5-2024

A multiple-methods assessment of faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction.

Kate A. Snider
University of Louisville

A MULTIPLE-METHODS ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD INCLUSIVE INSTRUCTION

By
Kate A. Snider
B.A., The University of Tennessee, 2010
M.A., San Jose State University, 2012

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Education and Human Development of the University of Louisville in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction

Department of Special Education, Early Childhood and Prevention Science
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2024

MULTIPLE-METHODS ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD

INCLUSIVE INSTRUCTION

By

Kate A. Snider
B.A., The University of Tennessee, 2010
M.A., San Jose State University, 2012

A Dissertation Approved on

April 8, 2024

By the following Dissertation Committee:

_____
Dissertation Director
Ginevra Courtade

_____
Justin Cooper

_____
Channon Horn

_____
Jeffrey Valentine

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I saved this page of writing for last and stared at the blank page for way too long, stressing that I would forget the amazing people who helped me finish the remainder of this dissertation. I am thankful to have worked with my dissertation committee, who helped me narrow my research focus and provided feedback along my dissertation journey. Special thanks go to my classmates and fellow "Purple People" who helped me stay focused on the light at the end of the tunnel and encouraged me throughout the program. I will forever be grateful for our official and unofficial work sessions, mental health breaks, and belly laughs.

I am fortunate to have such an amazing family, both chosen and biological. Without you, I would not have made it through a cross-country move during a pandemic and four years of a dissertation program. It goes without saying, but I am so thankful to my parents, Jon and Lydia, for always supporting me. Without you, I would not be the independent and strong woman I am today. Lastly, in the wise words of Snoop Dogg "I want to thank me for believing in me, I want to thank me for doing all this hard work. I wanna thank me for having no days off. I wanna thank me for never quitting. I wanna thank me for always being a giver and trying to give more than I receive. I wanna thank me for trying to do more right than wrong. I wanna thank me for being me at all times".

ABSTRACT

A MULTIPLE-METHODS ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD INCLUSIVE INSTRUCTION

Kate A. Snider

May 11, 2024

The enrollment landscape of postsecondary institutions in the United States has undergone significant demographic shifts, marked by increasing racial and ethnic diversity and a rise in enrollment of students with disabilities. Recognizing the importance of accommodating diverse learners, this study investigates faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction, Universal Design for Instruction, and disability-related topics. This multiple-methods study aimed to identify differences across faculty groups to establish an initial measure of faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching practices that can be used to design future training or professional development opportunities. Data was collected via an online distribution of the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI) and semi-structured interviews with faculty. A total of 89 surveys were used to conduct four one-way MANOVAs. The MANOVAS indicated significant results for faculty differences based on disability-related training and college affiliation for the subscales of Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. A thematic analysis of the open-ended survey question indicated generally positive perceptions of inclusive instruction and described two main limitations faced by faculty: the challenging workload and the feasibility of implementing inclusive practices and

accommodations. Phenomenological analysis of the data collected from faculty interviews indicated three recurrent themes across faculty experiences: (1) faculty using inclusive instructional practices and Universal Design for Instruction (UDI), (2) a need for more support for diverse student populations beyond those with disabilities, and (3) a transformation in faculty roles. Recommendations for the participating university include prioritizing faculty training on inclusive practices, particularly for those with limited prior training, and incorporating Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) principles into tenure and promotion criteria. The study also underscores the need for further research exploring the influence of technology on faculty attitudes and practices regarding inclusive instruction.

Keywords: Inclusive instruction, Universal Design for Instruction (UDI), Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI), faculty attitudes, postsecondary settings

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Postsecondary institutions in the United States are experiencing shifts in the enrollment of undergraduate students. Over the past two decades, college students have become more racially and ethnically diverse, where non-white students accounted for 46.6% of the total enrollment in 2015 compared to only 37.1% in 2003 (NCES, 2022). In addition to a more racially and ethnically diverse student body, there is an increase in the enrollment of students with disabilities that further contributes to the diversity of postsecondary students. According to the most recent data published by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 19.4% of undergraduates are students with disabilities, representing an 8% increase over twelve years (NCES 2011, NCES, 2021). The demographic changes of undergraduate students enrolled in postsecondary institutions suggest that faculty should aim to implement instructional practices that include and support diverse learners.

Additionally, a growing body of research suggests that rather than focusing on helping diverse students conform to the institutional structures of their universities, postsecondary institutions should adapt to the diversity of their students to improve retention (Tight, 2020). Faculty currently have a significant role in developing and supporting an institutional perspective that values and includes student diversity. Developing a better understanding of faculty attitudes toward diversity, specifically

toward students with disabilities may help support more inclusive practices and inclusive postsecondary environments.

In this study, I focused on faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction and students with disabilities, a growing population within postsecondary settings. Previous researchers have identified that faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities in postsecondary learning environments are generally positive but can vary by faculty gender, departmental affiliation, and type of accommodation they are asked to provide (Banks, 2019; Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Guilbaud et al., 2021; Lombardi et al., 2013). Additionally, researchers have indicated that faculty training related to disability awareness and the provision of accommodations have positive impacts on faculty attitudes and, ultimately, their ability to accommodate students with disabilities in their courses (Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Byrd, 2018; Guilbaud et al., 2021; Stevens et al., 2018). One approach to creating inclusive and accessible courses for diverse student populations is through Universal Design for Instruction (UDI). UDI was developed for postsecondary settings and incorporates many tenets of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). UDL is meant to support diverse learners, including those with disabilities, by providing equitable access and opportunities to participate in learning through multiple means of expression, multiple means of representation, and multiple means of action & engagement (Center for Applied Special Technology, 2015; Cumming & Rose, 2022). To comply with various disability laws in the United States, postsecondary institutions are legally required to provide equal access for students with disabilities to the same education, environment, and services as their peers without disabilities (Americans with Disabilities Act, 1990; The Rehabilitation Act, 1973). Within the course setting,

professors are often tasked with providing accommodations to students with disabilities without much knowledge or understanding of their responsibilities in upholding disability legal requirements (Ketterlin-Geller & Johnstone, 2006). Postsecondary faculty have a significant role in student success, especially for diverse students, including those with disabilities. Since faculty are the primary actors in providing accommodations and instruction, it is critical to understand their attitudes towards disability-related topics and inclusive teaching practices like UDI.

Review of the Literature

Disability Law and Postsecondary Institutions

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA, 1990) and the Rehabilitation Act (1973) are foundational laws that protect the rights of individuals with disabilities. Both laws were modeled after the Civil Rights Act (1964) and legally require equal access to spaces, services, and activities for individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA and Rehabilitation Act, an individual with a disability is defined as a person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, has a record of such impairment, or is regarded as having such an impairment (ADA, 1990; Rehabilitation Act, 1973). Within postsecondary education, a qualified individual with a disability is "a handicapped person who meets the academic and technical standards requisite to admission or participation in the recipient's education program or activity" (U.S. Department of Education, 2023, Para. 20). The definition's academic and technical standards component is often called "otherwise qualified," meaning that students with disabilities must meet the exact academic requirements and standards of students without disabilities (ADA, 1990; Rehabilitation Act, 1973). The provisions and

protections offered by the ADA and Rehabilitation Act are essential for students with disabilities in postsecondary settings regarding admissions, disability disclosure, accommodations, and financial assistance.

During college/university admissions, disclosing a student's disability status is not required, and mandated preadmission inquiries into disability status are prohibited. Although consideration of disability status is not required, institutions "may modify admission requirements as an accommodation for a student's disability" (Madaus & Shaw, 2004, p. 82; Rehabilitation Act, 1973). Standardized tests like the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), American College Test (ACT), and Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) are frequently a part of admission requirements for postsecondary schools. However, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act states that postsecondary institutions are not allowed to use tests that have "a disproportionate, adverse effect on individuals with disabilities" (Rothstein & Irzyk, 2019, p. 318). If a student with a disability does not meet admission requirements, including providing acceptable standardized exam scores, they have not shown that they are otherwise qualified and can be rejected for admission to the school like other students who have not met the entrance requirements.

When a student with a disability is admitted to a postsecondary school, the disclosure of their disability and pursuit of disability services is voluntary. If a student opts for nondisclosure of their disability and does not pursue accommodations, the institution cannot provide retroactive accommodations or services if the student decides to self-identify later in their postsecondary career. Additionally, if a student with a disability is unsuccessful in their coursework but did not disclose their disability and pursue accommodations, postsecondary schools are not required to modify or delete

grades that the student earned before they disclosed a disability and pursued accommodations (Madaus & Shaw, 2004).

One of the main goals of the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act is to ensure equal access to postsecondary education for students with disabilities. Postsecondary institutions must provide equal access to on-campus housing, transportation, and financial assistance. Furthermore, they are prohibited from charging students additional fees for the minimum level of reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids (Madaus & Shaw, 2004; Rothstein & Irzyk, 2019; U.S. Department of Education, 2021). The ADA requires postsecondary campuses to be accessible and follow specific architectural standards that ensure physical accessibility for students with disabilities. If buildings are not accessible to all students, they must be modified to enable access to individuals with disabilities, or their programs must be relocated to accessible buildings (ADA, 1990). Other legislation like the Fair Housing Act (2011; FHA) and governmental agencies (e.g., locally run vocational rehabilitation departments) may work with postsecondary schools to provide services and accommodations for students with disabilities as required by the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act. To ensure equal access for all students, postsecondary institutions are "required to make reasonable modifications to policies, practices, and procedures where necessary to avoid discrimination unless they can demonstrate that doing so would fundamentally alter the nature of the service, program, or activity being provided" (U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, 2020, para.14). Although there is a requirement of reasonable accommodations, they must be "readily achievable" by the postsecondary institution meaning that they are "easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense" (ADA, 1990). The passage of the Higher

Education Opportunity Act of 2008 broadened the scope of equal access to postsecondary education for students with disabilities by expanding grant opportunities, access to work-study programs, and endorsing teaching methods based on the principles of universal design for learning (Madaus et al., 2012). Disability laws and education policies provide more opportunities for students with disabilities to access postsecondary education, but many postsecondary institutions and faculty are challenged with serving more diverse student populations.

Universal Design in Postsecondary Institutions

Universal Design (UD) is rooted in architectural theory, which advocates for buildings to be designed to accommodate a wide variety of people rather than designed around a normative notion of a person (Meyer et al., 2014). Buildings utilizing UD have features like ramps, braille, and automatic door switches that support building access and can be used by many people. The theoretical foundation of UD has been applied within education and further developed into Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Universal Design for Instruction (UDI). Like the goal of UD in architecture, the theoretical premise of UDL and UDI is to make learning accessible for a broad range of learners. As student diversity in postsecondary settings increases, UDL and UDI provide educators and universities with a framework to support accessible learning for many students, including students with disabilities (Fornauf & Erickson, 2020).

The three principles of UDL are based on cognitive science research, which reflects the neurological organization of the brain (Center for Applied Special Technology, 2018a, 2018b). The three principles of UDL include providing multiple means of engagement, representation, and action & expression (Meyer et al., 2014;

Reardon et al., 2021; Cumming & Rose, 2022). The principles of UDL are commonly used in K-12 school settings and are focused on "adapting the curriculum to the learner, and not assuming that the learner needs to fit the curriculum" (Reardon et al., 2021, p. 211). Additionally, UDL aims to use best practices for student engagement while supporting teachers in meeting the needs of all students without specialized or specific teaching approaches (Reardon et al., 2021).

UDI is like UDL, but the UDI approach was explicitly developed for postsecondary settings and is defined as the "design of teaching and learning products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design" (Burgstahler, 2020, para. 3). The UDI framework has six components including scope, definition, process, principles, guidelines, and practices (Burgstahler, 2020). Although research on UDI is not as robust as the literature base for UDL, multiple studies have shown that UDI benefits both students with and without disabilities where both groups of students report high levels of satisfaction when UDI is implemented in postsecondary courses (Cumming & Rose, 2022; Dean et al., 2017; Kennette & Wilson, 2019; Tzivinikou, 2014). Additionally, faculty have reported improved teaching with the implementation of UDI but also express the need for more training and guidance in implementing UDI effectively (Cumming & Rose, 2022; Kumar & Wideman, 2014). Although faculty have reported improved teaching with the use of UDI, faculty attitudes have been cited as barriers to effectively implementing UDI (Cumming & Rose, 2022).

Faculty Attitudes

Previous studies have indicated generally positive faculty attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities and providing accommodations (Banks, 2019; Basilice, 2015; Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Lombardi et al., 2013; Smith, 2015). Several studies have compared faculty attitudes across groups, including gender and departmental affiliation. Banks (2019) reported differences in attitudes of faculty members across genders, indicating that female faculty members report higher levels of understanding of disability law compared to male faculty but showed that female faculty report a lack of knowledge in providing accommodations. Lombardi et al. (2013) found that female faculty with prior disability training scored higher than their male counterparts on the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory on the topics of Accommodations, Disability Law and Concepts, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, and Inclusive Classrooms. The results from both studies suggested that professional development or training may be an essential factor in how faculty responded to each study's attitude scale regardless of gender (Banks, 2019; Lombardi et al., 2013).

Several studies have indicated that faculty from different colleges within the same postsecondary setting have different attitudes regarding accommodations and working with students with disabilities. In Banks' (2019) study, faculty from the College of Education at one historically black college or university (HBCU) scored higher than faculty from other colleges on knowledge of learning disabilities, performance expectations, and perceived ability to provide accommodations. They also perceived themselves to have sufficient knowledge to provide instructional and examination accommodations compared to faculty from other colleges within the university.

Similarly, McGinty (2016) observed differences across colleges at Colorado State University. Faculty in the College of Health and Human Sciences and the School of Engineering indicated confusion about implementing accommodations for students and the appropriate etiquette and practices related to accommodations. These findings suggest that faculty attitudes can vary significantly across colleges within the same institution, which may create inconsistencies in students' access to services and accommodations.

While faculty generally exhibit positive attitudes toward providing accommodations for students with disabilities, there is variation in their attitudes towards certain types of accommodations. Faculty commonly referenced extra time, extended deadlines, separate testing locations, and the use of technology as commonly utilized approaches to accommodate and support academic achievement among students with disabilities (Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Guilbaud et al., 2021; McGinty, 2016; Smith, 2015). Although not frequently cited, some faculty contact the campus disability service office for suggestions and support in developing appropriate student accommodations (Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Guilbaud et al., 2021). Negative faculty attitudes toward significant accommodations, such as exempting students from exams and providing transcripts or captions for videos, were cited in several studies (Banks, 2019; Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Guilbaud et al., 2021). Exempting students from exams was described as ineffective, and providing students with transcripts and captions for videos was too time-consuming for faculty to provide on their own when they are also expected to fulfill the criteria for tenure and promotion, which do not prioritize teaching activities (Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Guilbaud et al., 2021). The most common suggestion for

improving faculty attitudes and support for providing accommodations is through training, professional development, and faculty outreach strategies.

The impact of professional development, training, and teaching experience on faculty perspectives regarding the provision of accommodations to students with disabilities is discussed throughout the existing literature (Banks, 2019; Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Corbran, 2020; Guilbaud et al., 2021; Lombardi et al., 2013; McGinty, 2016; Stevens et al., 2018; Wrage, 2017). Suggested topics for faculty training and professional development identified in multiple studies include practical implementation of accommodations, accessibility instruction for online courses, and developing an understanding of the faculty's role in upholding disability law (Banks, 2019; Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Foster, 2019; Guilbaud et al., 2021; Stevens et al., 2018). In the context of accessible online college courses for students with disabilities, Guilbaud et al. (2021) found that faculty with 6-10 years of online teaching experience showed slightly better performance and more positive perspectives than those with less than two years of experience or more than ten years of online teaching experience. Training and professional development complement teaching experience and influence faculty attitudes regarding accommodations. Guilbaud et al. (2021) and Lombardi et al. (2013) further note that faculty with training or professional development in teaching students with disabilities tend to have more optimistic perspectives on providing accommodations. Lombardi et al. (2013) also suggested utilizing faculty outreach strategies, including climate assessments, provision of a range of resources for faculty, using scenarios as exemplars for instructional planning, providing incentives, and supporting departmental collaborations with the disability services office.

Purpose of the Study

Multiple studies have been conducted to measure faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities in postsecondary settings (Abreu et al., 2017; Banks, 2019; Brockelman & Scheyett, 2015; Kim & Crowley, 2021; Lombardi et al., 2013; Mamboleo et al., 2020). As student populations become more diverse, faculty must be prepared to provide equitable access to learning in their courses for broad ranges of learner types. Researchers have reported that faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities can be influenced by professional development and training (Banks, 2019; Guilbaud et al., 2021; Lombardi et al., 2013). More training or professional development in disability-related topics has been shown to improve faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities and increase their knowledge of providing accommodations in their courses (Byrd, 2018; Lombardi et al., 2011; Lombardi & Murray, 2011). Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) is a promising framework for postsecondary faculty to implement to increase course equity and access for students with disabilities and diverse backgrounds. Studies regarding the effectiveness of UDI in postsecondary settings are limited but indicate that both faculty and students see positive impacts in course access and learning accessibility (Cumming & Rose, 2022). In this study, I aimed to establish an initial measure of faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching practices that can be used to design future training or professional development opportunities. This study moved beyond the current literature base by using quantitative and qualitative methods to measure faculty attitudes. I used quantitative and qualitative methods to provide nuanced information regarding differences across faculty groups. It allowed faculty to share their experiences, knowledge, and ideas regarding inclusive teaching and learning environments.

Research Questions

Quantitative Research Questions

I addressed the following quantitative research questions in this study:

1. Are there differences between faculty groups regarding attitudes toward disability-related topics and inclusive instruction?
    a. What is the impact of gender, teaching experience, disability-related training, and college affiliation on faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching strategies?

Qualitative Research Questions

I addressed the following qualitative research questions in this study:

2. What are the experiences of faculty with inclusive instruction and UDI practices?

Theoretical Framework

Critical disability theory is used to guide the qualitative design portion of this study. In this section, I describe the theory and how it was applied to the study. The participants in this study were faculty members at one university who have various levels of experience and understanding regarding disability-related topics, inclusive instruction, and barriers to inclusive instruction using a Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) framework. The critical disability theoretical framework supports exploring faculty experiences with and attitudes towards disability-related topics and inclusive teaching to provide the University with data to inform future faculty training or professional development.

Critical disability theory is an interdisciplinary framework that aims to critically analyze and challenge the dominant narratives surrounding disability. Researchers within

the critical theory paradigm “seek to understand the relationship between societal structures (e.g., economic, political) and ideological patterns of thought that impede a person or group from identifying, confronting and addressing unjust social systems” (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2009, p.126). Reflecting the critical theory paradigm, critical disability theory goes beyond traditional models of disability and examines the social, cultural, and political factors that shape disability experiences. Specifically, critical disability theory examines and exposes the unequal power dynamics that marginalize individuals with disabilities (Hall, 2019). A central concept in critical disability theory is the social model of disability. The social model distinguishes between impairment (the physical, sensory, or cognitive differences an individual may have) and disability (the social barriers and discrimination imposed on individuals with impairments; Rothman, 2010; Shakespeare, 2017). The social model posits that society's attitudes, inaccessible environments, and discriminatory practices disable individuals rather than their impairments. This perspective challenges the medical model, which views disability as a personal deficit to be fixed (Rothman, 2010; Shakespeare, 2017). Within the postsecondary setting, a student who does not fit the expected learning model and is struggling to access learning can be described as having a deficit in their abilities rather than the course or instruction being identified as lacking inclusive design. A critical disability theoretical approach suggests that a deficit response to struggling learners in postsecondary courses is oppressive because it marginalizes and excludes students who do not adapt to the existing educational structures. Within this framework, faculty are significant actors in reinforcing or removing oppressive barriers within the classroom and institution settings.

Critical disability theory provides a strong foundation for supporting the use of Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) in the postsecondary education setting. UDI is an inclusive approach to teaching and learning that aims to create accessible and equitable learning environments for all students, including those with disabilities (Burgstahler, 2008). The standard didactic teaching model in postsecondary courses may contribute to the oppression of students from diverse backgrounds and limit their academic success because they do not fit within this teaching and learning model. UDI emphasizes student engagement and active learning and provides students with multiple ways to use their unique learning strengths to demonstrate their understanding. In theory, developing an inclusive classroom by implementing the principles of UDI would limit the need for individualized accommodations that may inadvertently oppress or limit the success of diverse students. This study seeks to describe faculty attitudes towards students with disabilities and inclusive teaching practices via UDI to inform future institutional decisions regarding inclusive teaching practices. Additionally, faculty will be asked what barriers they face implementing inclusive teaching practices to identify potential solutions and next steps for institution-wide support and implementation of inclusive teaching practices. Identifying faculty attitudes, actions, and suggestions for utilizing UDI to improve educational outcomes for all students, not just students with disabilities, aligns with the critical theory paradigm and critical disability theoretical framework by challenging ableism, addressing systemic barriers, and creating inclusive and equitable learning environments that empower all students to engage and succeed in their educational pursuits fully.

Assumptions

In this study, I work with three primary assumptions, including:

1. The survey was distributed via email, and the study assumes that the participants who completed the survey were the intended recipients, resulting in the anticipated sample population.
2. For both the survey responses and interviews, it is assumed that the participants were honest and reliable in their responses.
3. It is assumed that the survey instrument, the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI), is a valid measure of faculty attitudes towards inclusive instruction and disability-related concepts.

Delimitations and Limitations

The research design used for the current study poses several interrelated delimitations and limitations. First, the scope of the study potentially limited the generalizability of the results since data were collected from one university location. While the study sample spanned several colleges at the University and included diverse faculty participants, population generalizations might be limited due to the exclusion of faculty demographic groups that could exist in other postsecondary settings, such as community colleges, private universities, and non-research-one four-year universities.

Another limitation of the study relates to sampling procedures. The University's Office of Academic Planning and Accountability determined the sample population pool to avoid conflicts with other university-wide survey research. The sample population pool did not include all faculty members at the University. However, I collaborated with the Office of Institutional Research and Office of Academic Planning and Accountability to

develop a diverse and representative sample population pool. Additionally, the current study relied on a volunteer participant sample where factors like willingness to participate, technology skills, and availability to complete the survey or participate in interviews may have influenced which faculty members participated. All completed surveys were used for data analysis to limit the threat of selection bias for this study.

Definitions of Major Terms

Accommodations

For this study, accommodations are, "Any reasonable modification, adaptation, or alteration in the delivery of instruction, curriculum, or test-taking process that enables students with disabilities to have equal access to education" (Chaturvedi, 2010, p. 17)

Disability Resource Center (DRC)

The center or office is located on a postsecondary campus. It is responsible for ensuring that the institution meets the legal provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973). The DRC establishes and directs services and accommodations for students with disabilities.

Faculty

This study includes all full-time and part-time teaching employees at the University, including professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, and clinical faculty members.

Inclusive Instruction

Inclusive instruction refers to teacher practices and strategies that develop an inclusive learning environment for students from diverse backgrounds, including students with disabilities. Inclusive instruction is based on the tenets of UDI.

Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI)

The Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI) is a Likert scale that measures attitudes and actions toward inclusive instructional practices. The ITSI attitudes scale measures attitudes toward inclusive instruction and uses a six-point Likert scale where one is "strongly disagree," and six is "strongly agree". The action scale of the ITSI is not used in this study, so the mention of ITSI scores throughout this project refers to ITSI attitude scores only.

Postsecondary Institution

All two- and four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Includes both degree-granting and non-degree-granting institutions.

Student(s) with Disabilities

These students meet the legal definition of an individual with a disability and have self-disclosed their disability to the postsecondary institution's Disability Resource Center to access accommodations. The legal definition provided by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA, 1990) states that an individual with a disability is an individual who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such individual; has a record of such an impairment; or is regarded as having such an impairment (ADA, 1990).

Universal Design

Universal design is an architectural concept where buildings and environments "can be accessed, understood, and used to the greatest extent possible by all people regardless of their age, size, ability, or disability. An environment (or any building,

product, or service in that environment) should be designed to meet the needs of all people who wish to use it" (National Disability Authority, 2020, para. 1).

Universal Design for Instruction (UDI)

UDI was explicitly developed for use in postsecondary education settings and is the "design of teaching and learning products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design" (Burgstahler, 2020, para. 5).

Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

UDL is commonly used in K-12 school settings and emphasizes adapting the curriculum to the learner by combining different engagement approaches and supports for instructors (Reardon et al., 2021). UDL emphasizes intentionally adjusting the learning environment to reduce barriers so that "all learners can engage in rigorous, meaningful learning" (Center for Applied Special Technology, 2018c, para. 1).

The University

References to the University identify and describe the four-year public university where the present study occurred and from which the study sample was defined and selected.

Study Summary

Postsecondary institutions in the United States are experiencing shifts in undergraduate student enrollment, marked by increased racial and ethnic diversity and a rise in students with disabilities. The changing student demographics highlight the need for faculty to implement instructional practices that support diverse learners. This study focuses explicitly on faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction and students with

disabilities in higher education's evolving landscape. The significant role of faculty in student success, especially for diverse students, underscores the importance of understanding their attitudes toward disability-related topics and inclusive teaching practices like Universal Design for Instruction (UDI).

In this study, I aimed to measure faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching and disability-related topics using quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore differences across faculty groups and experiences with inclusive instruction and Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) practices. My research is framed by the critical theory paradigm and critical disability theory, highlighting the imperative for a paradigm shift in understanding and addressing diverse student needs in higher education.

CHAPTER II: METHODS

A multiple-methods research approach was used to measure faculty attitudes and describe their personal experiences with inclusive instruction. Implementing a multiple-methods design in a complementary way enabled the development of a complete description of the status of faculty and their experiences with inclusive instructional practices and UDI. The current data trends in the United States show that postsecondary student populations are becoming more diverse, suggesting that faculty should be prepared to incorporate more inclusive teaching practices. The combination of quantitative and qualitative results from this study helped inform future faculty training and potential institutional policy changes in a unique and influential manner that neither quantitative nor qualitative approaches achieved independently.

Chapter II is divided into two sections: the quantitative methodological approach and the qualitative methodological approach. The study did not occur in phases, and dividing Chapter II into two parts based on methodology was an organizational choice to support clarity and understanding for the readers. Both methodological approaches are presented by first restating the research question(s) followed by the study design, instrument, procedures, and analysis. I conclude the chapter with a summary of the study's methods.

Quantitative Research Questions

The following quantitative research questions were addressed in this study:

1. Are there differences between faculty groups regarding attitudes toward disability-related topics and inclusive instruction?
    a. What is the impact of gender, teaching experience, disability-related training, and college affiliation on faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching strategies?

Specifically, I designed the study to determine whether faculty college affiliation, gender, teaching experience, and disability-related training produced score differences on the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI; Lombardi et al., 2015).

Quantitative Participants and Setting

Participants for the quantitative portion of this study were selected from a population of 2,891 faculty at a four-year public university in a midwestern state. According to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, the University is a Very High Research Activity university with twelve colleges, including a School of Medicine, a School of Dentistry, and a School of Law (American Council on Education, 2023). At the time of the study, 16,121 undergraduates and 6,099 graduate students were enrolled at the University (University of Louisville, 2023). More than 70% of undergraduates were enrolled full-time. Most of the faculty at the University were full-time faculty (63%), and 51.4% of faculty were male (University of Louisville, 2023). Of ranked faculty, 24.8% were assistant professors, 20.2% were associate professors, 19.4% were professors, and 0.04% were instructors. A total of 909 (31.4%) faculty were reported to have no faculty rank or were labeled as “other” (University of Louisville, 2023). Most faculty members at the University were white (71%), and the most

prominent minority group was Asian/Pacific Islanders, representing 11% of the faculty population (University of Louisville, 2023).

I used a nonprobability sample of faculty members from the University. Specifically, a convenience sample was used because it is based on the participants' willingness and availability to participate in the study (Fraenkel et al., 2015). Additionally, the sample population was provided by the University's Office of Academic Planning and Accountability to avoid interference with other existing institutional survey projects. According to the University, the most recent number of total faculty at the University is 2,891 individuals (The University of Louisville, 2023). The total sample size provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability was 1,326 faculty members. The sample provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability and the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability was pulled from the employee software Peoplesoft. The program SAS then pulled a random sample of 50% of the faculty population stratified by unit so I had a sample representative of different colleges across campus. The quantitative instrument was sent via email to all 1,326 faculty members identified by the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability.

Quantitative Instrument

The Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI) was used for data collection. Prior approval to use the ITSI for this study was given by Dr. Lombardi, the lead author and developer of the instrument (Appendix A). The ITSI measures inclusive instruction through seven factors related to disability knowledge, laws, and inclusive teaching based on UDI. The seven factors include Accommodations, Accessible Course Material, Course

Modifications, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Laws and Concepts (Lombardi et al., 2015). The survey was electronically distributed using the platform Blue by Explorance Inc. (2024). I received training from the Office of Institutional Research on creating and distributing surveys with Blue, which is the University's preferred survey platform. Before responding to the ITSI questions, participants were asked to complete a short demographic section on their college affiliation, gender identity, teaching experience, and disability-related training. The demographic data provided general information about the sample and served as the independent variables for parametric analysis. This study used the attitudes question stems from the ITSI to measure faculty attitudes towards the seven constructs via 6-point Likert scale response items from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Each item for the Attitude stems begins with “I believe it’s important to” (Lombardi et al., 2015, p. 459). The item response stems related to the seventh construct of Disability Law and Concepts is "I am confident in…" and uses the same 6-point Likert scaled response options as the other subscales. The second part of the ITSI measures faculty actions related to six constructs measured with a 4-point Likert scale, but it was not used in this study.

Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes toward disability-related knowledge, laws, and UDI when measuring faculty attitudes. The attitudes stem has 39 items, and Appendix B lists the ITSI subscales, items, and response stems. In addition to the attitude items, there was an optional open-ended question for participant comments and an optional recruitment question to identify potential participants for the qualitative portion of the study.

The ITSI was previously named the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners (ExCEL) survey, where exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using principal axis factoring and an oblique rotation identified eight factors (Lombardi & Murray, 2011). The current seven-factor structure of the ITSI was identified through a cross-validation study that used EFA and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA, Lombardi et al., 2013). Additionally, EFA and CFA results support the seven-factor structure of the ITSI even when translated into German (Lombardi et al., 2021). Cronbach's alpha has been used to measure the internal consistency of the ITSI subscales, with scores ranging from .70 to .91 (Lombardi et al., 2013; Lombardi et al., 2021).

Quantitative Data Collection Procedures

The quantitative data collection took place over one month once IRB approval was granted. Survey participants had the opportunity to enter a raffle for one of three $75 gift cards for completing the survey. Once the survey was closed, the three gift card winners were selected using a computerized random generator. Winners of the gift cards were notified via email. The following quantitative procedures were implemented in the study:

1. The ITSI survey was electronically distributed to the faculty identified by the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability . Informed consent to participate was included in the email as well as the first page of the survey. Participants either completed the survey immediately or paused and returned to it to finish later.

2. The survey was open for one month, and reminder emails were sent on days five, 10, and 14 after the initial survey distribution. The reminder emails included the importance of the study and the opportunity to win a gift card.
3. Potential participants for the qualitative portion of the study were identified through an optional question on the survey. Recruitment and interviews with participants of the qualitative portion co-occurred with the quantitative portion of the study.
4. The survey closed at midnight one month after the initial email was distributed.
5. After the survey closed, results were downloaded in an Excel file and converted into an SPSS Inc. (2023) data file for analysis.
6. The raffle winners for each of the $75 gift cards were randomly selected, and the three winners were notified via email.
7. The qualitative data collection phase continued past the month-long timeline of the quantitative phase and is presented in detail in the Qualitative Design section.

Quantitative Analysis

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Multiple one-way MANOVA parametric analyses compared differences across groups for multiple dependent variables. In this study, multiple dependent variables (ITSI subscale scores) measured the underlying construct of attitude towards inclusive instruction. Data were collected for the variables of interest, where the dependent variables were ITSI subscale scores and the independent variables were faculty groups, including college affiliation, gender identity, teaching experience, and disability-related

training. Table 1 lists each of the variables of interest. Additionally, descriptive statistics were conducted on the demographic data collected from the survey.

Table 1

Variables of Interest

Independent Variables		
College Affiliation	12 categories	College of Arts & Sciences, College of Business, School of Dentistry, College of Education & Human Development, School of Engineering, Graduate School, School of Law, School of Medicine, School of Music, School of Nursing, School of Public Health & Information Sciences, School of Social Work & Family Science
Disability-Related Training	5 categories	No training, >1-10 hours, 11-23 hours, 24-48 hours, more than 48 hours
Gender Identity*	4 categories	Female, Male, Transgender, None of these
Teaching Experience	3 categories	0-6 years, 7-12 years, 13+ years

Dependent Variables	
ITSI Subscales	Number of Items
Accommodations	8
Accessible Course Materials	3
Course Modifications	4
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	4
Inclusive Classroom	9
Inclusive Assessment	4
Disability Law & Concepts	5

Note. * Options reflect categories used by the U.S. Census Bureau (2021).

Four one-way MANOVAs were conducted to determine if faculty groups differed in ITSI scores. The Wilks' Lambda test statistic was used to determine significance ($p <$

.05). Significant MANOVA results were followed up with separate ANOVAs with Bonferroni corrections on each significant dependent variable to identify the significant differences (Field, 2014; Pallant, 2016).

Before running the MANOVA, underlying assumptions were checked, including sample size, normality, outliers, linearity, multicollinearity and singularity, and homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Table 2 lists the testing assumptions of MANOVA and how they were assessed.

Table 2

MANOVA Testing Assumptions

Assumption	Assessment of Assumption
Sample Size	Must have more cases in each group than DVs
Normality	Shapiro-Wilk test of normality
Outliers	Boxplots & Mahalanobis distances
Linearity	Scatterplots between each pair of dependent variables
Multicollinearity & Singularity	Run a correlation between DVs, problematic if r = .90 or higher
Homogeneity of Variance-covariance Matrices	Box's M Test; part of MANOVA output and looking for $p > .001$

Note. DV= dependent variable; IVs= independent variable

Qualitative Research Question

The following qualitative research question was addressed in this study:

2. What are the experiences of faculty with inclusive instruction?

Qualitative Approach, Participants, and Setting

An optional open-ended question was added to the ITSI survey that asked participants to share any additional comments, insights, or experiences related to inclusive instruction. Responses to the open-ended survey question underwent a thematic analysis to identify shared themes that described faculty's experiences with inclusive instruction and disability-related topics. The interview component of the study used a phenomenological research approach to explore the lived experiences of faculty by describing "what all participants have in common as they experience a phenomenon" (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 75). The phenomenological approach to describe individual participants' experiences with inclusive instruction relied on data collected through semi-structured interviews. The interviews sought to identify individual faculty experiences with inclusive instructional practices and develop a shared composite description of faculty experiences with inclusive instruction and UDI.

The sample for the qualitative portion of this study was survey participants who volunteered for in-depth interviews via their responses to the interview recruitment item on the ITSI survey. Each interview participant received a $75 gift card as compensation for their time. The researcher reached out to four interested participants based on their responses to the demographic questions on the survey and expressed interest in participating in the interviews. The intention regarding purposefully selecting interview participants was to increase the diversity of the sample. The interviews aimed to capture experiences across faculty groups within the University (i.e., departmental affiliation, teaching experience, etc.). A heterogeneous interview sample yielded more nuanced information than a homogeneous interview sample.

The target sample size for in-depth interviews was four faculty members. Phenomenological studies typically have a sample of 3-25 participants. A sample size of four faculty members for interviews was appropriate given the scope of the study, in which the qualitative analysis was a portion of a larger multiple-methods design.

After interview participants were selected, semi-structured interviews were conducted via Microsoft Teams. Through the platform, I was able to record interview sessions and transcribe data. The online meeting platform provided more options for interview scheduling because the interviewer and participant could be in a different location. Due to participant availability, study time limitations, and the scope of the overall multiple-methods approach, each participant completed one 30-min interview.

Faculty responses to the open-ended survey question were recorded. The responses were formatted and uploaded into ATLAS.ti (2022) for thematic analysis.

Qualitative Instruments

Semi-Structured Interviews

The interview protocol used open-ended questions and incorporated some aspects of the ITSI Action survey items (Appendix C). The semi-structured interviews followed the structure of phenomenological interviewing established by Bevan (2014), including contextualization, apprehending the phenomenon, and clarifying the phenomenon. After the interviews were complete, the transcription was downloaded from the meeting platform. The downloaded transcripts were read, formatted, and uploaded into ATLAS.ti for analysis.

Open-Ended Survey Responses

The open-ended item on the survey asked participants to "Please share any additional comments, insights, or experiences related to inclusive instruction here:" The open-ended responses provided by participants were downloaded from the survey platform, formatted into a Word document, and then uploaded to the ATLAS.ti (2022) platform for thematic analysis.

Qualitative Procedures

The qualitative portion of this study overlapped with the quantitative portion in that the open-ended questions and interview recruitment questions were included in the ITSI survey. The interviews began as soon as potential participants responded to the recruitment question included in the ITSI survey. The interviews occurred during and after the survey phase, depending on participant scheduling availability. The following procedures were implemented during the qualitative phase of the study:

1. Survey participants responded to the open-ended question, and potential interview participants responded to the recruitment question on the ITSI survey.
2. The open-ended responses were formatted and uploaded to ATLAS.ti (2022) for analysis.
3. Four participants were selected from the recruitment responses and were emailed a brief description of the interview format and a copy of the informed consent. Participants were asked about their meeting availability and scheduled for the interview via the online meeting platform.
4. The interview recruitment and scheduling occurred while the ISTI survey was open and continued after the survey was closed. The initial interview protocol was used to guide the interview. Unscripted questions were used when the participant

shared their experiences to further contribute to documenting the faculty experiences with inclusive instruction.

5. All interviews were recorded and transcribed through the meeting platform. Transcriptions were screened, formatted, and uploaded to ATLAS.ti (2022) for analysis.
6. After each interview, participants received a $75 gift card for their participation.

Qualitative Analysis

Phenomenological data analysis was used to analyze the data collected during interviews. The analysis followed the four generalized steps described by Creswell and Poth (2018), which are based on the foundational work of Moustakas (1994) and Polkinghorne (1989). Step one suggests generalizing the themes from the analysis of significant statements. Moustakas (1994) called this stage horizonalization, which is followed by the development of "clusters of meaning from these significant statements into themes" (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 79). The second step developed textual and structural descriptions. The significant statements and themes described the participants' experiences (textual description). The significant statements and themes were also used to develop a structural description of participants' experiences by describing "the context or setting that influenced how the participants experienced the phenomenon" (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 80). The third procedure reported the *essence* of inclusive instruction through a composite description (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The essence of a phenomenon is also referred to as the essential invariant structure. A composite description includes the structural and textual descriptions created in step two. The composite description focused on the interview participants' experiences with inclusive instruction. The final

step created a written report, included in the results and discussion sections, that presents the understanding of the essence of inclusive instruction as experienced by faculty participants at the University (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Moustakas, 1994).

Chapter Summary

I used a multiple-methods approach to examine faculty attitudes and experiences regarding inclusive instruction. Study participants were faculty members from one university located in a midwestern state. A convenience sample of faculty based on the participants' willingness and availability to participate was used for quantitative and qualitative analyses.

The quantitative portion of the study used the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI) to measure faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction and disability-related topics. Multiple MANOVA analyses of ITSI data determined if differences existed between faculty groups on attitudes toward disability-related topics and inclusive instruction. Faculty groups included in the analysis are gender identity, college affiliation, prior disability-related training, and teaching experience.

The qualitative portion of the study was designed to use an open-ended survey question and semi-structured interviews to describe faculty's experiences with inclusive instruction. A thematic analysis of the open-ended responses identified a collective theme regarding inclusive instruction, and a phenomenological approach was used to analyze data from the semi-structured interviews to generate an understanding of the essence of inclusive instruction as experienced by the faculty interview participants.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

With the quantitative portion of this study, I aimed to identify differences across faculty groups in terms of their attitudes toward inclusive instruction, UDI, and disability-related concepts. Four one-way MANOVAs were conducted to test for differences in ITSI scores across the faculty groups of gender, teaching experience, disability training, and college affiliation. The seven dependent variables for each MANOVA were the composite subscale scores of the ITSI. Participant's responses were averaged for each subscale so that they had an average score for Accommodations, Accessible Course Materials, Course Modifications, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. Since each question of the ITSI is measured on a six-point Likert scale, each subscale composite score ranges from 1 to 6. The ITSI survey was distributed electronically over one month in the spring of 2024. Potential participants were identified by the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability and shared with the primary investigator. A link to the survey was sent to all potential participants via email using the survey platform Blue.

Sample Group Characteristics

A total of 114 responses were collected from the sample of 1,326 faculty members provided by the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability, which reflected an 8.6% response rate. Two of the 114 responses were excluded because they were incomplete or invalid. Additionally, there were not enough responses in all the College Affiliation, Disability-Related Training, and Gender categories for statistical

testing. Only the College of Arts and Sciences (Arts and Sciences), the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), the School of Medicine (Medicine), and the College of Business (Business) had enough respondents to conduct the statistical analysis. As such, the college affiliation variable reflects four levels, not twelve. The Disability Related Training group was combined into four levels rather than five since the "more than 48 hours" category had limited responses. Lastly, the gender group reflects only female and male respondents because the categories of transgender ($n = 0$) and prefer not to state ($n = 4$) did not have adequate numbers for statistical analysis.

A total of 89 responses were used for statistical analysis (Table 3). Just over half of the survey respondents were male (52.8%), and most respondents were associated with the College of Arts and Sciences (38.2%). Most faculty reported having 13 or more years of teaching experience and 10 hours or less of disability-related training. One participant did not indicate their level of teaching experience.

Table 3

Sample Group Demographics

Variable	Response	Frequency	Percent
College	Arts & Sciences	34	38.2%
	CEHD	25	28.1%
	Medicine	16	18%
	Business	14	15.7%
Gender	Female	38	42.7%
	Male	47	52.8%
Teaching Experience	0-6 years	21	23.6%
	7-12 years	18	20.2%
	13+ years	49	55.1%
Training	No Training	26	29.2%
	1-10 hours	32	36%
	11-23 hours	14	15.7%
	24 or more hours	17	19.1%

MANOVA Results

Testing assumptions for the four MANOVAs were conducted. All data, except for Disability Law and Concepts data, failed normality. The data that failed to meet the normality assumption had significance values at .007 or less for the Shapiro-Wilk normality test (Table 4).

Table 4

Normality Tests

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Accommodations	.871	89	< .001
Accessible Course Materials	.915	89	< .001
Course Modifications	.959	89	.007
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	.893	89	< .001
Inclusive Classroom	.926	89	< .001
Inclusive Assessment	.914	89	< .001
Disability Law and Concepts	.983	89	.307

Additional inspection of descriptive data indicated non-normality and that the data was negatively skewed (Table 5). Univariate and multivariate outliers were examined using boxplots and Mahalanobis distances, indicating six univariate and two multivariate outliers. Both types of outliers were left in the data being analyzed. The six univariate outliers were included because they did not have extreme values (more than three box lengths from the bottom edge of the boxplot). Additionally, comparing the trimmed mean and mean for Accessible Course Materials and Inclusive Classrooms data showed differences of 0.0708 and 0.0588, indicating that the univariate outliers were not impactful (Table 5). The two multivariate outliers exceeded the Mahalanobis distance critical value of 24.32 but were included in the dataset because they minimally exceeded the critical value of 24.32 (26.06 and 27.22). Although the data violated the normality

assumption, the MANOVA was still conducted since it is “reasonably robust to modest violations of normality” (Pallant, 2016, p. 291).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables

Variable Statistics	Accommodations	Accessible Course Materials	Course Modifications	Inclusive Lecture Strategies	Inclusive Classroom	Inclusive Assessment	Disability Law and Concepts
N	89	89	89	89	89	89	89
Mean	5.3202	4.9747	3.1816	5.2247	4.9853	4.5927	4.2629
5 % Trimmed Mean	5.3784	5.0448	3.1755	5.2761	5.0441	4.6734	4.2872
Median	5.50	5.00	3.25	5.25	5.00	4.75	4.33
SD	.681	.888	1.301	.721	.781	1.059	.912
Minimum	3.50	2.25	1.00	3.25	2.22	1.00	1.50
Maximum	6.00	6.00	5.75	6	6.00	6.00	6.00
Skewness	-.984	-.866	-.111	-.734	-1.008	-.957	-.395
Kurtosis	.257	.476	-.997	-.088	1.358	1.663	287

Scatterplots between each pair of variables indicated a linear relationship. Pearson correlations between the seven dependent variables were all significant ($p < .001$), where correlation values ranged from .277 to .649 (Table 6). The moderate to strong correlations indicated no multicollinearity. Lastly, Box's *M* tests indicated no violations of homogeneity of covariance-variance matrices for faculty gender ($p = .046$), teaching experience ($p = .14$), disability training ($p = .062$), and college affiliation ($p = .252$). Since the remaining assumptions of MANOVA testing were met, the data was analyzed using MANOVAs to address research questions 1 (RQ1) and 1a (RQ1a).

Table 6

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

	Accommodations	Accessible Course Materials	Course Modifications	Inclusive Lecture Strategies	Inclusive Classroom	Inclusive Assessment
Accommodations	—					
Accessible Course Materials	.453**	—				
Course Modifications	.457**	.443**	—			
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	.471**	.433**	.372**	—		
Inclusive Classroom	.502**	.558**	.581**	.578**	—	
Inclusive Assessment	.536**	.452**	.630**	.413**	.649**	—
Disability Law and Concepts	.452**	.319**	.277**	.202	.326**	.395**

Note. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Research Questions 1 and 1a

RQ1. Are there differences between faculty groups regarding attitudes toward disability-related topics and inclusive instruction?

RQ1a. What is the impact of gender, teaching experience, disability-related training, and college affiliation on faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching strategies?

To answer RQ1 and RQ1a, I conducted a series of one-way MANOVA tests. I used Wilk's Lambda with a significance level of .05 for each MANOVA test. Significant MANOVA results were followed up with univariate analysis, where I used a Bonferroni adjustment and post hoc tests. The following sections present the details of each MANOVA result, listed by the independent variable.

Gender

I performed a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance to investigate gender differences in faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction. The seven dependent variables were average scores on each ITSI subscale, including Accommodations, Accessible Course Materials, Course Modifications, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. The independent variable was gender, which had two levels (female and male). Faculty who responded as female had higher scores on all the dependent variables except Disability Law and Concepts (Table 7). The male faculty's average score on Disability Law and Concepts was .007 greater than that of the female faculty (Table 7).

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics by Gender

	Gender	Mean	SD
Accommodations	Female	5.41	.603
	Male	5.27	.747
Accessible Course Materials	Female	5.11	.714
	Male	4.85	.998
Course Modifications	Female	3.41	1.362
	Male	3.10	1.202
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	Female	5.37	.737
	Male	5.10	.681
Inclusive Classroom	Female	5.09	.756
	Male	4.92	.767
Inclusive Assessment	Female	4.76	.817
	Male	4.53	1.110
Disability Law and Concepts	Female	4.25	.902
	Male	4.33	.931

Although I observed differences in overall mean scores across genders, the differences between genders on the combined dependent variables were not statistically significant where $F(7, 77) = .666$, $p = .700$; Wilks' $\Lambda = .943$; partial $\eta 2 = .057$.

Teaching Experience

I performed a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance to investigate differences in teaching experience and faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction. The seven dependent variables were average scores on each ITSI subscale, including Accommodations, Accessible Course Materials, Course Modifications, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. The independent variable was teaching experience, which had three levels: 0-6 years, 7-12 years, and 13 or more years. Faculty who responded as having 0-6 years of teaching experience had higher average scores on Accommodations, Course Modifications, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, and Inclusive Classrooms compared to

faculty who indicated 7-12 years or 13+ years of teaching experience. (Table 8). Faculty with 7-12 years of teaching experience scored higher on Accessible Course Materials and Inclusive Assessment than their counterparts. Faculty with 13+ years of teaching experience only had the highest mean score for one subscale, which was Disability Law and Concepts (Table 8).

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics by Teaching Experience

	Teaching Experience	Mean	SD
Accommodations	0-6 years	5.47	.522
	7-12 years	5.17	.699
	13+ years	5.28	.728
Accessible Course Materials	0-6 years	4.99	.944
	7-12 years	5.17	.556
	13+ years	4.91	.968
Course Modifications	0-6 years	3.38	1.07
	7-12 years	3.35	1.31
	13+ years	3.04	1.40
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	0-6 years	5.39	.630
	7-12 years	5.35	.681
	13+ years	5.11	.769
Inclusive Classroom	0-6 years	5.23	.498
	7-12 years	5.10	.510
	13+ years	4.84	.912
Inclusive Assessment	0-6 years	4.79	.845
	7-12 years	4.85	.854
	13+ years	4.41	1.194
Disability Law and Concepts	0-6 years	4.23	.933
	7-12 years	4.12	.802
	13+ years	4.31	.955

Although I observed differences in overall mean scores across teaching experience, the differences between teaching experience on the combined dependent variables were not statistically significant where $F(14, 158) = 1.030$, $p = .427$; Wilks' $\Lambda = .840$; partial $\eta 2 = .084$.

Disability Training

I performed a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance to investigate disability training differences in faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction. The seven dependent variables were average scores on each ITSI subscale, including Accommodations, Accessible Course Materials, Course Modifications, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. The independent variable was disability training, which had four levels: no training, 1-10 hours, 11-23 hours, and 24 or more hours. There was a statistically significant difference across disability training levels on the combined dependent variables, where $F(21, 227.395) = 2.355$, $p = .001$; Wilks' $\Lambda = .568$; partial $\eta 2 = .172$. My follow-up univariate analysis (ANOVA) using a Bonferroni adjustment set at $p < .025$ considered the dependent variables separately and indicated that Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts had differences that reached statistical significance (Table 9). I identified a statistically significant difference in Inclusive Classrooms scores across faculty levels of disability training $F(3, 85) = 6.257$, $p < .001$, partial eta squared = .181. I also identified a statistically significant difference in Inclusive Assessment scores between faculty levels of disability training $F(3, 85) = 4.292$, $p = .007$, partial eta squared = .132. Lastly, I identified a statistically significant

difference in Disability Law and Concepts scores between faculty levels of disability training $F(3, 85) = 8.127$, $p < .001$, partial eta squared = .223.

Table 9

Disability Training ANOVA

	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance	Partial Eta Squared
Accommodations	2.967	3	.989	2.221	.092	.073
Accessible Course Materials	4.808	3	1.603	2.109	.105	.069
Course Modifications	9.009	3	3.003	1.823	.149	.060
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	1.428	3	.476	.913	.438	.031
Inclusive Classroom	9.697	3	3.232	6.257	<.001	.181
Inclusive Assessment	12.980	3	4.327	4.292	.007	.132
Disability Law and Concepts	16.306	3	5.435	8.127	<.001	.223

The Tukey post-hoc testing results are shown in Table 10. The post hoc tests indicated that for Inclusive Classrooms scores, faculty with 1-10 hours of disability training had statistically significantly higher mean scores than faculty with no training ($p = .004$). Similarly, faculty with 11-23 hours of disability training had statistically significantly higher scores than faculty without ($p = .001$). Tukey post-hoc tests showed that for Inclusive Assessment scores, faculty with 1-10 hours and faculty with 11-23 hours of disability training had statistically significantly higher scores than faculty with

no training (p= .027 and p = .026). Lastly, Tukey post-hoc tests indicated that for Disability Law and Concepts scores, faculty with 24 or more hours of training scored statistically significantly higher than faculty with no training (p < .001) and faculty with 1-10 hours of disability training (p = .020). Faculty with 11-23 hours of training scored statistically significantly higher than faculty without training (p = .005).

Table 10

Tukey Post Hoc Tests for Disability Training

Dependent Variable			Mean Difference	Stand. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Inclusive Classroom	1-10 hours	No training	.6701*	.18978	.004	.1728	1.1675
		11-23 hours	-.2366	.23032	.734	-.8402	.3670
		24 or more hours	.2102	.21572	.764	-.3551	.7755
	11-23 hours	No training	.9067*	.23827	.001	.2823	1.5312
		1-10 hours	.2366	.23032	.734	-.3670	.8402
		24 or more hours	.4468	.25941	.319	-.2330	1.1266
Inclusive Assessment	1-10 hours	No training	.7560*	.26510	.027	.0613	1.4507
		11-23 hours	-.1987	.32174	.926	-1.0418	.6445
		24 or more hours	.5671	.30134	.244	-.2226	1.3568
	11-23 hours	No training	.9547*	.33284	.026	.0824	1.8269
		1-10 hours	.1987	.32174	.926	-.6445	1.0418
		24 or more hours	.7658	.36237	.157	-.1839	1.7154
Disability Law and Concepts	24 or more hours	No training	1.1422*	.25507	<.001	.4737	1.8106
		1-10 hours	.7286*	.24544	.020	.0854	1.3718
		11-23 hours	.2136	.29514	.887	-.5599	.9870

Note. Based on observed means. *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

College Affiliation

I performed a one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance to investigate differences in college affiliations and faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction. The seven dependent variables were average scores on each ITSI subscale, including Accommodations, Accessible Course Materials, Course Modifications, Inclusive Lecture Strategies, Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. The independent variable was college affiliation, which had four levels, including Arts and Sciences, the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), the School of Medicine (Medicine), and the College of Business (Business). I identified a statistically significant difference across colleges on the combined dependent variables, $F(21, 227.395) = 2.022$, $p = .006$; Wilks' $\Lambda = .612$; partial $\eta 2 = .151$. My follow-up univariate analysis (ANOVA) using a Bonferroni adjustment set at $p < .025$ considered the dependent variables separately and indicated a statistically significant difference in Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts scores across college affiliations. I identified a statistically significant difference in Inclusive Classrooms scores between colleges $F(3, 85) = 2.769$, $p = .047$; partial $\eta 2 = .089$ (Table 11). I also identified a statistically significant difference in Inclusive Assessment scores between colleges $F(3, 85) = 2.915$, $p = .039$; partial $\eta 2 = .093$. Lastly, I identified a statistically significant difference in Disability Law and Concepts scores between colleges $F(3, 85) = 2.949$, $p = .037$; partial $\eta 2 = .094$.

Table 11

College Affiliation ANOVA

	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance	Partial Eta Squared
Accommodations	2.995	3	.998	2.244	.089	.073
Accessible Course Materials	4.620	3	1.540	2.021	.117	.067
Course Modifications	4.154	3	1.385	.813	.490	.028
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	3.238	3	1.079	2.158	.099	.071
Inclusive Classroom	4.773	3	1.591	2.769	.047	.089
Inclusive Assessment	9.204	3	3.068	2.915	.039	.093
Disability Law and Concepts	6.897	3	2.299	2.949	.037	.094

Table 12 shows the Tukey post hoc tests for college affiliation. The results of the Tukey post hoc tests showed that for Disability Law and Concepts scores, faculty from the CEHD had statistically significantly higher mean scores than faculty from Arts and Sciences (p = .023). Inclusive Classrooms and Inclusive Assessment scores did not yield significant Tukey post hoc results.

Table 12

Tukey Post Hoc Tests for College Affiliation

Dependent Variable			Mean Difference	Stand. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Disability Law and Concepts	CEHD	Arts & Sciences	.6774*	.23260	.023	.0678	1.2869
		Medicine	.3293	.28266	.650	-.4114	1.0701
		Business	.5198	.29471	.298	-.2525	1.2921

Note. Based on observed means. * The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Qualitative Results

In the qualitative portion of this study, I aimed to describe the lived experiences of faculty related to inclusive instruction. Specifically, I sought to answer the second research question (RQ2):

RQ2: What are the experiences of faculty with inclusive instruction?

I conducted a thematic analysis of faculty responses to the open-ended question on the ITSI survey, which indicated that faculty have a positive perception of inclusive instruction but express limitations in implementing it or providing accommodations for students with disabilities. The constraints described by faculty are centered on two main categories (a) faculty workload and (b) feasibility of implementing inclusive instructional practices and accommodations. I also collected data from semi-structured interviews and used a phenomenological approach to describe individual faculty experiences with inclusive instruction. I then identified the commonalities across the faculty experiences and used them to develop a composite description of their experiences.

Thematic Analysis

I collected a total of 40 open-ended responses from the survey. The responses indicated various experiences and perspectives regarding inclusive teaching and accommodations for students with disabilities. Overall, faculty recognized the importance of inclusive instruction and had a willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. Still, individual circumstances and knowledge gaps, especially regarding Disability Law and Concepts, may have impacted the extent to which accommodations were provided. The challenges of workload and feasibility for instructors in implementing inclusive practices were a recurring theme. Several faculty responses indicated that their ability to support inclusive teaching practices and UDI was limited by their current workload, lack of compensation for additional hours worked, and lack of resources to support accommodations. Additionally, some participants expressed concerns about the lack of clarity and communication regarding accommodations. One participant stated that their interaction with the DRC was a hindrance. Still, most respondents who interacted with the DRC had positive experiences and felt well-informed and supported by the center. The respondents suggested recommendations that included better communication from the University and the development of a centralized university webpage to provide information on inclusive instruction for faculty, students, and staff. Figure 1 is a compilation of frequently used words from the open-ended survey response data that I used to develop the thematic analysis. Words that appear larger and in darker shades were used most frequently.

Figure 1

Concept Map of Thematic Analysis Word Frequency

Interview Sample Description

I purposefully chose interview participants to increase the diversity of the sample. The faculty who participated in the interviews represented differing groups based on gender, teaching experience, college affiliation, and disability-related training. I prioritized interviewing participants from different colleges and colleges not included in the MANOVA analysis. Dr. Smith was chosen because he is a new faculty member with

limited teaching experience. Table 13 provides demographic information for all interview participants.

Table 13

Interview Participant Demographics

	Gender	Teaching Experience	Disability-Related Training	College Affiliation
Dr. Smith	Male	0-6 years	No Training	Arts and Sciences
Dr. Davis	Female	13+ years	1-10 hours	Public Health and Information Sciences
Dr. Brown	Male	7-12 years	1-10 hours	Nursing
Dr. Jones	Male	7-12 years	More than 48 hours	Dentistry

Interview Participant Analysis

Dr. Smith

Dr. Smith taught a mid-level course with 100 undergraduates. In each class session, he checked in with students and reviewed what was covered in the previous class. He also encouraged students to ask questions and participate in discussions. Dr. Smith tried to normalize students' questions and sometimes asked other students to help answer them. He also incorporated in-class activities and quizzes for participation-based assessment. Technology played a role in the class, as everything was done through Blackboard. Dr. Smith had experience working with students with disabilities and provided accommodations such as extra time on exams and reduced distraction environments. The main challenge he described is getting students with accommodations to schedule their exams at the appropriate time. Dr. Smith suggested having the DRC schedule the exams in a dedicated room rather than relying on students to schedule them individually:

> I almost wish that I could, like at the beginning of the semester, give the DRC like when I'm planning to give the exams and they would have the students that need to take it and then like, they could just schedule that in a classroom somewhere and have someone proctor it. Rather than, so that I can just be like, reach out to the students that have an accommodation and be like, you need to go to this room to take the exam rather than like putting it on them to schedule something because the DRC is already doing work to like, try to schedule things rather than like, schedule one on one, like maybe moving the middleman, the middle person, and like trying to just work with the professor.

Dr. Smith strived for inclusive instruction by being open about his identities and setting expectations for respectful behavior. An example he shared included addressing transphobia, racism, and other forms of discrimination at the start of his courses. Despite his concern regarding the political climate in the University's location, Dr. Smith described the importance of reflecting on his experience as a first-generation queer student and how sharing that resonated with a student and it "really made a difference to them, like, they were like this is the first queer professor that I've known about" and that "they were excited about". To Dr. Smith, inclusive instruction went beyond providing accommodations to students with disabilities, and his value in developing inclusive instructional environments seemed rooted in his personal experiences and respect for other people's identities and perspectives.

Dr. Smith discussed the importance of creating a family-friendly classroom where students can bring their children if necessary. He also mentioned the need for university-wide changes to promote inclusive instruction, such as providing junior faculty with their first semester off to focus on learning inclusive teaching practices. Dr. Smith shared how he struggles to balance the demands of being a junior faculty member with his desire to learn about inclusive teaching:

> So the first thing that comes to mind, and this is something I reflected on some with other junior faculty, is that is like sort of preventing the second piece, is that

> I have had trouble sort of balancing the needs of being a junior faculty and like, literally just like prepping the course with then trying to also learn about like inclusive teaching practices because of like time. Basically, is just like there's, I don't I like just mentally and physically don't have enough time to add this to my plate right now. And it sort of tears at me because I'm like, I want to be doing that, but at the same time, like, if I don't do these other things, then I can't, like if I don't prep the courses right, like I can't then inclusive teaching is irrelevant because I'm not gonna have a course.

He expressed the need for the University to prioritize and support inclusive teaching by setting aside time for faculty to learn and implement inclusive strategies. Additionally, time dedicated by the University "would be super helpful for like removing the barriers to getting the information as far as like what that information is and what the policies are at the university".

Dr. Davis

Dr. Davis typically taught in-person undergraduate classes twice weekly for about 1 hour and 15 min. Class sizes ranged from 25 to 45 students. Her doctoral-level courses were smaller, with anywhere from three to eight students. These classes were also in-person, and the curriculum focused on critical pedagogy. Dr. Davis incorporated a variety of teaching methods, including mini-lectures, activities, case studies, and technology tools like Kahoot and Jam Board. She strived to create an inclusive environment where all students could participate, regardless of their learning preferences or challenges. Dr. Davis had an evident passion for continuing to develop her skills and understanding of inclusive instruction by attending professional development offered through the Delphi Center and other technology-related training. She shared that her academic department is very supportive of inclusive instruction, which is embedded in their research and throughout the department.

Dr. Davis also emphasized the importance of providing students with support and resources through a case management model and connecting them with academic counselors and other services:

> So much is like, this is probably off topic but, like, I think it's I think it's related to being setting up an inclusive environment but like this idea of umm of doing, like, case management as a faculty member. Like, very brief, I've started developing something just in my own practice, and I'm thinking about it a lot right now, which is like, identifying students basically like week three. Okay, I'm seeing that they're not showing up, right? This is a huge red flag. So how do I reach out to them with their academic counselor Cc'd on it, and umm, and you know, kind of do a quick assessment of like, hey respond to this, I want to figure out what's going on with you; I'm noticing you're not in class. Umm, let's chat for 15 minutes virtual meeting. And those that agree to that, it's usually an opportunity to kind of get quickly to the bottom of like, it's usually a financial issue. Like what's going on with you, you're working nights, you haven't time managed very well, you might be taking care of family member, lots of stuff going on but let's figure that out and case manage you and then I can hand it off to the academic counselor and the student success coordinator. Then they're able to kind of take it from there to basically like, get that student some smarter access, right? Or more fast access to like maybe emergency funds, or food from the cupboard or whatever it is that they need.

Dr. Davis's responses made a case for faculty playing a critical role in promoting equity and inclusivity beyond the four walls of a classroom. However, she noted that there may be barriers to this, such as faculty perceptions of their role and the lack of information or resources provided to them where there was "this barrier of like, you know, we don't really give this information to faculty. I have some questions about that, like why can't we have access?" Dr. Davis advocated increasing faculty access to resources, support, and information to enhance inclusive instruction.

Dr. Davis believed that faculty should be more active in supporting students, specifically mentioning students with high needs, Pell Grant recipients, LGBTQ students, and students with disabilities. Dr. Davis believed that one way for the University to show its investment in being inclusive is to update older buildings that "just kind of like it just

feels like a hangover from, like, a bygone era of how people lectured". She shared that many of the older buildings are not trauma-informed, nor are the "learning spaces equitable across campus". Dr. Davis was invested in inclusive instruction but also acknowledged the systemic element of inclusivity where:

> The effectiveness of how inclusive my learning environment is, is only one piece of the puzzle and that you step back and you look at the larger system, and that's the piece I was kind of, I was probably overwhelming you on, which just like, how do we, you know, what is our responsibility to students that have less access, higher needs, more trauma, more you know, more umm vulnerable identities? Like, I think that's part of this, it goes beyond, you know what we're doing in the classroom, and it goes to how are we providing them the necessary support to ensure that they can get to our classroom. And be in our classroom without, you know, and mitigating and minimizing what they're carrying figuratively into our classroom.

Dr. Brown

Dr. Brown taught face-to-face classes to both sophomore and junior nursing students. He used audience participation software to engage students and often incorporated case studies into his lectures. Dr. Brown used technology such as Panopto (screen and voice capture) and Top Hat (dynamic courseware) to record and distribute lectures and Blackboard to communicate important course information. Regarding inclusive teaching practices, Dr. Brown had worked with the DRC to accommodate students with disabilities who required closed captioning for videos and American Sign Language translators. Dr. Brown had a positive experience collaborating with the DRC and Delphi Center to ensure the students had the appropriate accommodations and materials. Adding a DRC on the Health Sciences campus has positively affected faculty and students. Dr. Brown stated that it is much easier to provide accommodations for students with disabilities now that there is a branch of the DRC on his campus. Dr. Brown and colleagues worked closely with the DRC to rewrite the College of Nursing's

policy on clinical absences due to injuries. Dr. Brown described the old policy and how it negatively impacted students:

> We rewrote our policy on clinical absences due to injuries. Umm, it used to be that students who, like, slipped on the ice and broke a collarbone, we'd say we're really sorry you've got this injury; you're gonna have to drop out and come back next semester because you can't go into a clinical and, and work with a broken collarbone. And the Disability Resource Center, somebody said we can't keep doing this because we're putting students behind. So, another faculty member and I were tasked, and we went to the DRC and we had them look at our current policy and they were like, you can't have another student work with this student? Like, you can't provide a reasonable accommodation to meet the objectives in the syllabus? Like, you can't have them, you know, the student doesn't need to use that arm all the time. Can you get them to use their brains? And then have another student boost the patient up in bed if they need it. So, we rewrote our policy for, umm, return after injury, illness, or pregnancy so that we could accommodate students that had a chronic or acute disability, like a broken bone or a pregnancy.

In addition to accommodating students with disabilities, Dr. Brown was very mindful of other diverse student populations. Dr. Brown used diverse representations in his lectures and worked closely with culturally and linguistically diverse students. When preparing content and finding images for his courses, Dr. Brown was purposeful in selecting what goes into his lectures to reflect diversity. He described how he selects images for his lectures and chooses pseudonyms for patient case studies:

> I use a lot of Google images, images I take from Google image search and I, I have to be specific, so I'll have to say older Korean patient because if I just put older patient, I'll end up with a page and a half of older white people you know, and it's like Google has no idea it does this. And I'm not blaming Google, but it occurred to me after I was looking at one of my lectures. I'm like, all these are white people. Like, there's no black people. There's no trans people, so I, I've very deliberately worked pictures of people. I work white people into my lectures, but they'll have equal representation, right? And it's like cause there's, you know. Umm, also the names that I use. I, I will use umm Mandarin names. I'll use Bhutanese names. I'll use French names when I'm using a case study because I don't want them to all be John Smith or Mary Jones. Umm, umm and that's a very deliberate strategy. I, I think they kind of get that.

Dr. Brown stated that his students were culturally and linguistically diverse. He expressed frustration over “not allowing accommodations for students where English is not their first or not their learning language”. He wrote a letter to the provost expressing his frustration, stating: “You know, we've got these students, and I've already mentioned earlier, you know, they've got, uh, they've got to do a lot of translation when they're reading these questions, we, we need to give them accommodations, you know, time and a half or double time to be able to take an exam”. He also described his experience having a student who was from China who faced a language barrier:

> I don't know what language she spoke, whether it was Mandarin or Cantonese, but she failed out, and she clearly did not have an intellectual issue because she came to my office after each exam and when she failed out, it was her second nursing failure. Our previous policy was your second nursing failure is dismissal from the program, so she was dismissed. I said apply for readmission or readmittance. I will write you a letter of support. I will indicate this is a language issue. This is not an intellectual issue.

Another challenge that Dr. Brown described is accommodating students from differing financial backgrounds. He described the challenges students with financial burdens faced and his desire to work with them to keep them in the program:

> People come into our program, who can very well handle the nursing curriculum. I mean, it's a beating. It's, it's not easy, but they've got financial issues. They've got at home issues. They've got a level of need there that I think needs to be assessed before it erupts in the classroom and typically when it erupts, it's not like it shuts classrooms down. It's more like why are you ghosting me? Well, I'm embarrassed that I can't afford the software and I'm like, I needed to know that. Like, we even say that now, it's not a matter of whether you can afford it or not. It's a matter of you're here. We want you to be here. We want you to be successful. If you need money for software because you also want to afford a vacation, that's not what we're talking about. If you want software because without it, you, you're either, and they'll tell us, either I’m putting gas in my tank to drive to school, or I'm paying for ATI, and we're like, let us get you the ATI.

Dr. Jones

Dr. Jones described his typical course lesson, which involved recording the class on Panopto, using PowerPoint with text, and using Kahoot for interactive quizzes. He mentioned that technology has been helpful for students in demonstrating their knowledge. However, the feedback from students was limited and usually occurred if the students "have something bad to say". In terms of accommodations for students with disabilities, Dr. Jones shared that those students who needed extra time for exams "go to a separate location and umm, so there are staff within the School of Dentistry that will proctor the exam for them and they get twice the amount of the normal exam time". Dr. Jones described an experience when he had an issue with the exam program and the students with accommodations could not access the exam, "The password did not work, so actually one of the people from academic affairs who has access to that course was able to go in and I think generate a new password".

Dr. Jones was working towards a master's in health professions education that had addressed inclusive teaching. He shared that he felt it has been helpful but could not quantify the impact. Regarding working with diverse students, Dr. Jones shared that the dental school had diverse students, including those from other countries. He described that "there are some fairly profound differences in how people practice and, not only that, but working in clinical education, how the practitioners interact with families and interact with their patients". Dr. Jones stated that it was difficult to relate to some international students because they were still trying to familiarize themselves with American society and "our professional customs or, or our professional way of behaving". From Dr. Jones' perspective, he thought that students acquired these social skills and practices naturally but also needed help from instructors. According to Dr.

Jones, language was not a major barrier for international students because the dental school required a "TOEFL score of 100 or greater to be accepted".

Dr. Jones shared a recent experience with a Muslim student who requested a decreased-schedule accommodation during Ramadan. Dr. Jones expressed uncertainty about how to make those accommodations. However, he felt confident in his ability to contact someone in the school for guidance. The interview with Dr. Jones occurred before Ramadan, and I do not know if he was able to find the guidance he needed.

Regarding changes or suggestions, Dr. Jones shared that the School of Dentistry could better support people with differing physical abilities and emphasized recruiting diverse students to practice in areas where they are most needed.

Composite Description: The Essence of Inclusive Instruction

The phenomenon of interest was the faculty members' experiences with inclusive instruction. Three recurrent themes were identified from the interview data: (1) faculty using inclusive instruction practices and UDI; (2) a need for more support for diverse student populations beyond students with disabilities; and (3) faculty roles changing. These three recurring themes were identified because they are present in at least three interview datasets. Table 15 shows the occurrence of these themes across interviews.

Table 14

Presence of Recurrent Themes

	Dr. Smith	Dr. Davis	Dr. Brown	Dr. Jones
Faculty Using Inclusive Instructional Practices and UDI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
A Need for More Support for Diverse Student Populations beyond Students with Disabilities	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Faculty Roles Changing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Faculty Using Inclusive Instructional Practices and UDI

All the faculty members who were interviewed shared that they were using strategies in their classes that promote inclusive instruction. All four participants cited the use of technology. It was used to record lectures, provide closed captioning, gain feedback from students, show videos, assess student learning, and provide platforms for student engagement. Three participants mentioned posting their lecture/class notes or PowerPoints for all students. Dr. Davis stated, “All of my class slides are posted before class for students to do with what they will, so that's often kind of our request, and that's already done”. Three participants described their flexibility in adjusting assignments or testing deadlines. Dr. Davis left exams open for six days, allowing students to complete the exam at any time within those six days. Dr. Smith worked directly with students requiring testing accommodations to set dates on which they could take their examinations. Similarly, Dr. Brown communicated with students who missed exams to

establish when they could take it and determine if the student had additional needs or circumstances prohibiting their ability to take the test.

More Supports for Diverse Student Populations Beyond Students with Disabilities

All four faculty shared experiences that identified a need for more support for diverse student populations outside students with disabilities. Dr. Davis and Dr. Jones described experiences when students stopped attending classes or could not access the course content due to financial hardships. Both faculty members connected students with someone who could help them purchase the required technology or provide access to additional resources. Dr. Brown repeatedly described his students' cultural and linguistic diversity and shared the challenges they faced in the nursing program. Dr. Jones' experience in trying to determine how to accommodate a student fasting for Ramadan also reflected the need for more support for students from diverse cultural and religious backgrounds. Dr. Smith shared how students had utilized his family-friendly classroom so that they could still attend class. Additionally, Dr. Smith acknowledged the diversity of his students by setting clear expectations that "transphobia and racism and Islamophobia and like, antisemitism and all these things" had no place in his courses.

Faculty Roles Changing

The interviews with Dr. Smith, Dr. Davis, and Dr. Brown shared commonalities: they all had underpinnings of advocacy roles. Dr. Smith described his experience sharing his identity with a student and "that if it made a difference to one person, that sort of like reaffirmed that I should keep doing that". As a new faculty member, Dr. Smith described the challenges he faced in finding time to develop his inclusive instructional practices and that it "sort of tears" at him because he did not have the time to do so. Dr. Brown and Dr.

Davis both described experiences where they tried to connect students with resources and communicated their commitment to the student's success in their courses. Dr. Brown helped reshape a clinical absences policy that adversely impacted students experiencing an injury, pregnancy, or other acute disability. Dr. Davis described how she viewed faculty roles changing from faculty providing knowledge to students to:

> The idea of supporting students and going beyond just like what our pedagogy looks like, but like, actually, how do we support students to be in our class because we have a healthy percentage of students with a 40% of students who are like, Pell recipients, a lot of high need students who need support. And if we don't? Faculty are in a really unique position because we see students so much and they, we are the ones they think back when they think back on their high higher education experience are we are the points of like that represent their experience, they're the most, we're the most connected to them. We're the most likely to be their mentors. We should probably be the most likely ones to connect them, at least be the first point of connection to services, even if we don't take it any further.

Chapter Summary

My quantitative results indicated differences across the faculty groups based on college affiliation and amount of disability-related training in terms of their attitudes toward inclusive instruction, UDI, and disability-related topics measured by subscale scores on the ITSI survey. I identified significant differences across faculty disability training levels and faculty college affiliations on the subscales of Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. My qualitative results included data from an open-ended survey question and four semi-structured interviews. My results from the thematic analysis of the survey responses indicated that faculty have an overall positive perception of inclusive instruction and UDI. Still, I described the barriers to implementing it, which included faculty workload and feasibility. My phenomenological analysis of the interview data indicated three recurrent themes experienced by faculty in

inclusive instruction. The three recurring themes were evident across three of the four interviews. They included (1) faculty using inclusive instruction practices and UDI, (2) a need for more support for diverse student populations beyond students with disabilities, and (3) faculty roles changing.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

I used a multiple-methods approach to identify differences in faculty members' attitudes toward inclusive instruction and disability-related topics and described faculty members' lived experiences with inclusive instruction, UDI, and supporting diverse student populations. I aimed to establish an initial measure of faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching practices that could be used to inform future faculty professional development. I identified practical recommendations for the University regarding how it can further support inclusive environments.

In the quantitative portion of the study, I used data collected from the ITSI survey to determine if statistically significant differences existed across the faculty groups of college affiliation, gender, teaching experience, and level of disability-related training. The survey was distributed to faculty via email and yielded 89 responses used to conduct the MANOVAs. There were not enough responses for statistical testing in all the college affiliation, disability-related training, and gender categories. Only the College of Arts and Sciences (Arts and Sciences), the College of Education and Human Development (CEHD), the School of Medicine (Medicine), and the College of Business (Business) had enough respondents to conduct the statistical analysis. The disability-related training group was combined into four levels rather than five since the "more than 48 hours" category had limited responses.

Lastly, the gender group reflected only female and male respondents because the categories of transgender ($n = 0$) and prefer not to state ($n = 4$) did not have adequate numbers for statistical analysis.

The survey results were analyzed using Excel and SPSS version 29 for Mac. MANOVA assumption testing indicated that the data violated normality. All data except the Disability Law and Concepts had Shapiro-Wilk values of .007 or less and were negatively skewed. Additionally, univariate and multivariate outliers were examined with boxplots and Mahalanobis distances, which indicated six univariate and two multivariate outliers. Both types of outliers were left in the data because it was determined that the outliers were not significantly impactful. Although the data failed normality, the MANOVA was still conducted since it was "reasonably robust to modest violations of normality" (Pallant, 2016, p. 291).

Implications

I identified statistically significant differences in faculty ITSI scores for disability-related training and college affiliation. The post hoc testing results of the MANOVA for disability-related training indicated significant score differences on the subscales of Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts. Faculty members with 1-10 hours and 11-23 hours of disability-related training scored higher than those without training on the Inclusive Assessment subscales. Faculty with 24 or more hours of disability-related training scored higher than faculty with 1-10 hours or no training on the Disability Law and Concepts subscale. Additionally, faculty with 11-23 hours of disability training scored higher than faculty without training on the Disability Law and Concepts subscale. These results supported other study findings that suggest

that disability-related training or professional development impacted faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction and UDI (Dallas & Sprong, 2015; Dallas et al., 2014; Lombardi et al., 2013; Lombardi et al., 2011).

Additionally, the results of my study suggested a limit to how many hours of training impact faculty attitudes. For the subscales of Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts, 1-10 and 11-23 hours of training yielded statistically higher scores than no training. Interestingly, 24 or more hrs of training only scored statistically higher than 1-10 hours, and no training on the Disability Law and Concepts subscale (not statically higher compared to 11-23 hours). Based on the results, I propose that 1-23 hours of disability-related training may have the most impact on faculty attitudes toward the concepts of Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts.

Post hoc testing of the significant MANOVA results for college affiliation showed statistically significant differences in scores for Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts subscales across college affiliations. Specifically, faculty from the CEHD had statistically higher mean scores on the Disability Law and Concepts subscale than faculty from Arts and Sciences. Although the MANOVA was significant and follow-up ANOVAs indicated significant differences for college affiliation on the Inclusive Classrooms and Inclusive Assessment subscales, Tukey post hoc tests were insignificant. The MANOVA results supported the findings of previous studies that indicated differences across faculty college affiliations (Dallas et al., 2014; Lombardi & Murray, 2011). My study results mirrored the findings of Lombardi and Murray (2011), who indicated that “faculty in Education reported greater Knowledge

of Disability Law and Concepts than faculty in all other colleges" (p. 49). The results of this study suggested that the College of Arts and Sciences had a gap in knowledge regarding Disability Law and Concepts compared to the CEHD.

Unlike previous research that used the ITSI to measure faculty attitudes towards inclusive instruction and UDI, the current study did not find statistically significant differences across faculty gender or level of teaching experience. Although I found no statistically significant score differences across faculty genders, the mean score differences reflected previous studies that utilized the ITSI, which indicated differences across faculty genders where female faculty had higher scores than male faculty (Cash et al., 2021; Lombardi et al., 2013; Lombardi et al., 2011). The results of this study also partially contradicted previous research that identified differences in ITSI scores based on faculty teaching experience (Dallas & Sprong, 2015; Dallas et al., 2014). Dallas and Sprong (2015) found statistically significant differences across faculty teaching experience levels and ITSI subscale scores on Disability Law and Concepts. However, the subscale scores did not result in significant Tukey post-hoc analyses. Dallas et al. (2014) found that faculty "with 13 or more years of teaching experience had significantly higher scores than faculty with 0-6 years of teaching on the Accommodations subscale" (p. 18). The researchers further stated that their findings were inconsistent with other research that did not identify teaching experience as a significant factor in ITSI scores. The present study had a relatively small sample size (n = 89), which may have contributed to the non-significant results for the variables of faculty gender and level of teaching experience. The small sample size also likely impacted the statistical power of the analyses.

In the qualitative portion of this study, I delved into faculty members' lived experiences regarding inclusive instruction, focusing on their perceptions, challenges, and roles. A comprehensive understanding of faculty experiences with inclusive instruction emerged from the thematic analysis of survey responses and the phenomenological approach of semi-structured interviews with selected faculty. The thematic analysis of 40 open-ended survey responses revealed various perspectives on inclusive teaching and accommodations. The findings revealed a generally positive perception of inclusive instruction among faculty, underscored by a willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. However, faculty faced limitations primarily revolving around two main categories: the challenging workload and the feasibility of implementing inclusive practices and accommodations. A recurring theme was the struggle to balance inclusive teaching with existing responsibilities, often exacerbated by a lack of compensation for additional efforts and insufficient resources to support accommodations. The limitations and themes identified reflected similar qualitative findings that described faculty concerns and challenges with having enough time to learn about, design, and provide accessible courses (Banks, 2019; Guilbaud et al., 2021).

The phenomenological analysis of the semi-structured interviews yielded three recurrent themes across faculty experiences: (a) faculty using inclusive instructional practices and Universal Design for Instruction (UDI), (b) a need for more support for diverse student populations beyond those with disabilities, and (c) a transformation in faculty roles. The themes were identified as commonalities across at least three interview datasets, which provided a robust foundation for understanding faculty experiences.

The interview participants' commitment to inclusive practices and UDI was evident, where technology played a pivotal role in facilitating inclusive instruction. Strategies such as posting lecture notes, providing flexibility in assignments and testing, and leveraging various technological tools were reported among faculty participants. Like previous research findings, the interview participants were familiar with testing accommodations and embedded various UDI strategies in their courses that limited the need for additional accommodations (Banks, 2019; Basilice, 2015). Additionally, the interview data highlighted the need for more support for diverse student populations, extending beyond disability accommodations to address financial hardships, cultural diversity, and unique challenges facing individual students.

The changing roles of faculty emerged as a vital aspect of the inclusive instruction phenomenon. Advocacy roles were prominent among the interview participants, where faculty members described connecting students to resources, reshaping policies, and fostering a supportive student environment. Faculty members, particularly Dr. Davis and Dr. Brown, emphasized a shift from merely providing knowledge to actively supporting students. This further showed their acknowledgment of their pivotal role in students' higher education experiences. The changing roles of faculty found in this study build upon the findings of Smith (2015), which identified the benefits of developing relationships between students and faculty outside of the classroom by attending office hours and through email communication.

Recommendations for the University

I identified several practical implications for potential training opportunities or policy changes for faculty at the University. My qualitative analyses identified that

limited time is a significant factor in faculty members' ability to develop inclusive instruction in their courses or skills in UDI implementation. Dr. Smith's interview revealed the additional pressure faced by junior faculty trying to balance the responsibilities of teaching, research, and service with creating inclusive courses. Although Dr. Smith's suggestion of relieving new faculty of their teaching responsibilities during their first semester may be more idealistic than realistic, the University should work with colleges and departments to formally dedicate time for faculty to focus on inclusive instruction. Additionally, the University and its colleges should consider supporting professional development or training in inclusive instruction and UDI to count towards the service requirement that is often a part of tenure and promotion opportunities. Supporting UDI as part of the tenure-track process would also benefit faculty with more teaching experience but are not yet tenured.

My quantitative results identified Inclusive Classrooms, Inclusive Assessment, and Disability Law and Concepts as suggested topics for faculty training due to score differences across faculty groups. Although it was not statistically significant, the University should consider including training on Course Modifications since that subscale had the lowest average mean score for the sample population. When considering which faculty should be prioritized for training, the data indicated that the University should prioritize faculty with no prior training since they consistently scored significantly lower than other faculty with prior training. Additionally, the University should encourage faculty to acquire 1-23 hours of training since the data showed that 24 or more hours did not consistently impact faculty attitudes towards inclusive instruction and UDI.

The University should consider conducting a similar survey project that uses the action component of the ITSI to measure how and if faculty are consistently implementing inclusive instruction and UDI practices. Data collected from the actions portion of the ITSI survey could provide further information on topics for training opportunities and identify differences in practice across colleges. Including a qualitative component in future ITSI research is critical to identifying barriers to implementing UDI and inclusive practices.

Triangulation

I employed triangulation to strengthen the credibility and validity of my findings by integrating quantitative survey data with qualitative interview data. Utilizing both methods provided me with unique insights and perspectives, enabling me to develop a more comprehensive understanding of faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction, UDI, and disability-related topics.

I performed statistical analysis on the quantitative survey data to identify patterns and relationships between variables. I examined qualitative interview data to develop a comprehensive understanding of the participants' experiences, perceptions, and beliefs. Additionally, I analyzed the qualitative survey data to identify recurring themes and interpreted the nuances of the participants' responses. By utilizing a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, I significantly enhanced the comprehensive analysis and interpretation of my findings. The statistical rigor provided by quantitative analysis was complemented by the depth and context offered by qualitative analysis. Triangulation facilitated cross-validation of findings across various data sources and methods, resulting in increased reliability and credibility of my results.

Limitations and Future Research

My research project had several limitations related to sampling procedures, data characteristics, and generalizability of the results. In the study, I relied on a convenience sampling procedure where the University's Office of Academic Planning and Accountability determined the sample population pool to avoid conflicts with other university-wide survey research. The sample population pool did not include all faculty members at the University. Since the current study relied on a volunteer participant sample, factors like willingness to participate, technology skills, and availability to complete the survey or participate in interviews may have influenced which faculty members participated. The presence of outliers in the quantitative data suggested that sampling bias may have affected the study. The purposeful selection of interview participants may have also contributed to sampling bias.

The characteristics of the data used in the statistical analyses are also limitations of this study. These data failed normality testing and indicated the presence of outliers. Although these data failed normality and suggested outliers, examination of the skew of the data, Shapiro-Wilk test values, means comparisons, and boxplots led to the determination that it was appropriate to conduct the MANOVA tests. The decision to conduct the MANOVAs after not meeting the normality assumption should be considered a limitation of the current study. Data collected came from 89 faculty participants, which reflected 0.03% of the total faculty employed at the University. The sample size limited the generalizability of the study and may not reflect the attitudes of the total faculty population at the University. Additionally, the data were collected from faculty members at one public four-year university, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to

other postsecondary settings like community colleges, private universities, and schools in other states.

One of my study's unique features was the use of quantitative and qualitative research procedures. The results indicated the value of implementing multiple-methods research to develop more robust and compelling recommendations and conclusions. I used a multiple-methods research design that provided nuanced recommendations for the University to better support faculty. Future research using the ITSI with a practical multiple-methods design has the potential to significantly inform and impact how postsecondary settings support faculty in creating inclusive learning environments for diverse student groups.

My quantitative results contradicted the results of former studies, in which differences in ITSI scores across faculty gender and years of teaching experience were reported. My study's insignificant results on these variables and the inconsistent results found in previous studies should be examined more closely. Understanding how gender and teaching experience impact faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction and UDI would benefit postsecondary settings and the research community.

Lastly, the quantitative and qualitative data collected in the current study suggested that technology was an essential component of inclusive instruction. Future studies should examine how faculty members' use of technology impacts their attitudes towards and implementation of inclusive teaching practices and UDI. Relevant findings from technology use and inclusive instruction could inform faculty professional development and influence how courses are designed and delivered.

Conclusion

In the study I conducted, I used a multiple-methods approach to measure faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction, UDI, and disability-related topics. I expanded on the existing literature by utilizing various methods to assess faculty attitudes toward inclusive instruction and Universal Design for Instruction (UDI). This approach provided specific and nuanced information that the University can use to support inclusive instruction and UDI practices. The ITSI was used to develop a quantitative measure of faculty attitudes and included one open-ended response item. The open-ended response item and data from one-on-one interviews with faculty provided a detailed qualitative description of faculty experiences with inclusive instruction and UDI implementation. The results supported previous findings that suggested faculty attitudes are influenced by professional development/training and can differ across colleges within the same university (Banks, 2019; Byrd, 2018; Guilbaud et al., 2021; Lombardi et al., 2011; Lombardi et al., 2013; Lombardi & Murray, 2011; McGinty, 2016). Additionally, the results highlighted the faculty's desire for more support with inclusive instruction and UDI regarding supporting diverse learning groups beyond students with disabilities. As student populations continue diversifying, faculty must have the desire and skills to establish equitable learning environments through inclusive instruction and UDI.

REFERENCES

Abreu, M., Hillier, A., Frye, A., & Goldstein, J. (2017). Student experiences utilizing disability support services in a university setting. *College Student Journal*, *50*(3), 323-328. https://docserver-ingentaconnect-com.echo.louisville.edu/deliver/connect/prin/01463934/v50n3/s2.pdf?expires=1711312872&id=0000&titleid=72010514&checksum=0C61AA1BDDDF213006A6CE1AB17522FA&host=https://www-ingentaconnect-com.echo.louisville.edu

American Council on Education. (2023, January 25). *University of Louisville*. CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION. https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/institution/university-of-louisville/

American Psychological Association. (2023). External validity. *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. https://dictionary.apa.org/external-validity

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq*. (1990).

ATLAS.ti Scientific Software Development GmbH [ATLAS.ti Web, v3.15.0]. (2022). Retrieved from https://atlasti.com.

Basilice, L. J. (2015). Faculty knowledge and attitudes regarding students with disabilities in higher education (Order No. 3664370). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1727739634). http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/faculty-knowledge-attitudes-regarding-students/docview/1727739634/se-2

Banks, J. (2019). Are we ready: Faculty perceptions of postsecondary students with learning disabilities at a historically Black university. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *12*(4), 297–306. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000100

Bevan, M. T. (2014). A method of phenomenological interviewing. *Qualitative Health Research*, *24*(1), 136–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732313519710

Brockelman, K. F., & Scheyett, A. M. (2015). Faculty perceptions of accommodations, strategies, and psychiatric advance directives for university students with mental illnesses. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, *38*(4), 342-348. https://doi.org/10.1037/prj0000143

Burgstahler, S. (2020). *DO-IT: Equal access: Universal design of instruction*. https://www.washington.edu/doit/sites/default/files/atoms/files/EA_Instruction_5_28_20_0.pdf

Burgstahler, S. (2008). *Universal design in higher education: From principles to practice*. Harvard Education Press.

Byrd, D. (2018). *Faculty attitudes towards graduate students with learning disabilities*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2117544617). http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/faculty-attitudes-towards-graduate-students-with/docview/2117544617/se-2

Cash, C. M., Cox, T. D., & Hahs-Vaughn, D. L. (2021). Distance educator's attitudes and actions towards inclusive teaching practices. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *21*(2), 15-42. DOI: 10.14434/josotl.v21i2.27949

Center for Applied Special Technology. (2015). *What is UDL?* http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/whatisudl

Center for Applied Special Technology. (2018a). *UDL and the Learning Brain*. http://ww.cast.org/our-work/publications/2018/udl-learning-brain-neuroscience.html

Center for Applied Special Technology. (2018b). *UDL guidelines version 2.2. Research evidence*. http://udlguidelines.cast.org/more/research-evidence

Center for Applied Special Technology (2018c). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2. Frequently asked questions*. http://udlguidelines.cast.org

Chaturvedi, A. (2010). *Universal Design for Instruction for students with disabilities at the postsecondary level* (Publication No. 3421028). [Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/universal-design-instruction-students-with/docview/750367009/se-2

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241 (1964). https://www.ada.gov/pubs/adastatute08.htm

Corbran, C. P. (2021). *Exploring Students' with Learning Disabilities Perceptions of Faculty Support and Bias* (Order No. 28263088). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2478602091). http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/exploring-students-with-learning-disabilities/docview/2478602091/se-2

Creswell, J.W. & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.).

Cumming, T. M., & Rose, M. C. (2022). Exploring universal design for learning as an accessibility tool in higher education: A review of the current literature. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *49*(5), 1025–1043. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13384-021-00471-7

Dallas, B. K., & Sprong, M. E. (2015). Assessing faculty attitudes toward universal design instructional techniques. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, *46*(4), 18–28. 10.1891/0047-2220.46.4.18

Dallas, B. K., Upton, T. D., & Sprong, M. E. (2014). Postsecondary faculty attitudes toward inclusive teaching strategies. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, *80*(2), 12–20. https://web-p-ebscohost-com.echo.louisville.edu/chc/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=dbc7d631-0004-408f-9dda-27a2fc5eebd0%40redis

Dean, T., Lee-Post, A., & Hapke, H. (2017). Universal Design for Learning in teaching large lecture classes. *Journal of Marketing Education, 39*(1), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475316662104

Dolmage, J. T. (2017). Universal design: Places to start. In *Academic ableism: Disability and higher education* (pp. 129-143). 10.3998/mpub.9708722

Explorance Inc. (2024). Explorance Blue [Survey software]. Montreal, Quebec: Explorance Inc.

Field, A. (2014). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Sage.

Fornauf, B. S., & Erickson, J. D. (2020). Toward an inclusive pedagogy through universal design for learning in higher education: A review of the

literature. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *33*(2), 183-199. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1273677.pdf

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2015). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Gawronski, M., Kuk, L., & Lombardi, A. R. (2016). Inclusive instruction: Perceptions of community college faculty and students pertaining to universal design. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *29*(4), 331-347. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1133816.pdf

Guilbaud, T. C., Martin, F., & Newton, X. (2021). Faculty Perceptions on Accessibility in Online Learning: Knowledge, Practice and Professional Development. *Online Learning*, *25*(2), 6-35. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v25i2.2233

Hall, M.C. (2019). Critical disability theory. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/disability-critical/

Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, *18*(3), 66–67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129

Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-315, 122 Stat. 3078 (2008). https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-110publ315/pdf/PLAW-110publ315.pdf

Fair Housing Act, 2011 Fla. Statutes §§ 760-760.20-760.37 (2011). https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2011-title42/pdf/USCODE-2011-title42-chap45.pdf

Foster, R. G. (2020). *Meeting the Needs of College Students with Learning Disabilities* (Order No. 27669780). Available from ProQuest Dissertations &

Theses Global. (2341738443). http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/meeting-needs-college-students-with-learning/docview/2341738443/se-2

Kennette, L., & Wilson, N. (2019). Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Student and faculty perceptions. *Journal of Effective Teaching in Higher Education, 1*(2), 1–26. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1214930.pdf

Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., & Johnstone, C. (2006). Accommodations and Universal Design: Supporting access to assessments in higher education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *19*(2), 163-172. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ844632.pdf

Kim, S. Y., & Crowley, S. (2021). Understanding perceptions and experiences of autistic undergraduate students toward disability support offices of their higher education institutions. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, p. *113*, 103956. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2021.103956

Kumar, K., & Wideman, M. (2014). Accessible by design: Applying UDL principles in a first-year undergraduate course. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 44*(1), 124–147. https://drjoe.ca/UDL_AODA/Accessible%20by%20design%20UDL.pdf

Lombardi, A., Buenner, L., Loose, J., & Hoos, O. (2021). Measuring inclusive instruction at German universities: Extending validity evidence. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *34*(4), 361–368. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1342744.pdf

Lombardi, A., Vukovic, B., & Sala-Bars, I. (2015). International comparisons of inclusive instruction among college faculty in Spain, Canada, and the United States. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *28*(4), 447–460. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1093535

Lombardi, A., Murray, C., & Dallas, B. (2013). University faculty attitudes toward disability and inclusive instruction: Comparing two institutions. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *26*(3), 221–232. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1026882.pdf

Lombardi, A., & Murray, C. (2011). Measuring university faculty attitudes toward disability: Willingness to accommodate and adopt Universal Design principles. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 34*(1), 43–56. 10.3233/JVR-2010-0533

Lombardi, A. R., Murray, C., & Gerdes, H. (2011). College faculty and inclusive instruction: Self-reported attitudes and actions pertaining to Universal Design. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *4*(4), 250. 10.1037/a0024961

Madaus, J.W., Kowitt, J.K., & Lalor, A. (2012). The higher education opportunity act: Impact on students with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Research, Policy, and Education* 26(1), 33–42. 10.1891/216866512805000893

Madaus, J. W., & Shaw, S. F. (2004). Section 504: Differences in the regulations for secondary and postsecondary education. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *40*(2), 81-87. https://doi-org.echo.louisville.edu/10.1177/10534512040400020301

Mamboleo, G., Dong, S., & Fais, C. (2020). Factors associated with disability self-disclosure to their professors among college students with disabilities. *Career*

Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, *43*(2), 78-88. https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143419893360

McGinty, J. M. (2016). *Accessibility and inclusion in higher education: An inquiry of faculty perceptions and experiences* (Order No. 10149928). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1832317106). http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/accessibility-inclusion-higher-education-inquiry/docview/1832317106/se-2

Meyer, A., Rose, D.H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal design for learning: Theory and Practice*. Wakefield, MA: CAST Professional Publishing. https://www.cast.org/products-services/resources/2014/universal-design-learning-theory-practice-udl-meyer

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). *Table 306.30. Fall enrollment of U.S. residents in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity: Selected years, 1976 through 2031*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d22/tables/dt22_306.30.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021). *Table 311.10. Number and percentage distribution of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions, by level, disability status, and selected student characteristics: 2015-16*. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d21/tables/dt21_311.10.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *Table 242 Number and percentage distribution of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions, by level, disability*

status, and selected student characteristics: 2003-04 and 2007-08. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_242.asp

National Disability Authority. (2020). What is universal design? *Centre for Excellence in Universal Design*. https://universaldesign.ie/what-is-universal-design/

Oliver, M. (1996). *Understanding disability: From theory to practice*. Macmillan.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2000, November 11). *Expanding the framework of internal and external validity in quantitative research* [conference presentation]. Association for the Advancement of Educational Research (AAER), Ponte Vedra, Florida, United States. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED448205.pdf

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Johnson, R. B., & Collins, K. M. (2009). Call for mixed analysis: A philosophical framework for combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. *International journal of multiple research approaches*, *3*(2), 114-139. https://doi.org/10.5172/mra.3.2.114

Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In: R.S., Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41–60). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-6989-3_3

Reardon, K., Bromley, K. W., & Unruh, D. (2021). The Promise of Universal Design in Postsecondary Education: A Literature Review. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *34*(3), 209-221. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1325431.pdf

Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. 791 § *et seq*.(1973). https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-87/pdf/STATUTE-87-Pg355.pdf

Rothman, J. C. (2010). The challenge of disability and access: Reconceptualizing the role of the medical model. *Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation*, *9*(2-3), 194-222. https://doi-org.echo.louisville.edu/10.1080/1536710X.2010.493488

Rothstein, L. F., & Irzyk, J. (Eds.) (2019). *Disabilities and the law* (4th ed., Fall 2019). Thomson Reuters.

Shakespeare, T. (2017). The social model of disability. In L.J., Davis, (Eds.), *The disability studies reader*. (pp. 195–202).

Smith, S. R. (2015). *Perceptions of college students with disabilities and perceptions of faculty concerning accommodations and/or services provided at two-year institutions*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1861702104). http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/perceptions-college-students-with-disabilities/docview/1861702104/se-2

SPSS Inc. (2023). SPSS 29 for Mac. [Computer software]. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

Stevens, C. M., Schneider, E., & Bederman-Miller, P. (2018). Identifying faculty perceptions of awareness and preparedness relating to ADA compliance at a small, private college in NE PA. *American Journal of Business Education (AJBE)*, *11*(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.19030/ajbe.v11i2.10142

Tight, M. (2020). Student retention and engagement in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *44*(5), 689–704. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1576860

Tzivinikou, S. (2014). Universal Design for Learning-Application in higher education: A Greek paradigm. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century, 60*(1), 156–166. 10.33225/pec/14.60.156

United States Census Bureau. (2021). *Sexual orientation and gender identity in the household pulse survey*. https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity.html

United States Department of Education. (2023). *Protecting students with disabilities: Frequently asked questions about Section 504 and the education of children with disabilities*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/504faq.html

United States Department of Education. (2021). *Auxiliary aids and services for postsecondary students with disabilities: Higher education's obligations under Section 504 and Title II of the ADA*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/auxaids.html

United States Department of Justice. (2020). *Guide to disability rights law*. https://www.ada.gov/resources/disability-rights-guide/

University of Louisville. (2023, February 15). *Office of Academic Planning & Accountability*. https://saspub.louisville.edu:8343/SASVisualAnalyticsViewer/VisualAnalyticsVi

ewer_guest.jsp?reportName=UofL+Employees&reportPath=/Shared+Data/External+Reports/&appSwitcherDisabled=true&reportViewOnly=true

Wrage, J. (2017). *Understanding the Perceptual Divide between Students with Disabilities, Faculty and Administration in an Open Enrollment Environment*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global; Publicly Available Content Database. (1906270126). http://echo.louisville.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/understanding-perceptual-divide-between-students/docview/1906270126/se-2

APPENDIX A

Prior Approval for Use of the Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI)

Re: The Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI)

Lombardi, Allison <allison.lombardi@uconn.edu>
Tue 3/7/2023 4:42 PM
To: Snider, Kate <kate.snider@louisville.edu>

1 attachments (395 KB)
LombardiVukovic&SalaBars2015.pdf;

Hi Kate,
Thanks for your interest in the ITSI. You have my permission to use it in your research. I attached a published article from 2015 that lists all items in the Appendix.
This is the most recent published version that I am aware of (although others have used this measure in various studies, dissertations and theses, so there could be variants floating around).
Please keep in touch and let me know if you have any questions.
Allison

Allison Lombardi, Ph.D.
she/her/hers
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Psychology
allison.lombardi@uconn.edu
http://education.uconn.edu/allison-lombardi/

Co-Editor, *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*
Associate Editor, *Exceptional Children*
Immediate Past President, Council for Exceptional Children Division on Career Development and Transition

249 Glenbrook Road Unit 3064
Storrs, CT 06269-3064

UCONN | NEAG SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

APPENDIX B

Inclusive Teaching Strategies Inventory (ITSI) subscales, items, and response stems.

Response Stem	Attitudes: I believe it's important to… Actions: I do...
Subscale	**Item**
Accommodations	allow students with documented disabilities to use technology (e.g. laptop, calculator, spell checker) to complete tests even when such technologies are not permitted for use by students without disabilities
	provide copies of my lecture notes or outlines to students with documented disabilities
	provide copies of my overhead and/or PowerPoint presentations to students with documented disabilities
	allow flexible response options on exams (e.g. change from written to oral) for students with documented disabilities
	allow students with documented disabilities to digitally record (audio or visual) class sessions
	make individual accommodations for students who have disclosed their disability to me
	arrange extended time on exams for students who have documented disabilities
	extend the due dates of assignments to accommodate the needs of students with documented disabilities
Accessible Course Materials	use a course website (e.g. Blackboard or faculty web page)
	put my lecture notes online for ALL students (on Blackboard or another website)
	post electronic versions of course handouts
	allow students flexibility in submitting assignments electronically (e.g. mail attachment, digital drop box)
Course Modifications	allow a student with a documented disability to complete extra credit assignments
	reduce the overall course reading load for a student with a documented disability even when I would not allow a reduced reading load for another student
	reduce the course reading load for ANY student who expresses a need
	allow ANY student to complete extra credit assignments in my course(s)
Inclusive Lecture Strategies	repeat the question back to the class before answering when a question is asked during a class session
	begin each class session with an outline/agenda of the topics that will be covered
	summarize key points throughout each class session
	connect key points with larger course objectives during class sessions

Inclusive Classroom	use technology so that my course material can be available in a variety of formats (e.g., podcast of lecture available for download, course readings available as mp3 files)
	use interactive technology to facilitate class communication and participation (e.g., Discussion Board)
	present course information in multiple formats (e.g., lecture, text, graphics, audio, video, hands-on exercises)
	create multiple opportunities for engagement
	survey my classroom in advance to anticipate any physical barriers
	include a statement in my syllabus inviting students with disabilities to discuss their needs with me
	make a verbal statement in class inviting students with disabilities to discuss their needs with me
	use a variety of instructional formats in addition to lecture, such as small groups, peer assisted learning, and hands on activities
	supplement class sessions and reading assignments with visual aids (e.g., photographs, videos, diagrams, interactive simulations)
Inclusive Assessment	allow students to demonstrate the knowledge and skills in ways other than traditional tests and exams (e.g., written essays, portfolios, journals)
	allow students to express comprehension in multiple ways
	be flexible with assignment deadlines in my course(s) for ANY student who expresses a need
	allow flexible response options on exams (e.g., change from written to oral) for ANY student who expresses a need
Response stem	*I am confident in…*
Disability Law & Concepts	my understanding of the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990) *
	my responsibilities as an instructor to provide or facilitate disability related accommodations
	my knowledge to make adequate accommodations for students with disabilities in my course(s)
	my understanding of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 *
	my understanding of Universal Design
	my understanding of the legal definition of disability

Note. *Canadian and Spanish versions of the ITSI included the legal wording of laws that are similar to these listed American laws.

APPENDIX C

Examining Faculty Attitudes Towards Inclusive Instruction
Potential Interview Questions/Protocol

1. Can you describe what you do during a typical class session?
2. Can you describe the structure or format of your course? (Online tools, in-person strategies etc.)
3. What is your experience providing accommodations for students with disabilities in your courses?
4. Please describe any challenges you have experienced in providing accommodations.
5. How would you improve the process of providing accommodations?
6. What are your experiences with implementing inclusive teaching strategies or universal design for instruction in your courses?
7. If you could make any university-wide changes related to inclusive instruction or providing accommodations, what would they be?
8. What are your experiences with implementing inclusive teaching strategies or universal design for instruction in your courses?
9. What contexts or situations might influence your experience implementing inclusive teaching practices or universal design for instruction in your courses?

CURRICULUM VITA

Kate Snider

EDUCATION

University of Louisville
Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education 2024
OSEP funded doctoral fellow with Project PURPLE
Grant focused on Preparing Urban and Rural Personnel as Leaders in Education

San Diego State University
Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Teaching Credential 2014

San Jose State University
M.A. Applied Anthropology 2012
Fostering Empowerment within Special Education: Building Communication in a Specialized Program

University of Tennessee Knoxville
B.A. Anthropology 2010

TEACHING CERTIFICATIONS

California Clear Education Specialist Instruction Credential Through 2026
Mild/Moderate Disabilities, K-12 and/or age 22

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Co-Instructor, University of Louisville
EDSP 570: Autism: Introduction and Understanding Fall 2022
EDSP 518: Structured Literacy for Diverse Learners Fall 2021
EDSP 345: Special Populations in Schools Spring 2021
University Supervisor MSD Alternate Certification Program Fall 2020-2021

Specialized Academic Instructor Mild/Moderate Disabilities
James Dukes Elementary, Ramona, CA 2015-2020
Bernardo Elementary, Escondido, CA 2014-2015

PUBLICATIONS

Whitney, T.; Cooper, T.; & Snider, K. (2024). A Comparison of Role-play v. Mixed-Reality Simulation on Pre-Service Teachers' Behavior Management Practices.[Accepted, waiting for publication]. *Journal of Special Education Technology*.

Ackerman, K., Ault, M., Courtade, G., Elliott, M., Harmon, T., Jones, K., Jordan, K., Long, A., Nutt, J., O'Neill, K., Rowlett, L., Snider, K., Swain, R., Wright, E. (2023). *Preparing Future Special Education Faculty for Service in Rural Communities* [Under review]. Department of Early Childhood, Special Education, & Counselor Education, University of Kentucky.

Page, D., Valentine, J., McClure, E., Snider, K., Pollard, J., Young, S., Landrum, T. Hunter, W. (2023). *A Meta-analysis of the Academic Achievement of Students with*

Emotional/Behavioral Disorders in Traditional Public Schools in the United States [Under review]. Department of Special Education, Early Childhood, & Prevention Science, University of Louisville.

Snider, K. (2012). *Fostering Empowerment within Special Education: Building Communication in a Specialized Program.* Available from San Jose State University. https://www.sjsu.edu/anthropology/docs/projectfolder/Snider-Kate-project.pdf

PRESENTATIONS

Elliott, M. & Snider, K. (2023, November 1-3). Beyond Academics: *The Development of Essential Personal Skills in Pre-Service Special Educators*. Annual Conference of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children, Long Beach, CA. Refereed

Nutt, J. & Snider, K. (2023, March 9-11). *KMIT Training Tool*. American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES) Annual Conference, Pittsburgh, PA. Refereed.

Nutt, J. & Snider, K. (2023, February 24). *KMIT Training Tool* [Keynote professional development]. The Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) Special Education Consortium (Kentucky),Virtual presentation. Invited.

Snider, K., Whitney, T., & Cooper, J.(2023, March 1-4). *Comparing Role Play v. Mixed-Reality Simulations to Practice Establishing Expectations* [Poster presentation]. Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention, Louisville, KY. Refereed.

Snider, K. (2023, March 1-4). *Teacher Self-Monitoring and PBIS Implementation in the Classroom: A Pilot Study* [Poster presentation]. Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention, Louisville, KY. Refereed.

Salter, J., Croce, K., & Snider, K. (2022, September 1-3). *Self-Management in The Educational Setting: Utilizing the Self and Match System Across Multiple Modalities* [Panel presentation]. Association for Behavior Analysis International, Dublin, Ireland. Refereed.

Snider, K., & Long, A. (2022, Dates TBD). *FLIPD: A Self-monitoring and Reflection Tool to Evaluate PBIS Implementation at the Classroom Level* [Lecture Series]. San Diego State University College of Education, San Diego, CA. Invited.

Snider, K. (2022, June 16-17). *Teacher Self-Monitoring and PBIS Implementation in the Classroom: A Pilot Study* [Poster presentation]. KY-CCBD Behavior Institute, Louisville, KY. Refereed.

Snider, K., Long, A., Wright, E., & Feger, J.(2022, January 16-19). *Everybody means everybody: FLIPD as a self-monitoring and reflection tool to evaluate PBIS implementation at the classroom level* [Poster presentation]. Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention & Expo, Orlando, FL. Refereed.

Snider, K. (2021, November 4) *Video modeling and performance feedback in higher education: A literature review* [Poster presentation]. Annual Conference of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children- Kaleidoscope, Fort Worth, TX. Refereed.

Snider, K., Long, A., & Feger, J. (2021, November 19). *Make that change! Accelerating transfer of knowledge to practice through FLIPD.* Annual Teacher Educators for Children with Behavior Disorders Conference, Tempe, Arizona. Refereed.

Snider, K., Long, A., Wright, E., & O'Neil, K. (2021, April 24). *Decreasing Racial Disproportionality in Exclusionary Discipline: A Professional Development Implementation Tool* [Poster presentation]. Kentucky Excellence in Educator Preparation, Virtual Conference. Refereed.

Aquino-Sterling, C., Zentella, A.C., Garrity, S., Hernandez, S., Jaffe, H., Jones, A, & **Snider, K**. (2019, November 6). *Critical Perspectives on the Language Word Gap Argument in Education* [Forum]. San Diego State University, The Office of the Dean, and Joint Doctoral Program in Education.

SERVICE

Kentucky Teacher Educator Journal
The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Kentucky Council for Exceptional Children
Peer Reviewer
Current

Kentucky Educational Development Corporation
2022
Support Transformation Zone work regarding the evaluation of math practices via the KMIT

Greater Louisville Education Cooperative
2021
Framework for Learning Implementation & Professional Development (FLIPD)

KEEP Steering Committee
2020-2021
Committee Member

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Association on Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD)
Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
Division for Research (CECDR)
Division of Emotional and Behavioral Health (DEBH)
Teacher Education Division (TED)
Kentucky Teacher Education Division (K-TED)
Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI)

GUEST LECTURES

February 2022. *Direct Instruction and Classroom Management*. Guest lecture for EDSP 345 – Special Populations-taught by Scott Patton, University of Louisville.

March 2022. *Direct Instruction and Classroom Management*. Guest lecture for EDSP 240 – Introduction to Exceptional Children-taught by Scott Patton, University of Louisville.