to promote the acceptance of UDI. As one participant stated, "I would take this back to the retention committee, and they could take that to the faculty, the faculty council in our case." Several service providers also described their potential role of providing data collection services and support to faculty implementing UDI. One service provider stated, "Because in our job we are putting together strategies...and we can help professors apply their information

to those strategies. We may not be the content experts, but we have that expertise that they might not have.”

Service providers also identified experiences that would be relevant to promoting UDI on their campus. One service provider described the relevance of UDI to an interaction she had shared with a professor:

[UDI would entail] less work for him, because his whole thing to me was, ‘I have 250 students in x number of classes, in each of my classes, and I can’t do this and such for this one particular student.’ So it would be not having to make individual accommodations.

Another service provider described working in an environment of increasing diversity at her institution and how that might relate to promoting UDI:

Our population of our institution is increasing...we will get more nontraditional students...I think this is going to be a research question. What are you projecting, what do you see your school doing in 5 or 10 years, a curriculum change, to include or incorporate everybody into your classroom?

A related question emerged from participants’ comments about their role in promoting UDI. They were asked if their role as service providers would change with the advent of UDI. Service providers predicted (a) positive changes in their daily responsibilities, (b) positive changes in their status within the campus community, or (c) no major changes at all. All three response categories are described in detail.

*Change in responsibilities.* Many participants predicted that UDI would alter the balance of their day-to-day responsibilities. Responses were grouped into four categories including (a) accommodations, (b) proactive practices, (c) record keeping, and (d) strategies instruction. Most of the responses depicted UDI as an effective method for accommodating students while providing service providers with additional time to pursue non-mandated responsibilities such as service provision and program evaluation. One service provider immediately identified a fiscal benefit related to accommodations, noting that UDI would “lessen my budget...We pay note takers \$50 an hour...That wouldn’t be necessary. That would be quite a savings.” Another participant identified a proactive practice, anticipating that UDI would provide “more time for data collection on things that do work and look at ways to improve programs. We don’t always get time to do that because we are always sticking our fingers in holes of a dike...” One participant reflected on changes in record keeping if more students were accommodated in the UDI classroom, commenting that “I think it would change my job to be more of just a paper pusher. Documentation; maintaining the records possibly.” Another service provider envisioned changes in strategies instruction:

So when you are actually sitting down with that student to provide the support, the information is there and because it is coming from possibly just the professor directly or it was verbatim the lecture, you’re able to help that student instead of trying to find what they are getting at in their notes or following the notetaker’s notes.

*Change in status.* In addition to changes in daily responsibilities, service providers also predicted that UDI would change their status on campus. Comments were categorized as (a) changes in how others would view service providers or (b) changes in how service providers would view themselves. Several service providers thought UDI would change how campus colleagues regard them. As one participant said:

It depends on the stance we take. If we take an active stance, then I think you will see professors coming to you in a new role that's more proactive, rather than dike-filling. So they'll be looking for that type of leadership.

Another participant predicted that UDI would lead to greater acceptance of the work done by OSD professionals, commenting:

I also think that perhaps my services would be more accepted, because one thing that I have seen about universal design is that this design not only helps disabled students but also helps students with non-disabilities, because they need to access the same stuff...People wouldn't look at me like I am advocating more for something as totally way out of the realm than what you would do for any other student.

Several service providers predicted that UDI would change how they view their own status. Comments focused on a newly collaborative partnership with campus colleagues. One participant described this new status:

We are all on the same team rather than the disability office saying you have to do this, you have to do this. And the other folks resisting and everybody working together and make the student a member of the team.

*Extent of change.* When asked to characterize the magnitude of any change that UDI would lead to in the operations of their offices, participants reported minimal overall impact. Their comments were categorized into two groups: (a) no change, and (b) some change. Several participants stated that UDI would not result in major changes to their OSD operations since service providers would still need to provide accommodations and could spend more time engaging in proactive practices such as service delivery and program evaluation. One service provider's comment summarized this belief:

I don't see any major changes. You are still going to have to identify where the problems are and how people address those problems and still doing the documentation process and all. I think there might be a little less accommodating that needs to be done because issues will be addressed in the classroom.

Three service providers did describe some changes that UDI would lead to in their OSD operations. All identified positive results from the additional time they would have as more students were accommodated by inclusive instructional practices. As one participant noted:

UDI is not the, like, the panacea for everything. I mean, it's not like, I think it would go a long way in reducing the need for accommodations if time was not an issue to faculty and every student had as much time as they needed, or some parameter of time. But, still, there is always going to be the need for strategies because the faculty member is still trained not to teach, but to know his content areas.

### *Supports Needed by Service Providers to Promote UDI*

In order to promote UDI on their campus, several service providers expressed a need for additional information including research about UDI. One service provider stated, “I would have to find out a lot more about UDI. Because I don’t know that much about it.” Another service provider expressed a need for “empirical evidence that it works.” A third participant questioned a focus group member’s belief about the necessity of expensive technology as a precursor to UDI, commenting, “I didn’t know, I didn’t assume that at all. I am thinking of making sure there is a diversity of approach in the way that the material is presented. So maybe we all have different ideas about what UDI is.”

In addition to more information about UDI, a majority of service providers identified strong endorsements from influential campus leaders as the primary form of support they would need. Participants identified individuals and groups that could provide this type of leadership. They also described leadership characteristics of the individuals or groups as well as the characteristics of effective change processes for implementing UDI.

*Identity.* Service providers identified individuals on their campus who could promote UDI effectively. These individuals included administrators such as the president or chancellor and academic leaders such as a vice president for academic affairs, division coordinators, deans, and particular professors. Participants also identified groups that could take a leadership role in promoting UDI on their campus including a center for teaching and learning, the faculty union, the faculty senate, the ADA committee, and the retention committee.

*Characteristics.* Service providers offered descriptions of the characteristics of those individuals and groups they had identified as potential leaders in promoting UDI on their campus. One service provider described a potential leader in her setting, the institution's provost: "He is very supportive of our services, but also of diversity on campus. I think he would be; he's pretty powerful." Participants also provided descriptors of an effective process that would promote UDI on their campus including a "chain of command" sequence. As one participant pointed out, "I think maybe some sort of endorsement is needed, I don't know what that may be, maybe some sort of, I don't know if it would be honor or monetary, whatever to make it a positive thing." Another service provider underscored the importance of key campus leadership stating: "The faculty senate...It would have to be the group, the faculty senate that would think it was important and they would pressure the dean and the president to implement it."

### Summary

In order to determine the challenges and barriers to equal access to instruction as perceived by disability service providers, two focus groups were conducted with service providers from two-year, four-year, public, and private colleges in the United States and Canada. Participants reported a range of questions from faculty about the inclusion of students with LD and ADHD, including students' qualifications for participation in higher education, effective instructional strategies, reasonable accommodations, maintaining fair academic standards, characteristics of students with disabilities, and legal compliance

procedures. Given this context, service providers offered their perspectives about perceived strengths and weaknesses of UDI. Strengths included the relevance of a supportive instructional environment to recruitment and retention of a diverse student body, provision of effective instruction to all students, empirical support, and the ability to reduce stigmas associated with unique learning needs. Service providers believed that these strengths were congruent with institutional, faculty, and student priorities. Weaknesses included faculty resistance, training issues, technology requirements, limited student self-advocacy opportunities, service providers' lack of expertise in instruction, and lack of a legal mandate to implement UDI. In addition, participants described hypothetical factors that could influence the implementation of UDI on their campus.

Service providers described potential roles they could assume to promote UDI including disseminating information to influential campus leaders, offering data collection services and support to faculty members who utilized UDI, and inviting faculty grappling with less time to consider UDI's ability to efficiently accommodate increasingly diverse learners. Many service providers believed that UDI would not become widely accepted on their campus unless top-level administrators, academic leaders, and influential campus groups or committees endorsed it. Participants also described effective processes for promoting UDI including the use of incentives. In addition, participants provided perspectives on the impact of UDI on their own role as OSD professionals. Some service providers envisioned positive changes in their daily responsibilities or status on

campus while other participants predicted no major changes if UDI were to be implemented.

## References

- Carey, M.A. (1994). The group effect in focus groups: Planning, implementing and interpreting focus group research. In J. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 225-241). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krueger, R.A., & Casey, M.A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Madaus, J.W., Scott, S.S., & McGuire, J.M. (2002a). *Addressing student diversity in the classroom: The approaches of outstanding university professors* (Universal Design for Instruction Project Rep. No. 2). Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.
- Madaus, J.W., Scott, S.S., & McGuire, J.M. (2002b). *Barriers and bridges to learning as perceived by postsecondary students with learning disabilities* (Universal Design for Instruction Project Rep. No. 1). Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.

### Author Note

The authors express their appreciation to Jennifer Quadrini, M.A. for her assistance with transcription and Maureen Crowley, M.A. for her assistance with the data collection.

## Appendix A

### OSD Focus Groups at PTI

#### Purpose:

Gather OSD perceptions about

- strengths and weaknesses of UDI (as a general approach to faculty development rather than specific feedback on Principles)
- the anticipated role of OSD in promoting UDI on college campuses and
- supports needed by OSD to fulfill this role

#### Protocol Questions

- 1) Icebreaker: (brief, round robin to get everyone talking)
    - Think of experiences or interactions you have had with faculty who are teaching students with LD or ADHD. What were some of the questions that faculty posed related to teaching these students?
  
  - 2) UDI has been proposed as an approach to faculty development that will enhance inclusive teaching.
    - What do you see as the strengths/advantages of a UDI approach?
    - What do you see as the weaknesses or possible pitfalls of UDI?
  
  - 3) If UDI is to become a prominent means of faculty development, it will need proponents and leadership on campus. Think about your own campus for a minute.
    - Who would need to be involved in a leadership role to make this happen on your campus?
    - What are some of the different roles that OSD may need to play in promoting UDI as a campus initiative?
      - o What kinds of information, support, resources do OSD need to fulfill these roles?
      - o "My office needs \_\_\_\_\_ to support/encourage faculty to implement UDI."
  
  - 4) What impact do you think UDI will have on the operations of your OSD office?
- ...Other?

## Appendix B

### Service Provider Focus Groups: Overview of Coding System

Question 1: Think of experiences or interactions you have had with faculty who are teaching students with LD or ADHD. What were some of the questions that faculty posed related to teaching these students?

1. Otherwise Qualified: comments from service providers about their own experiences with and/or faculty questions about admissions, eligibility, participation in, or successful transition into or out of postsecondary education.
2. Instruction: comments from service providers about faculty members' questions about providing instruction, including student learning, assessment, and testing accommodations, to students with disabilities.
3. Accommodations: comments from service providers about faculty members' questions about determining and/or providing accommodations (other than testing accommodations) for students with disabilities.
4. Maintaining Academic Standards: statements from service providers about faculty members' concerns regarding maintaining academic standards when students with disabilities participate in higher education, including issues of fairness.
5. Student Characteristics: statements that attribute certain characteristics to students with disabilities, or concern a need for information about the nature of disabilities.
6. Compliance: statements that concern faculty members' actions that affect the fulfillment of their legal obligations to assure equal access to higher education to students with disabilities who are otherwise qualified.

Question 2: UDI has been proposed as an approach to faculty development that will enhance inclusive teaching. What do you see as the strengths/advantages of a UDI approach? What do you see as the weaknesses or possible pitfalls of UDI?

7. Strength: statements about the manner in which the needs or interests of the postsecondary institution or any of its constituent groups would be supported by UDI.

Responses were sorted into four sub-codes:

- 7a. institutional needs, including such things as cultural diversity, instruction that addresses multiple intelligences, campus mission statement, and retention
- 7b. faculty needs or perceptions relative to UDI, including such things as satisfaction from providing effective instruction, no additional effort needed, existing use of UDI principles, preparation of future faculty, utilizing research from respected institutions of higher education, and suggestions that come from other faculty members

- 7c. student needs, including such things as reducing stigma, enhanced learning for all students, promoting self-advocacy skills, minimizing the need to self-advocate, and access to a broad range of instructional styles
- 7d. service provider's role, including the use of intuitive approaches
- 8. Neutral: statements reflecting service providers' need for additional information concerning the impact of UDI. These statements include such things as general information, uses of technology, and the FacultyWare.com website.
- 9. Variable: noncommittal statements that, nonetheless, identify a hypothetical factor that could result in the acceptance of UDI. These statements include such things as building a relationship with faculty, presenting UDI convincingly, addressing faculty's concern about workload, class size, campus type, and the manner in which curriculum is created.
- 10. Weakness: statements about potential challenges to, or limitations from, the implementation of UDI practices. Responses were sorted into six sub-codes:
  - 10a. faculty resistance, including such things as positive evaluations for current approaches, lack of commitment to the inclusion of students with disabilities, confusion about the meaning of "universal," academic freedom, unreasonable accommodations, lack of empirical support, and additional work
  - 10b. training issues, including such things as difficulty finding time to train adjunct faculty and graduate teaching assistants, lack of requirement that faculty members have any training in teaching methods, and budget constraints
  - 10c. technology, including funding for technology and availability of facilities that support technology use
  - 10d. students, including such things as students' opportunities to develop self-advocacy skills and discontinuity when students experience UDI in some classes but not others
  - 10e. the service provider's lack of expertise in instruction as a deterrent to advocating for UDI with faculty
  - 10f. the lack of a legal mandate to provide UDI to students with disabilities (unlike reasonable accommodations)
- 11. Other, including a service provider's concern that UDI will "water down" the curriculum.

Question 3: If UDI is to become a prominent means of faculty development, it will need proponents and leadership on campus. Think about your own campus for a minute. Who will need to be involved in a leadership role to make this happen on your campus? What are some of the different roles that OSD may need to play in promoting UDI as a campus initiative? What kinds of information, support, or resources do OSD need to fulfill these roles?

12. Identity: an individual or group is identified.

13. Characteristics: the qualities, experiences, or values of an individual (*when*

- the person is someone other than the service provider*) or a group that make the service provider believe he/she would be an effective leader to promote UDI on campus, or, the characteristics of an effective process for implementing UDI, including any description of a chain of command linked to an identity. Responses were sorted into two sub-codes:
- 13a. descriptors about an individual
  - 13b. descriptors about an effective process
14. Service Provider: statements about promoting UDI related to service provider's role, needs, or experiences. Responses were sorted into three sub-codes:
- 14a. role, including such things as statements about what they currently do or could do in the future on their own campus
  - 14b. needs, including statements about things that they would consider to be helpful in promoting UDI on their campus
  - 14c. experiences, including statements about processes, strategies, or approaches that they have already personally experienced on their campus, or particular characteristics of their campus which they feel would be relevant to promoting UDI

Question 4: What impact do you think UDI will have on the operations of your OSD office?

15. Responsibilities: statements about the day-to-day responsibilities of service providers that might change (e.g., what service providers *do*). Responses were sorted into four sub-codes:
- 15a. accommodations, including such things as smaller budget, fewer accommodations, new types of accommodations, and more rapid exchange of faculty accommodations letters
  - 15b. proactive practices, including such things as student strategies, assistive technology, working with faculty members, data collection, and program development
  - 15c. record keeping, including reviewing documentation and maintaining records
  - 15d. strategies instruction, including helping students use their lecture notes more effectively
16. Status: statements about how service providers would be regarded by others or how they would view their own status (e.g., who service providers *are*). Responses were sorted into two sub-codes:
- 16a. how they would be regarded by others, including such things as greater acceptance by faculty, requests by faculty for consultation, and interacting well with others
  - 16b. how they would view their own status, including being "on the same side" with other members of the campus community
17. Change: statements reflecting participants' perceptions that UDI would not result in *extensive* changes in the operations of their office; some participants also described *some* changes that they, nonetheless, believed would result from UDI. Responses were sorted into two sub-codes:

- 17a. service provider states belief that no extensive changes would result from UDI, including such things as still needing to provide accommodations, help people solve problems, and communicate with faculty
- 17b. service provider states belief that no extensive changes would result from UDI but describes some changes that may occur, including such changes as advocating for how students learn, a reduced need for accommodations, and increased access to class materials when providing strategies instruction
- 18. Other: including such things as documenting the efficacy of UDI, professors' consistency, a request for additional information about UDI, and Landmark College's work with UDI.