

Unit Planning: Student Services
Disability Services
For 2008-2009

Section I: Data Elements

Due December 14th, 2007

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Unit Effectiveness			
<u>Enhances Student Engagement</u>			
<u>Number of service contacts</u>			
Front Desk In-Person Contact	7,530	7,878	6,399
Front Desk Phone Contacts	3,557	3,232	2,473
Total Front Desk Contacts	11,087	11,110	8,872
Total Contacts % change from previous year	13% decrease	0.2% increase	20% decrease
<u>Number of unduplicated participants</u>			
Active New and Returning Students	320	363	327
% Change (Active Students)	2% increase	13% increase	10% decrease
Completed eligibility but inactive	96	86	61
End of year Pending Eligibility	49	36	34
End of year Not Qualified	52	60	15
Total for Current Year	517	545	437
Rolling Active 2-Year Total	510	538	652
Rolling Total Served	707	720	762
Returned from Previous Year (Retention)	125	142	234
% Change (Returned Students-Retention)	N/A	14% increase	65% increase
<u>Demographics of individuals served</u>			
% of Students PTE Majors	37%	30%	28%
% Male	39%	44%	41%
% Female	61%	56%	59%
<u>Other evidence of enhancing engagement</u>			
<u>Graduation Data per graduation year (across):</u>			
# identified as having a disability in the year: 03-04	33 grad in 05	25 grad in 06	6 grad in 07
04-05	24	24	14
05-06	4	26	22
06-07	9	13	34
Annual Total graduates with identified disabilities	70 grad in 05	88 grad in 06	76 grad in 07
<u>Enhances Student Learning</u>			
<u>CCSSE Benchmark-Supp for Learners-</u>			
<u>Accommodations Data:</u>			
Alt Format #Books/sets of materials/syllabi	328	277	24303
Alt Format Production – Scanning pages	--	22480	5278
Alt Format Production – Editing pages	--	890	2616
Alt Format – Braille pages	--	1250	98
Alt Format – Enlarging Pages	--	5444	58
Assistive Tech (students-duplicated term to term)	42	65	156
Furniture (students-duplicated term to term)	166	138	124/371
Test Accomms (students-duplicated tm to tm/Tests)	104/306	122/329	595
	--	596	794

Unit Planning for Instruction

	<i>2004-05</i>	<i>2005-06</i>	<i>2006-07</i>
Interpreter Hours	--	689	
Computer Assisted Notetaking hours			
Enhanced student persistence			
Other learning enhancement data			

Unit Planning for Instruction

Enhances Student Satisfaction

ACT STUDENT SATISFACTION DATA:

How often have you used Lane's Disability Services in the past year?

Often	12
Occasionally	25
Never	418

If you have used Disability Services, how satisfied are you with the services received?

Very Satisfied	17 = 44.7%
Somewhat Satisfied	12 = 31.6%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	4 = 10.5%
Very Dissatisfied	5 = 13.2%

DS STUDENT SATISFACTION DATA

I am satisfied with the quality of service I have received from DS staff:

	No Data	No Data	
# Students Surveyed			Fall W Sp
%Strongly Agree			#69 20 26
%Agree			67% 85% 73%
%Satisfactory			25% 15% 19%
%Disagree			9% 0 0
%Strongly Disagree			0 0 8%
%Not Applicable			0 0 0

The Letter of Accommodation helped facilitate communication with my instructor regarding accommodations:

	No Data	No Data	
# Students Surveyed			Fall W Sp
%Strongly Agree			#69 20 26
%Agree			58% 75% 73%
%Satisfactory			12% 10% 4%
%Disagree			4% 0 12%
%Strongly Disagree			0 0 0
%Not Applicable			0 0 4%
			26% 15% 8%

Accommodations have been implemented smoothly:

	No Data	No Data	
# Students Surveyed			Fall W Sp
% Strongly Agree			#69 20 26
% Agree			52% 60% 65%
%Satisfactory			16% 25%
% Disagree			11.5%
% Strongly Disagree			9% 5% 8%
			1.5% 0 0
			1.5% 0 4%
			20% 10%
			11.5%

Unit Planning for Instruction

% Not Applicable			
If there were difficulties with accommodations, were they resolved to your satisfaction?	No Data	No Data	
# Students Surveyed			Fall W Sp
% Yes			#69 20 26
% No			68% 50% 54%
% Not Applicable			11% 15% 15%
			22% 35% 31%
Other evidence of enhancing satisfaction			
Unit Efficiency			
Faculty/Staff to student ratios relative to benchmarks			
Lane's DS ratios of staff FTE per students served			
range between:			
Year Totals	1:207 to	1:218 to	1:175 to
Rolling Totals	1:283	1:288	1:299
Demand/capacity analysis (i.e. waitlists, complaints about access, etc.)		By spring term, 2-4 wks	1-2 weeks
Appointment wait time to see an advisor	Up to 6 weeks	Up to 4 weeks	1-2 weeks
Documentation Review wait time	Up to 10 wks		
Total general fund budget			
Allocated Budget			
Actual			
Spent	\$482,661	\$631,357	\$607,816
% Over/Under Budget at year end	\$605,457	\$703,165	\$649,932
	25% over	11% over	7% over
Budget from other sources (i.e., student fees, grants, etc.)			
Carl Perkins	\$20,545	\$21,124	\$20,940
Tech Fee	\$7,077	\$2,795	\$20,040
Tech Fee Contingency Requests	\$2,675	\$26,598	\$3,940
Other evidence of efficient use of resources			
Unit Essentialness			
Essential to completing a business process with students**			
Essential to an effective educational experience**			
Legally mandated**			
Other evidence of essential service			

**See Comments

Unit Planning for Instruction

Additional Comments/Clarifications to Student Services data elements

1. Unit Effectiveness

a. Engagement

- DS Front Desk contacts reduced by 20% in 06-07, no doubt as a direct result of budget cuts that closed the office to the public from 12-1pm Monday through Thursday, and at 2pm on Fridays. We believe this has significantly affected the department's ability to meet students' needs.
- Active (new and returning student data reduced by 10%, while returning students/retention stats increased by 65%... indicating a likely drop of new students. Some of the data indicates that fewer students ended the year not qualified, pending eligibility and eligible but inactive. This could be considered a positive outcome of efforts to have students be more aware of eligibility requirements through orientations prior to applying for services. However, the fact that active (new) students also decreased leads to a concern that some potentially eligible students may not be seeking support or finding the department accessible due to decreased hours of availability, or some other reason. We will continue to monitor this and explore the option of opening the office for more hours.
- We have added graduation data, which reflects the number of graduates in a given year who were identified as having a disability during various years before or after the year they graduated.

b. Learning

- Disability Services enhances learning by providing support for learners through accommodations, technology, advising, strategies, advocacy, facilitating communication between students and faculty/staff, providing education to faculty/staff and the community, etc. Statistics shown in Section 1 describe specific accommodations data over 3 years.
- Alternate Format has continued to change dramatically over the past year. The trend toward electronic delivery of materials continues to drive the development of our production processes as we strive to streamline and further refine existing scanning, editing and conversion practices. We have seen a global increase in accommodation requests for audio, text and Braille materials. The Braille requests, in particular, have been for subject areas that are some of the most complicated and time consuming to re-format: Music, Beginning and Intermediate Algebra, Pre-calculus and Biology. As a result, the need for editing and prep work increased substantially. We have also experienced a significant reduction in the need to produce hard copy enlargements as we became more proficient in the successful electronic transfer of these materials. Additionally, we continue to experience an increase in timely responses from publishers for requests for electronic materials, which will eventually reduce the need for the college to do this extensive, expensive work on site.
- Assistive Technology requests are slightly lower but the nature of these students' needs is complex and extensive.
- Furniture, Test Accommodation and Computer Assisted Notetaking demands continue to climb significantly.
- Interpreter needs have remained the same, but availability of interpreters is notably reduced. During the past summer, we worked with HR and the classified union to come up with a solution to the fact that other colleges in Oregon had increased pay rates to attract interpreters during this national shortage. The outcome was that Lane now can offer more adequate pay that is competitive with those in this region.

c. Satisfaction

Unit Planning for Instruction

- Satisfaction survey results...ACT survey questions are conducted every 2 years by IRAP. Disability Services Student satisfaction surveys are conducted the first couple of weeks of each term as of 06-07. Overall, the results are very positive, but the number of completed surveys is limited. Efforts are being made to increase respondents and to develop a follow up plan for problems identified in these survey results.
- Budget cuts led to reduced department hours, which we believe has affected student access to services, and therefore, satisfaction. Numerous problems (for students, DS staff, staff and faculty across campus) have resulted from the reduced hours. These include difficulty in getting equipment, reduced ability to problem solve, interruptions with reduced staff available during crises, etc.
- Each year, we work with a few students who are not satisfied with services. This can be due to requests for accommodations that we have determined the student is not eligible to receive, or because their disability interferes with their understanding of or ability to follow through with DS processes, or because we are unable to provide certain (expensive and non-mandated) services (e.g., diagnostic testing) that would be of great help to them. We always encourage students to let us know if they are uncomfortable or dissatisfied so that we can explore options to provide services and support that may be the most effective for them... but this is not always possible. We track these issues and resolutions through our DS communication forms.

2. Unit Efficiency

- The DS ratio of staff FTE to students in 06-07 is in a range from 1:175 to 1:299. We calculated this based on the varying numbers of students needing assistance in our office each year. This number (as well as the previous 2 years' ratios) far exceeds the nationally recommended best practice ratio of 1 staff to less than 100 students. Those best practice recommendations recognize that the nature of the needs of these students with disabilities tends to be volatile, time-intensive, high demand and very complex. We believe this is consistently proving to be true.
- The Demand Capacity Analysis shows that DS has dramatically reduced the wait times for students being able to see an advisor for a scheduled appointment, and the time it has taken for documentation to be reviewed and analyzed for eligibility. As a result, advisors are more readily available to see students on a drop-in, problem-solving basis. We continue to analyze whether our current procedures are creating problems that inhibit students from proceeding to complete their eligibility process.
- Historically, DS has overspent our grossly inadequate budget (by 48% in 03-04 and by 25% in 04-05). In 2005, DS was allocated a more reasonable budget and the department continues to reduce the annual overdraft created by unpredictable accommodation needs. The deficit in 05-06 was 11% and in 06-07 was only 7%.
- DS requests CP funds for non-computer needs that can be predicted (accommodation equipment repairs and upgrades, service provider costs). Carl Perkins money has also occasionally been available on an emergency basis for unexpected, urgent non-computer accommodation needs.

Unit Planning for Instruction

- Technology Fee funds have been granted to DS for critical computer-related accommodation needs or accommodation production needs. DS has also been able to obtain computer-related emergency accommodations through Tech Fee contingency funds.
3. Unit Essentialness
- Disability Services is primarily responsible for assuring that the college complies with federal regulations regarding disability issues, including:
 - Section 504, Subpart E of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which is a program access statute that requires public or private postsecondary education institutions (that receive federal funding) to be prepared to make appropriate academic adjustments and reasonable modifications to policies and practices in order to allow the full participation of students with disabilities in the same programs and activities available to non-disabled college students.
 - The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which essentially says that all public and most private entities (whether receiving federal funds or not) may not discriminate on the basis of disability. There are five titles within the Act, and Title II and III are the primary areas of the ADA that impact the accessibility of college programs and the services provided by DS.
 - Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which was expanded in 1998 to say the federal government is responsible for providing electronic and information technology that is accessible and usable by people with disabilities, as well as comparable to that provided to individuals without disabilities. (This refers to software, videotapes, audiotapes and other technology that must be accessible...)
 - Disability Services often serves as a consultant with other departments, including Financial Aid, Counseling, Testing, TRiO, Enrollment Services, Public Safety, Complaint process, Facilities, and Instructional Divisions. Each term, DS facilitates numerous problem-solving meetings with faculty, staff, students, and sometimes a parent or other agency professional, etc. DS also regularly works with the college's ADA/504 Compliance Officers in resolving complaints.
 - Receiving accommodations and support from Disability Services is an essential element for most students with disabilities in order for them to have equal access as well as an effective educational experience.

Section II: Accomplishments

This was submitted online (Accomplishments)

Unit Planning for Instruction

Section III: Planning for efficiencies, productivity and revenue enhancements:

Due December 7, 2007

2008-2009 (FY 09)

1. Efficiencies and Productivity: (Include impact, consequences, and comments)

NONE

2. Revenue Enhancements: (Include impact, consequences, and comments)

NONE

Unit Planning for Instruction

Section IV: This section is targeted to the three funding sources: Carl Perkins, Student Technology Fee, Curriculum Development, Deadline: January 31, 2008)

This will be online