Executive Summary - College Students with Disabilities: Their Future and Success

Catherine Fichten, Ph.D., Shirley Jorgensen, M.B.A., Alice Havel, Ph.D., Maria Barile, M.S.W.

With the Collaboration of

Marie-Eve Landry, M.Ps., Daniel Fiset, B.A., Jean-Charles Juhel, M.Ed., Sylvie Tétreault, Ph.D., Vittoria Ferraro, B.Sc., Caroline Chwojka, B.A., Mai N. Nguyen, B.Sc., Iris Alapin, M.A., Rosie Arcuri, Gabrielle Huard, Rhonda Amsel, M.Sc.

Adaptech Research Network - Dawson College, Montréal

Executive Summary

Abstract

In this investigation we examined views about obstacles and facilitators of academic success as perceived by Cegep graduates with and without disabilities as well as by Cegep based disability service providers and currently enrolled Cegep students with a variety of disabilities. Because both student and service provider perspectives are valid and reflect different aspects of the Cegep experience, information is needed about both views. The sampling also allowed us to determine similarities and differences between the experiences of nondisabled graduates and of graduates with disabilities who did, and those who did not, register to receive disability related services. It also enabled us to examine what happens to students after they graduate from Cegep (i.e., find out whether they were employed, continuing their studies, or doing something else) and to estimate what proportion of individuals with disabilities register to receive disability related services from their Cegep.

To accomplish this we studied (a) Cegep based disability service providers, (b) students with all types of disabilities who were enrolled at one of the 48 public Cegeps at the time of testing and who were registered to receive disability related services, and (c) three groups of recent graduates (nondisabled, with a disability and registered to receive services, with a disability and not registered to receive services). The graduates were sampled from three large Cegeps: Dawson College, Cégep du Vieux Montréal, and Cégep de Sainte-Foy. Disabilities studied included: learning disability/ADD, mobility impairment, hearing impairment, medically related condition, psychological disability, limitation in the use of hands/arms, low vision, blindness, neurological impairment, Deafness, speech/language impairment, and PDD (pervasive developmental disorder such as autism and Asperger's).

The data collected allowed us to answer the following questions: In what programs are students with disabilities registered at the college? What are graduates doing approximately one year after graduation? What are seen as personal, Cegep based, and external community based facilitators and obstacles to academic success? What can students, Cegeps and community based organizations do to facilitate the success outcomes of students with disabilities?

Here we summarize the findings and make recommendations for research and practice. Additional details are available in the full report along with English and French versions of the measure we developed - the Cegep Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) - in alternate formats.

Goals

To remove barriers, support success for students with disabilities in our postsecondary institutions and inform policy developers it is imperative that accurate information reflecting realities of diverse aspects of the Cegep community be made available to concerned groups and individuals so that they can: (a) help recruit, retain, and graduate students with disabilities, (b) ensure that these students have appropriate opportunities for further education and employment after they graduate, and (c) determine factors which influence the academic outcomes of students with disabilities that are unique to them and that are not evident from studies of nondisabled students. The overall goal of the present research was to provide such information which, ultimately, will help students with disabilities graduate and successfully compete for positions at university and in the workplace.

To realize this goal in the present research we (1) conducted a systematic study of what Cegep based disability service providers and current students with various disabilities perceive as important facilitators and obstacles in pursuing Cegep studies and in succeeding in the system, and (2) explored post Cegep educational and vocational outcomes and views about facilitators and obstacles of recent Cegep graduates with and without disabilities from both pre-university and career/technical programs. Because we surveyed all graduates from the three Cegeps with the largest enrollments of students with disabilities (i.e., Dawson College, Cégep de Ste-Foy, Cégep du Vieux Montréal), we were able to compare the views of nondisabled graduates, graduates with disabilities who registered to receive disability related services from their Cegep, as well as graduates with disabilities who did not register to receive services.

Specific goals were as follows
- Examine what makes it easier (facilitators) and harder (obstacles) for students with disabilities to succeed in their Cegep studies
- Explore similarities and differences between nondisabled Cegep graduates and graduates with disabilities who were and who were not registered to receive disability related services from their Cegep
- Describe what happens to students with disabilities after graduation
- Provide a questionnaire that evaluates academic obstacles and facilitators to students for use in institutional evaluation
- Inform policy development and practice

Method

The study was carried out in three phases. Response rates were 83% (Phase 1), 32% (Phase 2), and 28% (Phase 3).

- Phase 1 - 57 disability service providers completed the measures (Demographic Questions, Open-Ended Easier-Harder-Change Questions, Cegep Experience Questionnaire) by telephone interview during the fall 2004 semester.
- Phase 2 - 300 current students registered to receive disability related services from their Cegep completed similar measures during the winter 2005 semester. At least four weeks later, 159 of them completed the measures a second time (test-retest).
- Phase 3 - 1486 recent graduates with and without disabilities from two French and one English Cegep completed the same measures as well as the Post Cegep Questionnaire. 182 of these graduates indicated that they had a disability. 1304 had no disability.

Results

Sample characteristics and representation of students and graduates with disabilities in the Cegeps. Although this varied greatly, campus based disability service providers typically had seven years experience in the job and devoted an average of one day per week to providing services to students with disabilities. Over half of the campus based disability service providers reported that they had experience providing services to students with learning disabilities and mobility and hearing impairments. However, less than half of them had experience providing services to students with medical and psychological disabilities.

As is the trend in all postsecondary education, Cegep students with disabilities and all three groups of graduates were more likely to be female than male. Consistent with the results of an earlier study where we found that Cegep students with disabilities take one semester longer to graduate, in the present investigation we found that Cegep graduates with disabilities are, on average, ½ year older than their nondisabled counterparts. The vast majority (over 90%) of both current students with disabilities and all three groups of graduates were enrolled in a regular diploma program: approximately ½ in a pre-university program and ½ in a career/technical program.

The nature of the impairments of those who register to receive disability related services from their Cegep has changed over the years. Among the most common impairments of current students and graduates were: learning disability/attention deficit disorder, mobility impairment, hearing impairment, medically related disability, and psychological disability. Also, approximately 25% of those who registered for disability related services had two or more impairments.

The impairments of many students with disabilities no longer fit the original tripartite Québec Ministère de l'Éducation, Loisir et Sport (MELS) division of visual impairment, hearing impairment, and "other." In fact, a learning disability, the most common impairment reported by current students registered to receive disability related services from their Cegep, is not funded according to the MELS's traditional funding formula. Other common impairments of students include psychiatric and psychological disabilities, impairments which are not recognized or funded by the MELS, and about which disability service providers know relatively little.

We found that the proportion of Cegep students who are registered to receive disability related services has risen slightly since 1999. This change, however, is not dramatic and it may not be keeping up with corresponding increases in other provinces. Most troubling is that the percentage continues to be under 1% of the student body. Similarly, the percentage of students registered to receive disability related services for whom the Cegeps receive funding from the MELS has improved over the 1999 level, but only slightly. Currently, the Cegeps receive funding only for approximately ⅓ of the students who are actually registered to receive services. This has resulted in serious service provision and funding issues. Cegeps handle this problem in various ways. For example, some Cegeps have "waiting lists" for services.

Our study of graduates suggests that the actual proportion of Cegep students who self-identify as having a disability hovers around 10%, but that most students with disabilities do not register to receive disability related services. The majority of graduates with disabilities who had not registered for disability related services had medical, psychological, visual or learning disabilities.

Registered vs. unregistered students. As is the case in the rest of North American colleges and universites, our results suggest that the majority (approximately 90% in our sample) of students with self-reported disabilities in the Cegeps do not register to receive disability related services or accommodations. Therefore, estimating the rate of disability in the Cegeps using only those students who register significantly under-reports the actual rate. This also raises the question of whether there really are, proportionally, very few students with disabilities who require disability related services in the Cegep system or whether the students are enrolled, but, for a variety of reasons, do not register to receive disability related services.

Nevertheless, because most students with disabilities are not registered to receive disability related services, accommodations are often not made for them by faculty or staff. Therefore, there is increased need for universal instructional design, which involves educational strategies that are accessible to all students, including those with disabilities.

*Funding issues***.** Extrapolation suggests that there are approximately 15,000 students with disabilities currently enrolled in the Cegeps (i.e., approximately 10% of all Cegep students), although only about 10% of them register to receive disability related services from their Cegep. In turn, Cegeps receive funding for only about ⅓ of students who are registered, suggesting that there are serious financial concerns around providing services for students with disabilities.

The "emerging clientele." Reports from the disability service providers and from the managers in charge of services for students with disabilities at the three "centre d'accueil" Cegeps show important trends in the types of impairments presented by students to whom they provide services. Many of these are impairments for which Cegeps receive little or no funding from the MELS. The trend over time shows that the "emerging clientele" of students with learning disabilities, psychiatric and medical conditions has been increasing dramatically, resulting in even more important funding concerns. The "emerging clientele" has also posed difficulties for disability service providers who feel inexperienced and inadequate in providing services to many of these students.

Although the "emerging clientele" has translated into only very modest funding increases, the MELS has already instituted a variety of changes in the Cegeps to ensure that students with learning disabilities receive increased attention.

Using the Cegep Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) to facilitate student success. We developed the content of the 32 item closed-ended Cegep Experience Questionnaire and established that it has acceptable reliability and validity. Regular print, large print and digital (Word) versions are provided in the Appendix of the full report in French and English. Although there are no "norms," average scores for students with disabilities in general as well as for students with specific impairments are provided in the full report.

What factors make Cegep studies easier? Harder? What should be changed? In general, all samples of participants indicated more conditions that made academic studies easier than harder. This was especially notable in the case of Cegep based factors, which were generally seen as both important and quite facilitating. Students' personal situations and community and government based services were less so. In general, the more impairments a student reported having, the more obstacles he or she encountered.

Disability service providers identified numerous issues related to their functions which they considered important to student success. These include: good collaboration between professors and disability service providers; affordable diagnostic services external to the Cegep, such as evaluations of learning disabilities; students' ability to express their needs; the attitudes of the administration toward services provided to students with disabilities; identification of students' individual needs by the disability service provider; students' awareness of the impact of their disability; the budget allocated for disability services at the Cegep; willingness of students to use suitable accommodations; students' choice of career; and professors' level of knowledge about disability services and accommodations.

For the most part, individuals with and without disabilities reported similar facilitators as well as obstacles. Individuals with disabilities who did not register for disability related services, however, had significantly and substantially less facilitating scores overall, as well as on several Cegep environment related items, than nondisabled individuals or individuals with disabilities who did register.

Good teachers, tutors and learning centers (which assist with studying, writing, and exam taking skills and provide tutoring), and the availability of computers both on and off-campus were generally seen as important facilitators by current students and all three groups of graduates. Friends, good schedules, easy and interesting courses and programs, a good financial situation, good motivation and good study skills were also identified as facilitators. On the other hand, poor teachers, difficult courses, poor schedules, having to hold a job, transportation problems, a poor financial situation, lack of access to computers, having to take too many courses, poor study skills, demanding and boring programs, poor motivation, and insufficient time were generally seen as obstacles.

Consistent with the finding that the availability and accessibility of computers, both at the Cegep and off-campus, were seen as important facilitators, other investigations have also found that computers were rated as important facilitators by students with disabilities. In addition, a recent investigation shows that computer use on the job is associated with higher salaries for employees both with and without disabilities. Nevertheless, a comprehensive recent review, which showed that eLearning initiatives are important in Canadian postsecondary education, also noted that very little is known about eLearning needs and concerns of students with disabilities. Clearly, more research is needed.

Although level of personal motivation was rated as a very important facilitator by most students, it was seen as especially facilitating by students with learning disabilities. This is consistent with other research which showed that personal motivation was identified among the most important facilitators, along with family and friends, by students with learning disabilities.

Nondisabled graduates and graduates with disabilities who were and who were not registered to receive disability related services. The results also show that, overall, graduates with disabilities had significantly lower scores on personal situation items as well as on the overall Index of Difficulty (IDF) than nondisabled graduates. Issues of concern to those with disabilities include: poor health and the impact of their disability/impairment.

Improvements suggested by current students with disabilities as well as by graduates with and without disabilities were very similar and were generally aimed at aspects of the Cegep environment. Of greatest importance to all groups were better schedules, improving the college system, improving programs and courses in general, having better teachers, more available

computer technologies, support and help as well as improvements to the physical environment of the college. Changes suggested by disability service providers generally focused on improving the accessibility of classrooms and facilities as well as aspects of their services. Promoting collaboration and communication between staff, teachers and students, increased funding for their services, and better availability of tutoring were also frequent suggestions among disability service providers.

The data also suggest that it may be important for students with disabilities to register with their disability service provider. For example, graduates with disabilities who registered experienced certain aspects of their Cegep environment, such as the availability of computers and course materials, as more facilitating. They also had overall Index of Difficulty (IDF) scores that were more facilitating than graduates with disabilities who did not register. In fact, graduates with disabilities who did not register for services generally had the worst scores, especially on Cegep environment related items. The IDF score for graduates who had registered for disability related services was similar to that for graduates with no disabilities. However, when disability related items were excluded, the registered graduates had IDF scores that were, on average, more facilitating than those of graduates without disabilities. This was not true for unregistered graduates.

Consistent with reports by others, individuals with disabilities who were registered to receive disability related services from their Cegep overwhelmingly indicated that disability related accommodations were among the most important facilitators, along with sensitization and information dissemination about disabilities to teachers. In the present investigation specific accommodations seen as helpful were: having a note taker or interpreter in class, extended time for exams and assignments, accessible facilities, as well as MELS and college policies which permit students with disabilities to take a reduced number of courses and still be considered "full time students."

Not only has extended time been shown to be especially important to students with learning disabilities in other investigations, but it has also been shown to improve their scores. This has been found to be the case for both algebra and reading comprehension tasks where students with learning disabilities, who initially scored significantly lower than nondisabled peers under regular timing conditions, improved their scores and did not differ from nondisabled peers when both groups experienced extended time conditions.

Comparing students with disabilities and campus based disability service providers. In most cases students and service providers agreed on which factors were important as obstacles and facilitators. Exceptions show that although students identified a variety of "personal situation" variables as facilitators, such as friends, their schedule, computers off-campus, physical adaptations at home, and their finances, disability service providers did not do so. Also, students noted the following important obstacles that were not mentioned by service providers: too many and difficult courses, bad schedules, the impact of their impairment, a problematic financial situation, and having to hold a job while studying.

Campus based disability service providers, on the other hand, indicated that a knowledgeable service provider, pre-registration of students with disabilities for courses before other students register, the attitude and willingness of professors to adjust their courses to students' needs, and good counselling and academic advising were important facilitators - factors generally not noted by students with disabilities. On the other hand, although students did not identify these concerns, service providers were dissatisfied with various aspects of the disability related services and accommodations that they provide, with the lack of information and sensitization about disabilities in the Cegep, with having inadequate knowledge about disabilities and accommodations themselves, and with students' poor self-advocacy skills. Indeed, self-advocacy skills have long been seen as important for academic success by disability service providers and the importance of the evolving role of faculty in the successful outcomes of students with disabilities has been stressed in several recent publications.

What happens after graduation? Our findings show little difference in the percentage of graduates with and without disabilities who continued their studies after Cegep or in the percentages of those who were working full time or part time. Similarly, there was no significant difference between the employment rates of graduates with and without disabilities.

The employment rates of graduates in career/technical programs was very high - over 95% for both graduates with and without disabilities. Statistics Canada findings for people with and without disabilities in 2001 generally also showed little difference in the employment rates of adults with and without disabilities. There is an important caveat, however, because the overall statistics for Canada also show a huge difference between the proportions of people with and without disabilities who are not in the labor force. This was not found for Cegep graduates, as the proportions of graduates with and without disabilities who were studying or not available to the labor force for other reasons were very similar.

Also, there was no significant difference between graduates with and without disabilities concerning whether their employment was related to their field of study. This was also found to be true of university graduates in a large U.S. study. Indeed, the only important difference we found between graduates with and without disabilities was that graduates with disabilities in career/technical programs were less likely than their nondisabled counterparts to obtain employment in a field "closely" related to their field of study.

Conclusions

Overall, when it comes to individuals with disabilities in the Cegeps, the findings of this investigation show more positives than negatives. The proportion of Cegep students with disabilities has increased during the past five years. Participants reported substantially more facilitators than obstacles to student success, especially facilitators related to the Cegep environment. And, graduates with and without disabilities continued their studies and successfully joined the labor force in equal proportions.

There are, however, three major reasons for concern. First, the growth during the past five years in the number of students with disabilities who registered to receive disability related services from their Cegep has been limited and remains under 1% of the student body, compared to the approximately 6% we found for the rest of Canada five years ago. Second, the findings show that approximately nine out of 10 Cegep graduates who had a disability did not register for disability related services. Furthermore, these unregistered graduates with disabilities experienced more obstacles and, in particular, more Cegep related obstacles, than nondisabled graduates or graduates with disabilities who had registered for services. Third, the findings highlight serious funding problems for Cegep based disability related services that need urgent attention.

Recommendations

Research recommendations.

Evaluate obstacles and facilitators to students with different impairments before and after changes are made to Cegep policies and practices at the college.
- The Cegep Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) can be used to evaluate obstacles and facilitators for current students with and without disabilities as well as in institutional research surveys of students and graduates

Routinely include questions related to students' disability status and the nature of their disabilities in research.
- Include disability related questions on all Cegep based surveys and make sure these are available in alternate formats
- Include disability related questions on SRAM (Service régional d'admission du Montréal métropolitain) and SRAQ (Service régional d'admission au collégial de Québec) surveys

Conduct research on the accessibility of eLearning and computer technologies.
- Given that the availability of computers and information technologies was seen as either an important obstacle or an important facilitator, research on the accessibility of eLearning and computer technologies needs to be carried out at the Cegeps

Evaluate the impact of funding of Cegeps' disability related services.
- The academic outcomes of students for whom the Cegeps receive funding should be compared to those of students who are registered but for whom funding is not available (i.e., those with "recognized" vs. "not recognized" disabilities). High school leaving grade can be used as a covariate or as a basis for equating the two groups of students

Gather more information about students with disabilities who do not register to receive disability related services
- Those with disabilities who did not register for disability related services at their Cegep experienced more obstacles to academic success than either individuals with disabilities who had registered for services or nondisabled individuals.
- To ensure appropriate services to unregistered students with disabilities, more information is needed about them: Why do they not register? What are their needs and concerns? How can their educational needs best be met when they are not registered? Would they be better off academically if they were to register?
- There is a need to compare the academic outcomes of students with disabilities who are registered to receive disability related services and those who are not. Here, too, high school leaving grade can be used as a covariate or as a basis for equating the two groups of students

Evaluate the effectiveness of each type of Cegep based disability accommodation for students with different disabilities.
- Disability related accommodations were among the most important facilitators for individuals with disabilities

Conduct prospective and retrospective studies to investigate what happens to Cegep graduates.
- What happens to Cegep graduates with disabilities?
- Since such a large proportion of Cegep graduates continue their studies, how do graduates with disabilities fare at university compared to their nondisabled peers?
- How do the careers of technical program graduates, including their salaries, progress in the long term?

Practice recommendations. These are intended primarily for MELS and college personnel, including campus based disability service providers, faculty, managers of disability related resources, personnel responsible for student services, financial aid, information and computer technologies, professional development, etc.

There is a need for evidence based practice in providing disability related funding, services and accommodations in the Cegeps.
- Inform campus based disability service providers about relevant research findings to promote evidence based practice
- Use the newly developed Cegep Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) in program evaluation and in evaluations of how students with disabilities are faring at the Cegep
- Disability service providers can regularly administer the (CEQ) to their clientele to provide a snapshot of students' current situations. This can help improve services by incorporating the students' views, tracking changes over time, evaluating the impact of any improvements, and providing evidence to facilitate decision making by Cegep and MELS based administrators

There are fewer students with disabilities who are registered to receive disability related services in Québec's colleges compared to other provinces. Also, relatively few Cegep students with disabilities are registered to receive disability related services from their Cegep. In addition, appropriate accommodations and information dissemination about disabilities to the college community were seen as especially facilitating. This suggests that there is a need for greater visibility of disability related services and accommodations in a variety of contexts.
- Increase the visibility of disability related services at the college to incoming students by sending pamphlets to all students upon admission to the Cegep
- Develop a college guide for students with disabilities which provides information about the types of accommodations, resources and facilities available, and information about successful outcomes of students with disabilities, and make this available to all students, not only those with disabilities
- Develop a promotional video and pamphlet to discuss the services available to students with disabilities in the Cegeps. Include services that could benefit students with learning, psychological/psychiatric, and medical disabilities
- Publicize the success of students with disabilities and the availability of disability related services in various settings (e.g., within the Cegep, in high schools, in rehabilitation centers, to community groups, to the Ordre des conseillers et conseillères d'orientation et des psychoéducateurs et psychoéducatrices du Québec, to Emploi Québec, to adapted employment centres such as the SEMOs)
- Include information on disability related accommodations available at the Cegeps at open house and high school visits
- High school professionals and teachers need to motivate high school students with disabilities to attend Cegep

- Include disability related information in SRAM (Service régional d'admission du Montréal métropolitain) and SRAQ (Service régional d'admission au collégial de Québec) publications such as the "Guide aux études" and the "Guide général d'admission"
- Given the high priority accorded by both students with disabilities and disability service providers to sensitizing and informing others about disabilities, design and distribute promotional materials to sensitize and inform college personnel, especially faculty, about disabilities and appropriate accommodations
- Promotional materials could be designed and distributed to all college personnel, with a special emphasis on faculty
- Promote the benefits of registering for disability related services in Cegep newsletters, web sites, and other publications
- Suggest to faculty that they include a statement such as, "If you have a disability you may want to get in touch with the Cegep's campus based disability service provider so that he or she can provide appropriate accommodations to support your success" on all course outlines
- De-stigmatize registration for disability related services by including these among other services offered in the Cegeps (e.g., exam invigilation service, not intended exclusively for students with disabilities)

Students stated that their financial situations and their need to work at a paid job during the term posed obstacles.
- College personnel and MELS policy makers need to pay more attention to students' financial situations. There is an urgent need for better financial assistance to students with disabilities to reduce the need to work during the academic term
- Lobby for more government support to students with disabilities
- Get involved in committees to make improvements to government financial aid and compensation programs for students (e.g., social assistance, funding related to students' Cegep studies)
- Publicize the availability of scholarships to students with disabilities (cf. AQEIPS (Association québécoise des étudiants ayant des incapacités au postsecondaire), NEADS (National Educational Association of Disabled Students))

Students with disabilities indicated that friends constitute an important facilitator.
- Help develop a system of peer mentoring for students with disabilities

Employment is an important post-Cegep outcome.
- Provide support and training to students and graduates with disabilities to help them find summer and permanent jobs and internships
- Encourage prospective employers and adapted employment agencies (e.g., IAM CARES, SEMOs) to recruit on campus

Computer and information technologies, universal instructional design, and knowledgeable faculty were seen as important facilitators.
- Enhance access to computer technologies with needed adaptations for both Cegep and off-campus use
- Promote universal instructional design and the accessibility of eLearning to Cegep based organizations such as APOP (Association des applications pédagogiques de l'ordinateur au postsecondaire), AQPC (Association québécoise de pédagogie collégiale), profWeb (2006), Clic (Bulletin collégial des technologies de l'information et des communications)
- Provide more information about universal instructional design at professional development activities for faculty, disability service providers, and eLearning practitioners and specialists at the Cegep (e.g., PERFORMA, education degree programs)
- Enhance professors' knowledge by developing faculty teams which can promote accessibility to their peers
- Include consideration of the accessibility of eLearning in Cegep information and communication technology initiatives and activities
- Sensitize rehabilitation centers and officials from various ministries about the importance of computers for off-campus use
- Lobby for better funding for Cegep based adaptive and accessible computer tehcnologies

Campus based disability service providers believe that they are not sufficiently knowledgeable and that providing services to students with disabilities is not an important Cegep priority.

- Improve the status, recognition and relevance of disability service providers in the colleges
- Ensure more job stability of campus based disability service providers
- Provide additional opportunities for professional development for campus based disability service providers to become more knowledgeable about adaptive computer technologies and about how to better meet the needs of the increasing numbers of "emerging clientele" students with disabilities (e.g., students with medical and psychological impairments), whether these students are registered with the service or not

Improving services and accommodations for students with disabilities was seen as an important issue by both students and service providers.

- Given that personal situation factors posed significant obstacles to students with disabilities, campus based disability service providers need to pay more attention to ameliorating problematic situations in this realm.
- Provide services to students with all types of impairments
- Provide supplementary transportation services to supplement adapted transport
- Ensure better availability of tutoring
- Improve the accessibility of college buildings and facilities
- Because a good schedule was seen as an important facilitator, offer pre-registration to students with disabilities to permit them to obtain schedules that better fit with their impairments
- Because having too many courses was seen as an obstacle by many, inform students with disabilities that they are permitted to register for fewer courses and still be considered full-time students and encourage career/technical program coordinators to allow students to complete their studies in more semesters than specified in the program description
- Provide better links between inexperienced campus based disability service providers and the Eastern and Western Quebec "centre d'accueil" Cegeps

Improved funding for disability related services at Cegeps was seen as an important priority.

- The MELS needs to reconsider its funding formula for services to students with disabilities. Changes need to acknowledge the "unrecognized" disabilities of the "emerging clientele," such as learning disabilities, certain medical conditions and psychiatric disabilities

CEGEP EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Using the following scale, indicate in what way each of the items below has **affected your Cegep studies** by making them:

1	2	3	4	5	6	[N/A]
Much Harder	**Moderately Harder**	**Slightly Harder**	**Slightly Easier**	**Moderately Easier**	**Much Easier**	**Not Applicable**

Put a number beside all items. If an item is not applicable to you, respond with **N/A** (not applicable).

Personal Situation

1. _____Financial situation
2. _____Paid employment
3. _____Family situation
4. _____Friends
5. _____Level of personal motivation
6. _____Study habits
7. _____Previous education experiences
8. _____Health
9. _____Impact of my disability

Cegep Environment

10. _____Level of difficulty of courses
11. _____Course load
12. _____Course schedule
13. _____Attitudes of professors
14. _____Attitudes of non-teaching staff (e.g., registration staff, financial aid staff)
15. _____Attitudes of students
16. _____Availability of computers on campus
17. _____Training on computer technologies on campus
18. _____Availability of course materials
19. _____Opportunity to participate in Cegep extracurricular activities (e.g., clubs, sports, social activities)
20. _____Willingness of professors to adapt courses to my needs
21. _____Accessibility of building facilities (e.g., doorways, classrooms, labs)
22. _____Accessibility of Cegep physical education courses
23. _____Availability of disability related services at the Cegep

Government and Community Supports and Services

24. _____Availability of financial aid
25. _____Availability of tutoring outside the Cegep
26. _____Public transportation
27. _____Availability of computers off-campus
28. _____Training on computer technologies off-campus
29. _____Disability-related support services off-campus
30. _____Availability of adapted transport for student with disabilities
31. _____Coordination between disability-related support services (e.g., attendant care, adapted transport) and school
32. _____Availability of adaptations / career/technical aids at home (e.g., ramp, TDD)

Contact Information

For additional information and the full report, consult the Adaptech Research Network web site (http://www.adaptech.org) or contact one of the principal investigators.

Catherine S. Fichten, Ph.D.
cfichten@dawsoncollege.qc.ca

Shirley Jorgensen, M.B.A.
sjorgensen@dawsoncollege.qc.ca

Alice Havel, Ph.D.
ahavel@dawsoncollege.qc.ca

Maria Barile, M.S.W.
mbarile@dawsoncollege.qc.ca

Adaptech Research Network
Dawson College
3040 Sherbrooke St. West
Montréal, Québec
Canada H3Z 1A4

Tel: (514) 931-8731
Fax: (514) 931-3567
www.adaptech.org