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The needs of those with disabilities at Georgia State University have always been great. For one reason, each different disability represents its own unique pattern of challenges. For another, this University was founded in 1913 and has many aging buildings that are often difficult for some individuals with disabilities to navigate. The congressional passage of the amended Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act (ADAAA) in late 2008 significantly expanded the definition of “disabled.” This will result in a larger number of individuals eligible for services. It is imperative that the University be ready to meet their needs, both for legal and for educational reasons.

After two decades of efforts to change a critical mass of problems on campus, we remain with significant needs.

Three focus groups of faculty, students, and staff with disabilities or with interests in the field were held in April 2010 to discern campus problems disabled persons face, the results of which are summarized in Appendix 1 with the full transcript of the sessions provided in Appendix 2. Their answers reveal that many faculty members, students, and staff with disabilities experience a serious culture of what can only be deemed official neglect at this University. For the last twenty years, problems in assisting disabled campus community members have been addressed in markedly ineffective ways.

Past administrations have assigned oversight to advisory committees with no power or funding to effect change. From the early 1990s until 2006, the ADA/504 Committee advised then-Provost Ron Henry on University ADA-compliance. Annual reports to him identified problems areas, without any action being taken (Appendix 3). In 2006, the ADA/504 Committee chair Dr. Susan Easterbrooks joined the University Senate; and, together with the committee chairs of Cultural Diversity (Dr. Christine Gallant) and Planning & Development (Dr. P.C. Tai), she formed the Disability Initiatives Committee (DIC) to replace the ADA/504 Committee. As a Senate subcommittee, the DIC was in a stronger position to influence this central legislative body of the University; but it still lacked direct authority or funding.

In addition, most of the recommendations of official reports demonstrating the University’s lack of ADA-compliance have not been implemented. This was true for the
annual reports to the Provost on University non-compliance and other efforts. For example, the ADA/504 Committee in 2005-2006 was authorized to oversee a study of campus compliance, the Heery Report (Appendix 4 found as an appended pdf file); and while some of the problems have begun to be addressed, many more remain. In 2008, the Administrative Support Unit Review (ASUR) reviewed the Office of Disability Services, as mandated by our Office of Institutional Effectiveness. (Appendix 5 & 6). These documents reiterated serious concerns relating to University Compliance in general and the Office of Disability Services in particular (due largely to insufficient staff) that already had been identified in the 2000-2001 report to the Provost but not redressed (Appendix 2).

Furthermore, there has been no oversight of those providing new construction and building renovations to ensure that they complied with ADA standards. Often the University has gone to considerable expense to accomplish ADA compliance, with the resulting facility renovations failing to follow legal ADA specifications or functional needs. This has not been just a problem with the repair of older buildings, but with new construction on campus as well. Appendix 7 provides evidence of occasions where contractors did not follow ADA specifications and for which there were no sanctions.

Finally, there are systemic shortcomings in our official efforts to serve individuals with disabilities, and in our official policies concerning those with disabilities. The 2009 Georgia State University and Peer Institutions’ Ratio of Disability Staff per Students report (Appendix 8) compares student/staff ratios between Georgia State and its 15 peer institutions, and reveals our inadequacy. Additionally, there are no clear leave policies for faculty, staff, and administrators for those persons with disabilities. So far, we have comparatively little to show for our two decades of efforts to make the University as accessible to those with disabilities as to the able-bodied. It is important to remember that federal law mandates that we be able to serve all of our students and employees. It is necessary as well to our educational mission to support all diverse groups, and encourage them to flourish. As we continue into the twenty-first century, we should adopt a new, proactive approach that takes into account the full range of possible disabilities that our students and employees may present, and that makes our campus truly accessible for them. For these and other reasons, we pose the following solutions below.

*The University should establish the position of Associate Provost for Disability Issues.* This person should have the authority to refuse all non-compliant work on the part of contractors who claim to be providing ADA-compliant work. A staff person in this office should know how to read building plans and how to implement applicable laws and policies. The office should be a clearinghouse for all disability programs, services, and entities around campus, supporting a One Stop Shop for disability issues. This should be a separate unit from the Office of Opportunity Development and Diversity Education Planning, the Office of Disability Services, or Human Resources. The Associate Provost for Disability Issues should report to the Provost and should be charged with the role of Compliance Officer; this position should not be the responsibility of the Office of Disability Services director, which is a clear conflict of interest.

*The Office of Disability Services should have a clear role in serving students, and not in serving employees.* Employment issues can intertwine with disability issues and the staff of the ODS is not trained in such legal matters. This office, with its resources
already over-extended, should serve students alone, with the Office of Human Resources assisting employees.

All written policies relating to disabilities in faculty, staff, and student handbooks and on the various University websites should be revised for clarity, consistency, and compliance with all present laws. For example, policies on the following websites are outdated and inconsistent: http://www.gsu.edu/images/HR/facultyhandbook.pdf and http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwfhb/updates/300/301/30103-00.html. This is particularly necessary given the new federal ADAAA now in effect. In line with this, the University should amend any policies regarding individuals with episodic impairments (e.g., Lupus, Multiple Sclerosis, Epilepsy), since these impairments now are defined as “disabilities” and covered by the ADAAA.

Communication should be formalized. The new Associate Provost for Disability Issues should establish ways, such as an ADA newsletter, to inform students, faculty, staff, departmental chairs, directors, deans, supervisors, and managers about disability issues, making expectations and services more transparent. A University diversity webpage should be created for all diverse groups including those with disabilities. Employees and students should be encouraged to self-disclose any disabilities so they may receive appropriate services. This will take effort on everyone’s part to establish a culture of inclusiveness and sense of safety; to date such a culture does not exist and many feel the need to hide their disabilities.

Never before has it been so clear that individuals with disabilities have a place on the University campus. ADAAA (2008) expands the definition of an eligible disability and the 2008 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (Section 709- Programs to Provide Students with Disabilities with a Quality Higher Education) has provisions that extend services to students with intellectual disabilities, which will require creativity and sensitivity to a degree heretofore unseen at Georgia State University. Additional recommendations are available in the various appendices. The University must proactively approach support for the inclusion of ALL students on its campus, regardless of race, socio-economic status, gender, or disability status. The campus must be accessible to all if we are serious about becoming the leading urban research center to which we aspire.

Appendix 1
In April 2010, three Focus Groups were conducted in preparation for writing this report, one each with faculty, staff, and students. Participants self-identified as having a disability, serving individuals with disabilities, or expressing a concern about individuals with disabilities. 15 individuals participated across the three groups. The following questions were posed to each group, and a summary of their answers follows.

Summary of Findings
What do we want the Strategic Planning Committee to know about the needs of the campus disability community? Accessible routes and entryways into buildings and classrooms, ease of acquiring necessary technology, safety of passage, availability of accessible restrooms, knowledge of whom to contact for help, lack of courtesy by some responders, physical hazards in classrooms, website accessibility, accessibility to print media, liaison with the city regarding sidewalks, fears regarding building evacuations,
inadequate academic accommodations, lack of after-hours support, and distractions in
the classroom were all mentioned.

Do you know who the disability coordinator or support person is for faculty members?
Do you know who is responsible for campus services? Unequivocally faculty and staff
answered “no” to this question. Students knew where to start.

What additional resources and staff do you think GSU needs? Web accessibility,
parking, real compliance, police escorts to transport a person with a temporary disability
at night, a One Stop Shop/Clearinghouse/Triage center for disability concerns,
instruction on Universal Design, campus-wide training on the new Higher Education
law, training on cognitive disabilities, more staff, workshops, clear policy handbooks, a
kinder gentler response from service providers.

Do you understand the role of disability services and its supervisory structure?
Responses to this were vague, indicating a lot of confusion about where to go for help
and with whom “the buck stops.” Succession planning and training seminars on ULearn
were mentioned.

Summarizing all we have talked about, please state for me as succinctly as possible a
specific policy you feel should be enacted at Georgia State University. Room planning,
oversight, web accessibility, a fully-accessible campus, training, fixing compliance
issues in Aderhold Hall, collection of disability status of faculty members, sufficient
resources, a commitment to an inclusive campus environment, and leadership were all
mentioned.

Appendix 2
Focus Group Responses

In Preparation for the Disability Policy White Paper

April 9, 2010

Three focus groups were conducted, one each with faculty, staff, and students. Participants
were identified as having a disability or serving individuals with disabilities or expressing a
concern about individuals with disabilities. Faculty members who could not attend the faculty
focus group were invited to attend the staff focus group. Staff members who were not able
to attend the staff focus group were invited to attend the student group. All individuals were
invited to submit a letter of additional information if they later thought of comments they
wanted to convey. Fourteen individuals attended across all groups.

Several individuals requested that they not be identified in the body of this document;
therefore, all new comments are begun with the indicator comment.

The essential question was written on the board at the front of the room and was in view of
all participants. It was read to all participants as well to ensure that those with visual
impairments knew the essential question being addressed by the focus groups. The first
session began at 1:00. The last session ended at 5:15. The facilitator and recorder was Dr.
Susan R. Easterbrooks, Chair, Disability Initiatives Committee of the University Senate. She
recorded responses on an MP3 player and typed responses as they were stated. Later, she
listened to the MP3 recording and revised her typed draft, which is provided in its entirety
below.

Essential Question- What do we want the Strategic Planning Committee to know
about the needs of the campus disability community?

1. There are many inaccessible features of GSU buildings that interfere
with the daily lives of students, faculty and staff with disabilities. These
same features also influence the lives of students with temporary disabilities.
What experiences are you aware of either that you personally have had, that
a student has had, or that someone else you know has experienced.
Comment... At the General Classroom Building, I had to go through the loading dock, which is the accessible route but it was often locked. Sometimes it was not open and I had no idea whom to contact for access. Current issue, I tore the cartilage in my right knee. Fell on campus, I can no longer make it to back to back classes from one side of campus to another. But I do not know what service is available or how to register faculty on campus so someone will know my needs. Didn’t know whom to contact. Dean’s office scheduler told her to register with disability service offices but that is for students. Annette Butler was going to send a survey out but she never received it. How do we inform people of our needs?

Comment... In the College of Business, classroom scheduling is a problem. I am legally blind so there is assistive technology that needs to be installed every semester. I need to be at Aderhold. Most of the computer equipped classrooms you cannot move the monitor. Is so far away as to be useless due to my field of vision. Aderhold has flat screen monitors on security cable. Usually possible to move that and see it. Depends on how cable is laid out. Back to back rooms...usually I am able to get this. I requested this and received a *hostilely toned letter* assuming that he I was not registered. Had to verify that I had previously registered. Found the tone of the letter offensive. Letter implied I should give up on having back to back rooms. Associate chair assisted me and fought it. A specific recommendation for strategic plan: The whole business of assigning rooms need to be looked at very closely. Primitive software. Any faculty member, disabled or not, teaching two sections back to back ought to have the same classroom.

Comment...Has 3 back to back and she has to move each time. Across the street is fine but across campus is not.

Comment...With reasonable software and a helpful attitude, this should be something we could accomplish. In Aderhold, all rooms have what looks like a power and internet connection but it is dead. Looks good on publicity photos but they are useless. Have to have the classroom dimly lit so they can see screen. All kids have power cords and in poor light it is dangerous for me to move around...same for non-disabled. Physical hazard to all. Rooms built to look good but only look good and are not effective. Need gaffer tape or something but that would not look good on the publicity brochures.

Comment... Website accessibility is a problem. I have had to construct my own websites. Not always sure if they are really in compliance. I used to use Bobbi [a web accessibility system] to evaluate it but it is not longer an option. I would like to have some mechanism in place to review websites for accessibility. Do not see a mechanism in place. Need some infrastructure.

2nd...used to have students in classes who were Visually Impaired and Braille was their primary media. I would convert handouts myself and this is time consuming. Office of Disability Services at the time was not able to do it. I would like to see that this service becomes available. All print material should be accessible in the students’ primary mode of reading.

Next,...regarding the building...the few bathrooms that are supposed to be accessible are not really accessible or they are locked. Especially a problem for wheelchair users. Need a policy that there are functioning, accessible, unlocked bathrooms.

Comment...Accessible website...is it supposed to be accessible. If it meets the standards then the standards need to be thrown out. Many links are too light for a person with Visual Impairment to see...light blue on medium blue website does not follow any standards of contrast. You will not get many partially sighted freshman if they start at the website.

Comment...Sometimes people off the street lock themselves into bathrooms. On our floor everyone has keys and students just need to ask for the key.

Comment...That is not in effect on all floors and in all buildings. For evening classes where do students find a faculty member on another floor and how do they know to do this?

Comment...This is for our floor and so another plan is needed if we are designing it for people in the whole building.

One of the ways to solve the problem is to swipe it with Panther cards. With a card everyone could get into classrooms and bathrooms. From a safety standpoint that is a major issue. A public safety colleague says they have training for getting people out of buildings but updates are needed.
Attitude is a big problem. We need a "kinder gentler" attitude. I was monitoring master’s comp. A student had Cerebral Palsy and couldn’t use the mouse on the keypad because it was too small and asked for a regular mouse. The technology person told her to "Suck it up". I went to the technology person and addressed it. Person taking comps was very upset while taking comps. I did meet with the tech person who apologized but the experience was very unfortunate and we need ongoing, attitudinal informational sessions across campus about the needs of persons with disabilities.

Accessible entries is a major issue. Routinely there are questions about it. The strategic plan should assure that all buildings have accessible entrances. It should not be a punitive route. It takes more time to do it anyway and then they are sent down circuitous routes. This constitutes “micro-aggressions” that accumulate. When you must enter through the loading dock it says that you are a second class citizen. Visually Impaired folks find obstacles on the street. People put signs out at restaurants. Kids trip over them all the time. They are dangerous for Visually Impaired students.

Comment...If we are an urban university, why is there no disability liaison between GSU and city?

Comment... Why are all doors not accessible?

Comment... Sometimes when you push the button the doors don’t open. What do you do in that situation? How do you handle it? Students in wheelchairs...when there is a fire-drill or fire, how do we get students down? If they ever shut the elevator down you could die.

Comment...Fire makes the doors open where the fire is? Are supposed to be designated areas in the stairwells but how do people know about this.

Comment... 9th and 8th floors of the COE have evacuation chairs but is anything like that on other floors and in other buildings?

Comment... Very frustrating...these issues come up year after year after year and we tout ourselves as a major urban institution. It is shameful. This should be a priority issue. It always gets swept under the floor. That’s not what this university is supposed to be about.

STAFF

Comment... I haven’t seen physical so much but the Office of Disability Services has counselors who will help set up academic accommodations. The problem is that they are not easy to get to. Other institutions I know about have an open door policy where you can see the counselor. Here you have to go through a couple of steps. Not much room for flexible drop-in service. For example, a student can have a huge psychological evaluation at the Regents Center. It goes to the Office of Disability Services at the different universities that use the Center services and students receive the appropriate services. At GSU it is more difficult. Students can’t just call and make an appointment and go over their paperwork. They have to go online and fill out another form. They wait for phone calls to be answered. They can’t even drop by at the office. We have some students who have difficulty reading computer screens and filling out forms online and it is difficult for them in trying to access services.

Comment... We do hear from different sources that there are barriers for parents and students when they try to navigate the campus, try to find anything on the website.

Comment... I have had interactions with other colleges and Georgia State stands out as a real problem. There is more fluidity elsewhere. We have one of the more difficult set ups.

Focus Group Leader’s Comment- I have two kids who have been to 4 different colleges. We have always been met with smiling faces.

Comment... Quite a bit of need for students with disabilities. Other schools have a better student to staff ratio than GSU. One student I know went to meet with a counselor and was stopped at the front desk and turned away. There is no open door policy. There should always be an open door for students.

Comment... Recently I had foot surgery. At the COE building, dropping off is easy but if you are on the passenger side it is hard to get out in traffic. Have to get in back seat of car. If are picking someone up it is a big problem because there is nowhere to park to pick up someone with a disability. Crutches or wheelchair are a real problem. You can’t get from G-deck to COE. No back access to get in and after you are tired out from getting all the way from G-deck you still have to go all the way around the front. If in a wheelchair cannot do stairs. I was lucky that people would bring me to work and drop me off. Ended up going to
basement and going out garage door because there was no other place to pick someone up.

Around the university is a problem where if someone is bringing someone, with traffic, where can you drop them off safely at any building without having to worry will they be hit. As a staff member, I know where to go but students don’t. We need more signs.

Comment- It would be helpful if there was an accessibility map. If they were available that would help. Online is one thing but what do you do if you just walk on to campus. How do you find anyone who can give you any help?

Comment- I am guessing I would have nothing to add about accessibility but the campus is famous for being plunked down in the middle of a city and there are many problems with access.

Even if there is a map on the website, when you are actually here, how do you negotiate this campus. Bathrooms, doors, are all issues. Web accessibility...I am thinking that there are major issues with the website broadly. Some of the standards that our professional associations require for Section 505, we do not meet. Our website is not accessible from a legal standpoint.

Sharon- If you are colorblind, the website is not accessible. A substantial portion of the male population is color blind.

Comment- In our office we deal with a large array of student issues but most of the students have issues with text material. Instructors will work with them on an individual basis.

Comment- Cognitive disabilities are also a problem. We need to remember about that. Personally I have gone to events. I have a hearing impairment and there doesn’t seem to be any accommodation for that offered in advance or made known but I don’t know what happens for someone who needs it. Speakers at different centers are a problem. There are no assistive listening devices. They should be expected to have services.

Comment- Main events are interpreted but the problem is how do you decide which events to interpret and which not.

Comment- I have had an experience where an obese student had trouble accessing classroom seating. Sometimes facilities will help accommodate but there was no real path to get help. I ended up going to the Dean’s office.

Comment- If student is registered with office of disability services, they can make accommodations. Otherwise you have to work it out with the professor.

Group Leader’s Comment: The level of paperwork that students have to go through is a real barrier. It takes a long time to get all the paperwork completed, not all students understand how to get through it or have the reading or physical skills to do the paperwork, or the organizational or financial wherewithal to get required documentation from their doctors. They give up very easily. It should be an easy, supportive process, not a punitive one that turns students away.

Comment- Instructors do not know how to make a request for help on behalf of a student.

Comment- Consistently we see compliance problems with newer buildings and construction such as the Commons and the new science center. Are several ADA issues and so there needs to be some kind of universal policy in the very beginning. Architects say they meet the guidelines but they are not. The university needs an agreed upon set of ADA guidelines. Consistently we have new buildings coming on board that do not meet access, rooms with lowered tables. Should build in designated design features. The university does not address features up front. For example, the science center has raised mounds. What are they? Even for a sighted individual, I was tripping over them so what is a blind, low vision student going to do. Those kinds of things need to be examined in terms of access and dealt with before they even occur.

Comment- It is absolutely maddening to see new buildings going up that are not accessible. We have no university policy. There should be someone to sign off before we pay these people.

Comment- The other piece is you can have a building that is technically accessible but it is not always the most convenient. You are treated like a second class citizen. There is technical compliance but actual compliance is different. True accessibility does not occur. Universal Design should be considered.

STUDENT RESPONSE
Comment: As a staff person when we have folks visiting us with physical disabilities we have problems. Our parking is at G-deck and so we have to deal with bad or missing curb cuts. We tried to cut through a building, which was a mistake. If you are a person who uses a wheelchair it is like going through a maze. You can’t go from point A to point B. I have also had students tell me they had difficulty with their course schedule in getting from one place to another and the amount of time it takes.

Comment: From the LD side, I have trouble with processing. In Sparks Hall in particular because of how the classrooms are designed the doors have grates and anyone standing in the hallway, all their sound comes in the classroom. This semester I have had to ask people to move or lower their voices. I am not able to process what the professor is saying because of the distraction. It is always a problem in Sparks Hall. That’s the main thing I am struggling with. I moved in this room because the AC is really loud. I have trouble with that and interacting when I am not processing well.

Comment: I was in a classroom once where someone was using a slinky and I thought I was going crazy.

Comment: Often I feel like I am not getting heard and so as nicely as possible I have to ask people to stop. I preface it with saying “I am sorry but I cannot process what you are saying.”

Comment: I am very concerned about the website accessibility. From what I have learned from how our website works, we work on our own ones so we are responsible for alternative text on a picture. There doesn’t seem to be any safeguard for other campus sites. The text at the top is an image and doesn’t have an alternative text for screen readers to convey the information. They are transitioning all the websites to the format used in the main site. It is bad and is not compliant. It uses flash and that is very difficult for the screen reader. As far as I know, there should be something that says “Click here for text.”

Comment: Mainly it is finding what I need. Even within my floor there are so many levels to find a specific piece of information. Within MSIT then language and literacy then a particular form, unless I already know how to find it, it is hard to find the specific piece of information you need. If I don’t know already where it is, I can’t find it. The search bar doesn’t necessarily pull up what you need.

Comment: Regarding the Office of Disability Services, for the most part it is OK but maybe it was accidental but the last semester of my masters I went and said I was starting the PhD. Am I OK and they said there was nothing I needed to do...that it would automatically flip over in the fall and then in the fall it didn’t. They couldn’t find any record that I had ever done anything with them. They handed me this stack of 50 or 75 papers and said to start all over again. I asked them to check again and they still didn’t find me. I had to go to the Regents Center all over again. It took the entire fall semester to get all the tests, copies of old tests, my mom to fill out the parent checklist. I turned it all in and the Regents Center called and said that since I had been approved earlier, they didn’t understand why I had to do it again. The Office of Disability Services made it sound all legal and like I’d be shot...all for nothing. Unfortunately that was the only semester where I needed the distraction reduced testing. I had to link up the Regents Center with the Office of Disability Services. It should not have been that complicated. They already had everything. It was a very frustrating thing to happen.

Comment: You have to go when the right person is there, though.

Comment: I asked the staff member if she knew where to go if she needed services. She did not.

Comment: I have heard folks talk about the difficulty of navigating on the bus. Students with disabilities have trouble with it. I haven’t heard a lot about students with learning disabilities. I wish that when we had an undergrad class of 100 more folks would come forward as an indication that our campus is welcoming to those folks. We get very few who self-identify and it is because we aren’t very accessible.

Comment: Part of the things I worry about is that people don’t know that they CAN ask. If they didn’t go through IEPs or services when they are in high school then they aren’t familiar with the system and so they would not really know. In my case I didn’t get services and since I am in education I fear that people without the education background don’t know how to articulate what they need to professors and would rather stay in the back and get help outside. OR they don’t get through the class and are falling through the class. But if they don’t self identify, how do you know they are there.
Comment: Is this information a part of students’ Freshman orientation? How do they find out about it?

2. GSU needs to identify a disabilities coordinator/point person during the building or renovation phase of any campus building. This person must be responsible for ensuring ADA compliance throughout the process. Do you know who the disability coordinator or support person is for faculty members? Do you know who is responsible for campus services?

FACULTY RESPONSES

It is probably in an email folder somewhere. Recall that it was a he.

No

No

100% of participants did not know who the contact person was for faculty. Even some dean’s offices do not know.

STAFF RESPONSES

Comment: Last week I got an email. I didn’t know anything before that.

Comment: When I was hurt I had to ask and figure it out but it is not evident.

Comment: The process for employees begins with Human Resources but usually ends in disability services. It is very problematic. There are many more issues than just a disability involved with faculty and staff that are beyond the ODS level of expertise. There are FERPA, worker’s comp, and other legal issues that we are not charged to deal with. Student service is not really the best place. It requires another level of expertise. Employment and ADA issue and law should not go under student service. That is a big potential issue. So when those notices [referring to notices from HR inviting employees to self-identify] go out it creates a wave of initial interest but it just allows it not to be the most effective way. Once it is in HR it should stay in HR. Also, sometimes there are issues related with level of work performance that differs from the problems that are a result of the disability and those have to be sorted out by someone other than student services.

Comment: Do people in Human Resources have that training? With me nobody told me anything about what to do when I came back to work. Human Resources needs a lot of training on ADA issues.

Comment: Students [in a particular instructional program] get about 5 minutes on Title 1 and most of it is on Title 7 but the next generation of HR people are not being trained in that area.

3. GSU needs to devote additional resources and staff to disability services to enable them to assist students. What additional resources and staff do you think GSU needs?

FACULTY RESPONSE

Comment: It would be nice to have someone to help with website accessibility. We need an oversight committee that has some power behind it.

Comment: Oversight committee? Would they supervise and recognize problems in building plans? Once I asked a guard where the accessible entrance was and he said no we don’t have one. What would students do that needed access and no one knows who to ask. How could anyone build something that was not standard.

Comment: Parking is a big problem. Some people who had access to closer parking did not want to give it up for someone with a disability.

Comment: I have heard a couple times about there being apparently a bureaucratic gulf between faculty/staff versus for student services so it becomes even more difficult for either group to find help.

Comment: When I fell on campus, I filled out the paperwork. But the elevators did not work. Office manager called for police escort. Because I was injured they would not transport me
to my car because of liability issues.

Comment- That’s the perfect Catch-22. If you hadn’t needed to be transported you wouldn’t have had trouble getting transportation.

Comment- Just wanted to mention…when I was on crutches they did transport me so there is not a firm policy.

STAFF RESPONSE
Comment- There needs to be a One Stop-p Shop for disability access. Where do you go to resolve an issue? There is no office, no one place. There should be an administrative office high up where the strength of the office says this must be addressed.

“Universal design” means instructional access. From a resource perspective, I do not think there is a lot of continuing education for the faculty in how to make coursework more accessible. Faculty needs to get more training. It will be even more needed in the next 5 to 10 years. All higher education campuses must be open. The new Higher Education Act is similar to the laws that forced inclusion of students with disabilities into public schools. The campus must be open for all and all will need to be accommodated. I don’t think we know how to do that. We are 18 months into the Act. I don’t think the provisions have hit us yet. I am part of a network of 30-40 programs looking at integrating students with intellectual disabilities onto campus.

Comment- The Teaching and Learning Center should incorporate disability training into their offerings.

Comment- ADA addresses more than just the physical disabilities and start thinking about the hidden disabilities. Psychiatric issues are so poorly addressed. I have had a student say to me “I could never let my professor know I have this or that”. We need an awareness campaign to address hidden disabilities. It is frightening. They don’t know what it means.

Comment- For an institution this large, there MUST be a larger staff for the students and more contact with Rodney’s office [referring to Office of Disability Services]. Are faculty trained in technology that is available for disabled students? One helpful thing would be to let students download an outline of the class the night before. Cognitive and attention disabilities both need something like an outline. Huge lecture halls are not helpful for these folks. Technology is a big issue.

Comment- A lot of students that are registered will get help from the Office of Disability Services but not the kinds of encouragement they need throughout the course from the instructors. For example, a student with Vision Impairment in a math course said “I know the formula but how do I hear that and visualize it at the same time?” I encouraged him to explain his perspective to the instructor. There needs to be a lot more training, staffing, and help.

Comment- We need a more universally accessible tutoring center, some kind of center, some agency on campus where you could connect with tutors based on your individuals set of strength to learn new strategies. That integrated model on campus would be very helpful. I have also been talking to folks at the university counseling center. There is a great need for skill building, time management, social skills, help with organization skills. The need is great but the resources are minimal. Need to set up need based theme based groups.

Comment- There is no one place to go to figure out what resources ARE available. Needs to be someone or something to direct people. A clearinghouse. A One Stop Shop.

Comment- A triage center

Comment- We do have a brochure on tutoring resources but they go to the webpage and so there should be one website for all student support services. No single central place to access the information.

Comment- Needs to be somebody who is an expert in ADA within Human Resources or take on a variety of tasks. Sign off on buildings.

Comment- We get lists of workshops you can attend. You never see a workshop on disabilities. ADA regulations. We need more about helping the hearing impaired, why can’t there be a workshop added to our list we can attend.

Comment- ODEP offers one for supervisors on ADA conducted by legal affairs. But Human Resources reorganization may have changed that. I see what you are saying.

Comment- Staff comes into contact with students. WE could use training too. We would like to be able to tell them where they might need to go. I would go to this kind of workshop. We
have a lot of committees on campus. I don’t know how many committees there are when
decisions are being made concerning the university. Is there anybody on these committees
that can bring attention to what is needed? We probably have had a lot of students who
wanted to attend Georgia State but it is like a maze and they go someplace else.

Comment- A recommendation for the office staff is that they need to be trained to work with
students with disabilities. ODS gets questions about everything. Career, financial aid, all that
kind of thing. Advisement for courses.

Comment- Language is an issue. “Student Success” the name needs to be more
transparent. Need to be able to navigate around the website easily.

Comment- There needs to be something on the wall [in the classrooms] you can flip to to
find information you need. If there is a problem in a classroom, we have a flip chart we can
look in for emergencies. If that were in every classroom or room, that information should be
visible for all people to see. Say somebody comes into the classroom and you need a larger
chair. You could look at that and see who to call. What about medical emergencies, too.

Comment- Is at a systemic level. We have talked about centralizing but we also want to
have infusion. Not just one little subset who knows about it but how can we infuse this
across campus so there is a balance between the two approaches. More broad based. Both
are needed.

STUDENTS [Question reframed for the students. What is the most important thing to fix
here at Georgia State? What would you do if you had all the money in the world?]

Comment- The most glaring thing is the lack of physical access. From a population access,
if we fixed the physical access problem we would be more accommodating but at the same
time, my heart is more toward a greater diversity of abilities in the classroom and making it
more accommodating for all kinds of learning abilities. So working with the ODS supports in
making it more welcoming. Yes, we have all these forms but here is how we are going to
help you. “We want you to have these services”, not [saying to them] ‘try and get it’. Also
instructors need to learn more about universal design. Many do not know all the different
teaching techniques that are available. I think about the statement we were required to have
on a syllabus [referring to statement from policy handbook regarding a notice about
disability services required on all syllabi]. I wish it were more welcoming.

Comment- And the timing….the statement is written like “you’d better take care of it now”
and it is confusing for people with organization issues. You have to have all this taken care
of before you even start and it is stressful. One of the things about learning issues as
opposed to physical….the things a person with a physical disability needs are… they are
more concrete things (curbs, parking lots) whereas it can be kind of hard to explain
[cognitive disabilities] to the professors because it is kind of hard to say what I need before
the class actually gets going. There are a couple things I know I am going to need and I
have been lucky that people are very helpful but I did have to actually sit down and figure
out what to say and write it out because I have attention and processing things and I don’t
always know what I’m going to need. It took the first couple of semesters to figure out
things….like I have to sit away from the AC vent.

Comment- I wonder if faculty in the education department might be more understanding of
accommodations or policy than science because students have a variety of interests.

Comment- My experience has been almost entirely with this COE building and I wonder if
professors outside have knowledge of instructional techniques that are more inclusive. A lot
of professors don’t really know how to teach. They know their subject matter but do they
know access to information.

Comment- GSU needs to clarify the role of disability services.

Comment- We need, for lack of a better word, an ombudsperson. There needs to be a
supervisory structure to this.

4. We talked about services to GSU employees. Do you understand the role
of disability services and its supervisory structure?

FACULTY RESPONSE

Comment- Regarding assignments, if a student has some kind of disability, where he needs
extra time for assignments or tests, I get a form. They contact me. There was a Visually
Impaired student with an assistant and when an instructor offered to let her take [her test] at
ODS she preferred to take it in the classroom.
Comment: It's 50-50.

Comment: Some students complain that offices are closed when they are supposed to be taking a test. The office is closed in the evenings. Graduate students are especially affected.

Comment: I am concerned about timing as well. [A discussion ensued regarding the limited staff at GSU relative to the University of Georgia and our 15 sister institutions. GSU has the worst staff/student ratio of all, with only one other university providing fewer services. See appendix regarding that survey. It was noted that ODS cannot provide more services until it gets more staff.

Comment: ODS is closed in the evenings when we have our classes.

STAFF RESPONSES

Comment: The average staff member knows very little. We used to have training for new faculty. The average faculty on this campus has little knowledge.

Comment: The Office of Disability Services had to do an ASUR report a couple years ago [see appendix]. Discussion of numerous requests, needs, and problems identified in the report. There was no follow up. Recommendations need to be followed up so we aren't doing the same things that were problems seven years ago. Staffing, organizational structure [are identified as problems]. ADA should come under another office, not student services. We need more staffing to address the ever-growing and changing [campus disability community]. There are psychological problems. [Individuals with] Asbergers are on campus. UGA has 25+ staff members [GSU has 3 and some part time assistance.]

Comment: We need an Associate Provost on Disabilities. We have one for women and recruitment of minorities. Given all the changes and laws and reports, it is time for someone like this to be appointed. There needs to be continuity. Succession planning. Usually it is individuals driving the process but nothing systemic.

[The focus group facilitator offered some examples. When Dr. Taylor was on campus, she did an extensive project with her students to map campus accessibility. When she was hired away by another university, the project ceased. Some buildings have been mapped. Many have not. There is a hot link on the university map but there is no explanation anywhere that his would be where someone should go to find accessible routes. As another example, an effort was begun to work with the building managers of all buildings, but that project was never funded and so nothing came of it. We have fixed many bathrooms only to find out that they were fixed incorrectly. A new railing was installed at one building on a handicapped accessible ramp and the railing did not meet ADA specifications. There is no bottom

Comment: With training, you could put a lot on ULearn. Have training videos on ULearn. Put it on there so they are at least introduced to the concepts.

Comment: Expand the film department. Recording key workshops that could be accessed would be great.

5. Summarizing all we have talked about, please state for me as succinctly as possible a specific policy you feel should be enacted at Georgia State University.

FACULTY RESPONSE

1. More flexible and responsive room scheduling system.

2. Website accessibility starting with gsu.edu main website specifically.

3. Disability issues should become a priority at this university with the formation of an oversight committee that has the power to enforce these issues and that it would have financial backing to hire necessary personnel to orchestrate addressing our needs commensurate with a university of our stature.

4. A system in place to keep faculty aware of issues affecting students and faculty regarding assistance for disability issues.

5. Reiterating what we have said before, we need a FULLY accessible campus.

6. There needs to be education for faculty, staff, and student training (e.g., service dogs. Has anything changed over the last year? I do not know. There could be changes that I am not aware of. There should be education and training for administration as well.

7. I would still like to see the wiring done right in Aderhold.
Comment: GSU is giving the message that if you have a disability you are not as welcomed here as someone without a disability.

STAFF RESPONSE

1. There needs to be a Provost [for disability service to the broader campus disability community, not just students alone.] Folks with disabilities are part of a diverse community. We are a society that melds but the way to make institutional gains is to make a commitment to those gains. There should be an Associate Provost for Disability Issues.

2. GSU needs to commit to being an inclusive community.

3. An associate provost would develop policies and procedures to integrate inclusion into the overall campus community.

4. Accessibility and facility must both be addressed. If we really want to welcome everyone, we need to provide facility not just accessibility.

5. Disability status is not collected for faculty and staff so if you are going to have an affirmative action, you must document the discrepancy between population numbers and gains. This can be quantified but you can't do that if you do not know what the numbers are. It also impacts staffing. The percent who self-identify is very small.

6. Need to make sure that the resources are available. There needs to be designated fund specific to ADA initiatives. [The money current spent] is not nearly enough.

STUDENT RESPONSE

1. I think Georgia State values disability as an element of diversity just like race and gender. We have folks in leadership [positions] for race and gender but to my knowledge there is nothing like this on disability. It is a topic of emerging prominence. Obama appointed a council on disability for the first time. It is something we should be pursuing as well. Statistically 20% [of the population] have a disability, and a lot experience it and it should be something we are embracing and supporting as another cultural identity that people experience in their lives.

2. We should move toward Universal Design theory. A university should think of universal access. Not just what one group needs but what are we going to do that meets the needs of all people. By helping that one person succeed here we are helping others as well.

3. We are an urban university looking at race, socio-economic status, and it is unbelievable [how those things intersect with] disabilities whether it is health outcomes...it is a natural fit to look at those cross sections and is something that falls under our purview as a leading urban research center that we aspire to be.

Appendix 3
Appendices from the Annual Report to Provost Ron Henry on campus ADA-Compliance.
Ada/504 Advisory Committee Annual Report to the Provost Georgia State University
2001-2002

The ADA/504 Advisory Committee met periodically during the 2001-2002 year to continue its work of the previous year. This report begins with a summary of actions taken regarding recommendations from the 2000-2001 report. The next section describes new activities undertaken in 2001-2002. The report ends with recommendations, in particular, those regarding the great reluctance across campus to address ADA compliance. The Chair makes specific recommendations regarding resolution of the apparent impasse.

Part I Resolution of 2000-2001 Recommendations
Recommendation 1: Invite a speaker from the State of Georgia to discuss the State’s response to ADA, 504, and new regulations.

Action: A speaker was not invited from outside the university, although Mr. Shumpert did come and meet with the committee, during which time he agreed to undertake a walking tour of the campus to identify ADA compliance problems.

Recommendation 2: Develop and distribute a brochure university-wide regarding rights and responsibilities under ADA and 504.

Action: The brochure was completed and distributed.

Recommendation 3: Develop or acquire training tapes and on-line materials of self-study by university faculty and staff. Request the Provost to inform the University community of its obligation to review these.

Action: The Committee determined to set up a website of materials for the university’s use. This site is presently under development.

Recommendation 4: Constitute a Task Force to develop a University policy on accessibility to electronic media, especially the web. Determine an appropriate phase-in period. Request the Provost to inform faculty and staff of their obligations to the new policy.

Action: A sub-committee of the ADA Committee met and discussed a policy. However, since the university has a larger task force studying this problem, it was determined to hold further action until we had additional information regarding the university’s committee.

Recommendation 5: Update the Facilities Needs Assessment and prioritize action.

Action: This request for funds to re-examine facilities was turned down.

Recommendation 6: Send two committee members to the annual ADA conference.

Action: Gergely and Olsen attended National ADA Coordinator’s Conference.

Part II Committee Activities for 2001-2002

The ADA/504 Advisory Committee engaged in the following new activities.

1. Development of a website regarding accessibility at Georgia State University. This site is currently under development.

2. Completion and distribution of a brochure regarding individuals with disabilities. (Copy attached.)

3. Development of a draft policy regarding web accessibility at Georgia State.

4. Collaboration on a grant proposal to the Board of Regents to secure additional funding for ADA compliance actions.

5. Ongoing efforts to require compliance with ADAAG.

Development of a Website
In order to provide the University community with needed information regarding ADA and 504 compliance, it was determined that a website be developed that will provide information on compliance, accessibility, and accommodation issues. The address of this website will be www.gsu.edu/~wwwada. The website is scheduled for completion before December 2002. Appendix A contains a copy of the proposed site map.

Brochure
The Human Resources subcommittee completed development of a brochure describing services for individuals with disabilities at Georgia State University. A copy of this brochure is included at the end of this document.

Web Accessibility Policy
The Electronic Media subcommittee developed a draft policy for web accessibility. Dr. Bill Evans agreed to take this policy to the Faculty Senate, but upon his departure, the activity was curtailed. The committee is requesting that Dr. Henry appoint a new sponsor to take this policy to the Senate. Appendix B contains a copy of the proposed policy.

Collaboration on Grant Proposal
In the winter of 2001, the ADA Advisory Committee Chair met with Mr. Harvey Shumpert to discuss issues and concerns regarding ADA compliance on campus. This meeting included a discussion of the need to review the 1994 campus needs assessment, to inspect current building compliance problems, and to reprioritize building and refurbishing needs across the campus. At that time, Mr. Shumpert agreed to participate in a walking tour of the campus.
On March 15, 2002, Mr. Shumpert came and spoke with the ADA Advisory Committee. The committee shared its concerns about the current status of compliance on campus. This included both the need for a compliance review procedure required of all new building and an updated review of all existing buildings and previously identified problems. Mr. Shumpert agreed to assign a staff member to work with the committee on this task. To date, no staff member has contacted the Chair regarding this collaboration.

On March 19, 2002, a letter was sent to the university from the Board of Regents requesting a proposal for ADA compliance funds. The university gave no response to this letter. On June 21, 2002, a second letter was sent. Caroline Gergely received a copy of this letter on the 25th or 26th and forwarded the information to the Committee Chair indicating that Georgia State had not submitted a proposal to the Board of Regents for additional funding for ADAAG compliance. The Committee Chair contacted Mr. Shumpert and offered to help develop a grant proposal. Caroline Gergely, Jim Olsen, Dana Mason, and Susan Easterbrooks met with Mr. Shumpert, Kim Bauer, and another gentleman from Mr. Shumpert’s office on July 2nd to prioritize needs. A grant proposal was hastily developed and submitted to the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission (GSFIC) by the July 10th deadline.

A list was distributed to the University System from GSFIC showing allocations to each unit of the system, and there was no allocation listed on the GSU line. Mark Demyanek, the State of Georgia’s ADA Coordinator, informed Jim Olsen that no funds were allocated to GSU because it had not yet utilized its existing ADA money. This is unconscionable. The ADA/504 Advisory Committee Chair would like to know why the allocated compliance money has not been spent, and if it has been spent elsewhere, then the Chair would like an accounting of where the money was spent. There are clear needs that must be met in order to bring the physical facilities of GSU into compliance. Many of the needs identified in the 1996 campus review still exist, and new needs have arisen. The monies are there, but the effort to bring the university into compliance is not.

The ADA Committee Chair is eager to discuss this critical issue of a lack of processes and procedures to address non-compliance with the Provost and with appropriate Vice Presidents. Compliance issues are not being proactively managed, and GSU is being penalized financially as a result.

Ongoing Compliance Problems

The Chair of the ADA/504 Advisory Committee has come to believe that there is a crisis of compliance on the Georgia State University campus. First and foremost, there is no one on campus with the final authority to require compliance. Appendix C, a report from Caroline Gergely, the ADA/504 Coordinator, points out numerous instances of problem in compliance. Following is an example. This e-mail interchange took place between Dana Mason and another individual on campus:

I was in Kell Hall and noticed that the rest rooms on the 2nd floor are closed for renovation. How will we be addressing accessibility to the rooms with the step present or will you be adding a unisex rest room if it is technically infeasible in the existing rooms? (See O.C.G.A. 120-3-20.-33(3)(1).)

Also, where are we on creating the unisex rest room on the 4th floor where renovation was recently completed of the single sex rooms that are still not accessible?

Thanks,
8/9/02
Dana

We have no plans to add a unisex rest room to the fourth floor. The men’s restroom and the interior of the women’s meet ADA. It’s just that step up to the women’s that causes non compliance.

As for the second floor I am not the project manager. You may want to talk to ____ or _____.

In other words, the restroom is compliant once you get into it, but you just can’t get into it. There is absolutely no logic to this response. Either a restroom is compliant or it is not. Currently, the restroom in question is out of compliance. It is very problematic that there is no recourse available to remedy situations like this. There is no bottom line.
The ADA/504 Committee and the Chair of the Committee strongly urge you to take the following steps:

1. Give the authority to a person (perhaps the University’s ADA/504 Coordinator) or unit (perhaps a subcommittee of the ADA/504 Advisory Committee) to review all building/renovation plans and enforce ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) and State of Georgia Accessibility Codes (GAC). This person or unit should have the authority to call a halt to construction or to withhold an occupancy permit until ADAAG and GAC standards are met. A process should be developed whereby entities engaging in building and renovation activities on campus would be required to report at pre-determined intervals to this person or unit, who should conduct a site visit. In order to continue with construction/renovation, the entity would have to provide a written plan of how any non-compliance issues would be addressed before construction/renovation could continue. This person or unit should be the primary point of contact between GSFC and GSU regarding ADA funds available. Unless such a person or unit is given this authority, the university will remain in jeopardy regarding non-compliance with ADAAG and GAC standards and future funding opportunities may be lost.

2. ADA funding and project oversight should be placed administratively under a division other than Facilities Management. This is necessary to eliminate existing and potential conflicts of interest.

3. Currently one individual fulfills the roles of ADA/504 Coordinator and Director of Disability Services. This presents a problem because the Director’s position is embedded in several levels of administration, yet the Coordinator’s role is one that impacts the entire university. This places a university-level function within a department-level framework and creates conflicts of interest when the overseeing department is out of compliance.

The ADA/504 Coordinator needs to be able to report directly to a university-level administrator without the encumbrance of multiple levels of supervision. One solution would be to leave the role of ADA Coordinator as it is and move Disability Services administratively. Since Disability Services is not a student service office, but rather a compliance office, this should not create an administrative problem. A second option would be to create a separate position of ADA/504 Coordinator, placing this position directly under the Provost or the Vice President responsible for other aspects of safety, risk, and campus-wide support. Either option would give the ADA/504 Coordinator the freedom to adequately do the job.

Committee Structure
Last year, attendance at ADA/504 Advisory Committee meetings was woefully sparse. As a result, the Chair elevated all alternates to the status of full committee members. However, this did not impact attendance. The Chair proposes that the following procedures for conducting business be instituted. The Chair will meet with the full committee once in the fall and once in the spring. The chair will meet monthly with an executive committee comprised of the chairs of the three subcommittees, the ADA Coordinator, and any other committee member who wishes to attend. The subcommittee chairs will meet separately with subcommittee members as needs warrant. This will allow all parties involved to work on projects at a pace commensurate with need. Biannual meetings of the full committee will allow everyone to review the actions of the broader membership.

Part III  Recommendations

1. Of major concern is the lack of authority on campus to require ADA/504 compliance. An individual or unit should be given the authority to require compliance, as described in the section above.

3. Support an initiative to move the management and oversight of ADA compliance out of Physical Facilities to prevent conflicts of interest.

4. Take necessary action so that the role of ADA/504 Coordinator is supervised by a university-wide administrator.

2. Provide funds for two individuals to attend the National ADA Coordinator’s Conference again this spring. (~$2000)

5. Provide additional funds to purchase more brochures for distribution across campus. (~$500).

6. Recommend an appropriate individual to bring the Web Accessibility Policy to the attention of the Faculty Senate.

7. Permit the Chair to revise the procedures of the Committee as described above.
Respectfully Submitted,

Susan R. Easterbrooks, Chair

ADA/504 Advisory Committee

October 15, 2002

ADA Coordinators Report for 2002

The intent of this report is to cover those issues which are germane to the overall accessibility of the Georgia State Campus and our compliance with applicable federal and state regulations. Tangential to this, the areas of policy, process and personnel will also be addressed.

**Website Accessibility:** As discussed in the last meeting with the Provost, ODS has begun the process of working with Bill Evans to bring this issue before the faculty senate. Unfortunately, Bill was unable to finish this task before he left. Therefore, we need begin again with a new contact person. I hope that Dr. Henry can again assist us in this endeavor.

**Campus-wide Assistive Technology:** This is an ongoing project. The goal is to allow students with disabilities equal access to all labs and computer clusters on campus. To achieve this, assistive technology must exist in each of these areas.

Using Technology Fee money, we have thus far been able to set up accessible work stations in the following areas: College of Education Computer Lab, A&M Computer Lab, Library South Computer lab, the computer cluster on second floor of Library North, and the library at Alpharetta Center. While this is a good start, we still have much to do. There are other hubs and labs across campus and computer classrooms that are currently inaccessible to students with certain disabilities.

**Buildings and Physical Access:** A comprehensive transition plan was established in 1994 for the buildings that then existed on campus. In 1996, an Ad Hoc Committee was given the charge to review the issues referenced on the plan. Since that time, no update has been done even though GSU has acquired more buildings (some old, some new) and has made some progress on the issues affecting the ones contained in the original plan.

The LEGAL assumption is made that any renovations or construction occurring after the transition plan are in full compliance of ADA. All buildings having permits issued after July 1, 1995 must also meet the new Georgia Accessibility Code, which in some cases supersedes the ADA. Unfortunately, the reality is that these laws and codes are often ignored.

Because there is no full-time ADA/504 Coordinator to oversee all construction projects on the campus, compliance is generally left to the individual department and their architects and construction teams. Many times this has proven to be ineffective.

A couple of recent examples will illustrate the problem:

1. Major renovations were done to a restroom to bring it into ADA compliance however the entrance have an approx 4 inch step up thus making it inaccessible
2. An accessible ramp was bid but the plans were not compliant with ADAAG guidelines
3. Major renovations are being done to a music library with no accessible checkout counter.

Even when the problems are identified to the responsible parties, compliance is not assured. Evidently ADAAG guidelines and State of Georgia Accessibility Codes are not deemed important by many individuals. Because these individual know that there is no one with the ability to stop construction or occupancy, they can (and do) ignore these laws. Therefore, Georgia State continues to build and renovate structures without regard to accessibility and in doing so, continues to break the law and create areas not accessible to individuals with mobility impairments.

**Aderhold Building:** Because this new building is so far away from the main part of GSU campus, it is creating a major obstacle for our students with mobility impairments. Currently, there is no GSU parking or transportation close to the building. This makes the building inaccessible to many students.
Suggestions:

- Identify a new faculty person to take the issue of Website Accessibility to the Faculty Senate.

- Give the authority to a person or group (perhaps the ADA Advisory Board) to review all building/renovation plans and enforce ADAAG and State of Georgia Accessibility Codes, including the ability to halt construction or occupancy until the standards are met.

- Last year, two individuals from the ADA Advisory Board were able to participate in the National ADA Coordinators Conference. This was very helpful in assisting the board to keep up with these complex guidelines and national trends. It would be wonderful if funding were available to do this on a yearly basis.

Appendix 4

Heavy Report

This report detailed the University’s problems of physical access for the disabled (e.g., restroom facilities, building access, signage) that placed the University in non-compliance with federal law. They would cost approximately $7 million to remedy. This report only identified problems of physical access, but not those such as disabled student access to materials or services needed in order to maximize likelihood of successful matriculation; nor did it address compliance issues faced by disabled employees regarding necessary modifications to allow them to perform maximally. The summary tables are available in an associated pdf accompanying this document.

Appendix 5

2008 ASUR Report on the Office of Disability Services

The report identified these problems:

The need to separate the responsibility for serving students versus employees. Although the Opportunity Development and Diversity Planning office (OHD) and the Office of Disability Services (ODS) are designated to serve employees, the employees at Georgia State are largely unaware of where to go and what to do when they need assistance (See Appendix 1). There is no systematic plan for educating the University Community regarding where to go and what to do.

The need for all offices, departments, organizations, and entities on campus to collaborate with one another to share expertise and best practices. This is a continual source of frustration to those seeking services as they are sent from one location to another receiving no resolution. This continues to occur because at present there is no proactive, upper level administrative support for such.

The untenable position of having to service a campus the size of Georgia State with woefully inadequate staff. The ASUR Action Plan (p. 2) cites the fact that “our peer
in institution, University of Georgia’s disability services office serves twice as many
students but also has four times the number of full-time staff members and numerous
part-time staff members and student assistants to service disabled students and does
not assist disabled employees”. This issue is addressed again in the next section of this
document.

Administrative Support Unit Review (ASUR)

Committee Report

The Margaret A. Staton
Office of Disability Services (ODS)

Within
Division of Student Affairs

Prepared by:
Leslie Taylor, Review Committee Chair
Mary Anne Gaunt, Review Committee Member
Mary Jo Dejoice, Review Committee Member

Approved by the ASUR Committee on June 11, 2008

I. Unit Profile

A. Mission: The mission of The Margaret A. Staton Office of Disability
   Services (ODS) is to provide persons with disabilities equal opportunity to
   participate in and benefit from the programs and services offered through
   Georgia State University by assuring physical and programmatic access.

B. Number of Employees: The Office of Disability Services has six
   employees: the Director; a Cognitive Disability Specialist; a Senior Interpreter;
   two Administrative Coordinators; and an Administrative Secretary.

C. Customer Base: Primary customers are members of the Georgia State
   community (students and faculty/staff with disabilities) who need
   accommodations by mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
   Secondary customers are GSU faculty/staff of the various colleges and
   departments of the University and outside agencies (e.g. Vocational
   Rehabilitation, Workforce Recruitment, Alternative Media Access Center) who
   depend on ODS internally for ADA guidance and consultation as well as
   externally as a referral resource for student clients.

D. Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$154,969</td>
<td>$156,469</td>
<td>$178,039</td>
<td>$176,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Outcomes and Effectiveness Indicators

The unit’s current intended outcomes are:

- Students will report that they are satisfied with services they receive from disability services. Student satisfaction with disability services, relates to providing quality professional programs in a learning-centered environment that supports individual learning.

- Students with disabilities will be able to independently and successfully negotiate their academic accommodations with their professors. Disabled students’ ability to negotiate accommodations allows them function in a learning-centered environment that supports individual learning.

- ODS will provide students receiving academic coaching with effective ongoing strategies to compensate for their academic functional limitations. Students with disabilities who receive academic coaching services will demonstrate the ability to consistently implement a new strategy or skill that mitigates their academic functional limitations. Academic coaching for students with disabilities provides a learning-centered environment that supports individual learning.

The unit’s Effectiveness Indicators are:

- In satisfaction of services, ODS looked at a percentage from poor to excellent with a target performance indicator of 85-100%. The evaluation focused on request for services, staff sensitivity, staff knowledge, confidentiality, staff availability, facilities, and accommodations.

- For successful student independence in obtaining academic accommodations, ODS looked for students to demonstrate success by achieving an 85-100% rate in the following tasks: 1) if the student approached the professor for accommodations, 2) explained the process with professor, and 3) if the student made an appointment with the professor to discuss their needs.

- For academic coaching, ODS looked for demonstration that students have learned the skill to be deemed a success (i.e. self-advocacy, academic skill strategies, decision making, time management, use of assistive technology). Skill mastery was set in increments of 30 to 90 days.

II. Evaluation of Self-Study:

1. The ASUR committee commends the two team members who wrote this report for an excellent report. The writers have used this report to make a well-articulated case for the need to transfer some of the office’s current responsibilities to another.

2. As the university’s advocate for, and “watchdog” on the behalf of persons with disabilities, this office should not be the compliance office for ADA required building codes,
and other site based accommodations that provide persons physical access within the university campuses.

3. The writers also have made an adequate case for transferring to Human Resources responsibility for issues which concern GSU employees, even though this role only appears to be five percent of the director’s responsibilities. By removing those, that will allow this office to work totally on behalf of students and their programmatic access to the learning environment.

4. The Effectiveness Indicators to measure performance are very well done as are the actions to improve performance.

5. There are some minor areas where more information or more clarity would help make the Office of Disability Services better understood:

   a. A more judicious use of appendices would have been helpful. That there were 111 pages of appendices was very daunting to the committee and therefore not particularly helpful:

      i. First they should have been numbered and then referenced by page number and Title.

      ii. When an appendix was thoroughly described in the text, it was not necessary to include it.

      iii. Those appendices that held valuable information were obscured by the volume. The budget notes and the peer comparison chart would have been of great benefit in the report.

      iv. The 45 pages of the laws that govern this unit were not necessary especially since this committee is not looking at compliance issues.

   b. Examples of which types of services are mandated versus those which are not. Also, what is not understood is that if there are mandated services for increasing numbers of students, how GSU can continue with the current support load as compared to our sister institution in Athens?

   c. Although most of the issues raised by the lower than mean scores on the climate survey were described, the response to question #6 could have been filled in with answers rather than questions. We expect that staff would have been asked about their interpretation of “meeting customer needs” to ascertain if they just think they are not able to do enough with current resources or if they believe their efforts are in the wrong place as a possible example.

   d. The supply budget versus expended is an incredible difference; the readers are left to assume if that amount is that described as “Provost amended” resource for mandated accommodations for students. That would have been clarified if the budget notes from the appendix were added to the report.

   e. A description of the role of an assistive technology person. Does this person assist individual students or provide expertise in hardware and software that might be appropriate as contract services?

III. Key Observations

Specific observations related to the report are noted below. Action Recommendations, which follow in Section IV, are correlated with each Key Observation.

1) Some of the notable accomplishments of this unit include providing accommodations to over 2,000 students in areas such as testing, coaching, and access to technology, awarding $132,500 in scholarships to students, participating in the Diversity Career Symposium, and continued work on a comprehensive ADA transition plan.

2) The responsibilities of the ODS for ADA accommodations for the current customer base encompasses students, faculty and staff.
3) Changes in staff responsibilities have occurred secondary to survey results (n=4) assessing staff satisfaction and appear to be associated with improved morale and service delivery.

4) The mission statement and the first core responsibility identify ensuring/assuring physical access to the facilities of the University.

5) The number of students seeking support and services from the ODS Service provision has increased over the reporting period.

6) The Director of ODS is currently serving as the University’s Compliance Coordinator for the required ADA/504 Compliance Coordinator and Officer.

7) Operational supplies are significantly under-budgeted for the three years presented.

8) Lack of sufficient technology support is identified.

IV. Action Recommendations

Action recommendations related to the key observations are noted below:

1) Continue to maintain a relationship with all units at GSU who have a focus that includes action for people with disabilities in order to share expertise on best practices. Continue to monitor access issues and act in an advisory position for solutions.

2) The responsibilities of the ODS for overseeing the ADA accommodations for faculty and staff should be reviewed for appropriateness and efficiency of services with consideration of the proposed transfer of the issues which concern GSU employees to Human Resources.

3) Reassess reorganization structure for staff satisfaction and global measures of service delivery and efficiency.

4) Clarify mission and core responsibilities to one of assisting and/or enhancing academic access to the University programs as appropriate to a Student Affairs unit instead of ensuring physical access, given the nature of certain buildings on campus.

5) Continue monitoring the number of students and employees seeking support from the ODS as well as types of requests in order to support expansion of staff and graduate assistants.

6) Consider relocating the 5-year goal of creating a new ADA/504 Compliance Coordinator and Officer position placed in another University Department such as Facilities and Management Services/Risk Management to a one- or three-year goal in order to more effectively address ADA/504 issues on campus and address the Director’s comments regarding conflicts of interest in assuming both roles.

7) Given the unpredictable nature of services needed each semester and consistently increased operating costs evidenced over the reporting period, the operating budget merits increase.

8) Efficiency of services could be enhanced through coordination of services with a IS&T liaison with knowledge of technology-enhanced accessibility (e.g. remote captioning, specialized software, etc) and continued submission of Student Tech Fee proposals.

Appendix 6.
Margaret A. Staton Office of Disability Services (ODS)
2008 ASUR Action Plan

RESPONSE TO ASUR ACTION RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendation 1 – Continue to maintain a relationship with all units at GSU who have a focus that includes action for people with disabilities in order to share expertise on best practices. Continue to monitor access issues and act in an advisory position for solutions.

ODS Response: As part of an ongoing effort to ensure that students with disabilities are served and their specific needs met, ODS will continue to work
closely with several campus offices (i.e. Counseling Center, Office of the Dean of Students, Housing, Student Support Services). Trainings and informal meetings are held periodically to discuss concerns and provide solutions that address the challenges of our disabled students. More formal relationships have been established through a memorandum of Agreement.

The ODS Director currently serves on the Disability Initiatives Committee and the Major Renovation & Repairs of Facilities (MRRF) subcommittee in an effort to address access issues and provide recommendations on funding of campus ADA related renovations and repairs.

**ODS ACTION PLAN:** Recommendation #1 ongoing

**ODS Response:** Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) covering employment requires a high level of expertise that also involves a detailed understanding of related employment laws that often overlap (i.e. Family Medical Leave Act, Workers Compensation). This requires a different knowledge base beyond that of student accommodations.

Furthermore, this creates a challenge for employees who must interact with two different offices. Human Resources may have information that could impact the ADA process that ODS is not aware of or may be barred from access because of confidentiality reasons. Subsequently, a disconnect between the two offices is created that may impact the outcome and increase the potential for litigation by the employee. ODS will continue to support such efforts to ensure the efficiency of services to GSU employees.

**ODS ACTION PLAN:** Recommendation #2 in progress

**ODS Response:** There are several new staff members in ODS. Annual performance appraisals, feedback sessions, and monthly staff meetings will allow the ODS Director to garner useful information regarding staff satisfaction with the current organizational structure, service evaluation, and efficiency.

**ODS ACTION PLAN:** Recommendation #3 ongoing

**ODS Response:** Under the current structure ODS is limited both in resources and an extensive working knowledge required in the area of ADA accessibility guidelines and the Architectural Barriers Act. Physical access issues will continue to increase as buildings age, the campus grows, and new buildings are built and acquired both on and off campus. This will necessitate a greater role and involvement of this office to address physical access issues.

By removing the ADA/504 compliance function to another campus office this will allow ODS to focus more of its resources on ensuring academic access to the programs and services of the university and further support the Student Affairs strategic plan of promoting student retention.

**ODS ACTION PLAN:** Recommendation #4 ongoing

**ODS Response:** Continue monitoring the number of students and employees seeking support from the ODS as well as types of requests in order to support expansion of staff and graduate assistants.
**ODS Response:** The 2007-08 Annual Report on Academic Services for Students with Disabilities showed an increase in student census. With more medically/psychologically involved students, disabled Iraq/Afghanistan war veterans, and the recently revised ADA amendments the resources of ODS will continue to be stretched.

Our peer institution, University of Georgia’s disability services office serves twice as many students but also has four times the number of full-time staff members and numerous part-time staff members and student assistants to service disabled students and does not assist disabled employees (see attached UGA organizational chart for the disability services office).

Additional staff would enhance ODS ability to meet Georgia State’s growing disabled student population. However, because of current budgetary constraints the hiring of additional staff members will be difficult in the immediate future. The addition of another disability services professional to share in the large student caseload and an assistive technologist to maintain the office’s expanding computer technology for students with disabilities will greatly increase ODS ability to serve disabled individuals on campus.

**ODS ACTION PLAN:** Continue collaboration with Human Resources on employee accommodations. Also, prepare and review annual reports on services for students with disabilities and discuss findings with interested parties.

**Recommendation 6-Consider relocating the 5-year goal of creating a new ADA/504 Compliance Coordinator and Officer position placed in another University Department such as Facilities and Management Services/Risk Management to a one- or three-year goal in order to more effectively address ADA/504 issues on campus and address the Director’s comments regarding conflicts of interest in assuming both roles.**

**ODS Response:** To support the recommendation of relocating this function to a one-or three-year goal, ODS will identify university offices on campus that could more appropriately serve this function.

**ODS ACTION PLAN:** Recommendation #6 is ongoing.

**Recommendation 7 - Given the unpredictable nature of services needed each semester and consistently increased operating costs evidenced over the reporting period, the operating budget merits increase.**

**ODS Response** – As the disabled student population increases an increase in the operating budget is merited.

**ODS ACTION PLAN** – Continue to monitor expenses and allocate resources as needed.

**Recommendation 8 - Efficiency of service could be enhanced through coordination of services with a IS&T liaison with knowledge of technology-enhanced accessibility (e.g. remote captioning, specialized software, etc) and continued submission of Student Tech Fee proposals.**

**ODS Response** - To support its existing operation, ODS will greatly benefit from the services of an IST liaison with knowledge of technology-enhanced accessibility issues for students with disabilities. A recent example for such a need is the Tech Fee Award received by ODS that required the extensive coordination with outside vendors, legal affairs, purchasing as well as IST.

**ODS ACTION PLAN** - ODS in collaboration with IS&T will identify a liaison to serve as a resource.

---

**ODS Action Plan Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritized Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Measures of progress</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Build relationships with IS&amp;T to increase support of assistive technology.</td>
<td>Regular meetings with a designated IS&amp;T representative two or three times a semester.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complete reorganization structure with the unit.</td>
<td>Align staff according to new reorganization structure.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Evaluate the costs associated with the operating budget. | Increased funding received as needed. | Ongoing |

### Three-year goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritized Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Measures of progress</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinate services with an IS&amp;T liaison.</td>
<td>Identify an IS&amp;T liaison to serve as a resource.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Creation of new ADA/504 coordinator position. Responsibilities placed in Facilities &amp; Management Services (e.g. Risk Management).</td>
<td>Position is filled or reassigned.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increasing staffing in the areas of direct services and assistive technology.</td>
<td>Positions are filled.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Human Resources takes over ADA accommodation function for employees.</td>
<td>Employees go to Human Resources for ADA accommodations.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Five-year goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritized Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Measures of progress</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of more space to meet the growing demands of service delivery</td>
<td>New and or additional space is acquired</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix 7.**

*Examples of non-compliance in construction and renovation. Additional examples are available upon request.*

Example 1 describes interactions that various individuals had with a contractor whose final product was non-compliant.

From: Caroline Gergely  
To: Kurt Keppler  
Date: 10/11/2001 3:30:20 PM  
Subject: Accessible workstation in new Nutrition Classroom  
CC: Harvey Shumpert

Kurt,

I just wanted to give you a “heads-up” on a potential situation. Dana Mason and I recently visited the newly reconstructed Nutrition Classroom. It is equipped with workstations which include stoves, ovens, counters etc. In short they are food prep areas. However, in its current state, this room does not meet ADA Architectural Guidelines. So, a student in a wheelchair could not participate in this class.

Title II of the ADA requires that any new construction or renovation projects MUST be accessible. Therefore, the university is out of compliance with the ADA. The State of Georgia Accessibility Codes demand the same compliance. We have no excuse for not adhering to these laws.

I have spoken with Bruce Young, the project manager and Sejal Patel the architect. They are going to meet tomorrow and decide what they are willing to do. However, if they are not willing to bring this room into compliance this will need to go forward to someone (legal, provost) who has the authority to make them do so. I’ll keep you informed of further updates.

All the Best  
Caroline Gergely  
Director, Disability Services  
Georgia State University  
From: Dana Mason
To: Jim Olsen  
Date: 10/12/2001 10:01:39 AM  
Subject: Conversation with Howard Wortheimer  
CC: Harvey Shumpert

I just received a call from Howard Wortheimer concerning yesterday’s meeting between Caroline Gergely, Bruce Young, Sajel Patel, and myself on the Nutrition Lab. I got the distinct impression that he was “fishing” for me to say something/anything that would relieve him or his firm for design flaws with the project. He was critical of the process (or different processes) that each project manager uses and how Harvey should come up with a standardized procedure. He cited Nadine Levy as an example of someone who has good project coordination skills and keeps everyone “in the loop”. I reminded him of a recent project of his that she intentionally did not include me on. When pressed again to provide an answer on how to correct the problems in the Nutrition Lab, I again referred him to Bruce Young who I said would answer his questions and concerns for the University. He continued to blame Bruce for the lack of project coordination and ultimately for the not having the ADA design considerations included in this project.

Dana

Example 2 describes construction to make a restroom in Kell Hall compliant. The restroom itself met standards, but it had one little flaw; YOU COULD NOT GET INTO IT if you were in a wheelchair.

>>> Dana Mason 08/08/02 03:23PM >>>

Marty,

I was in Kell Hall and noticed that the rest rooms on the 2nd floor are closed for renovation. How will we be addressing accessibility to the rooms with the step present or will you be adding a unisex rest room if it is technically infeasible in the existing rooms? (See O.C.G.A. 120-3-20-.33(3)(1).)

Also, where are we on creating the unisex rest room on the 4th floor where renovation was recently completed of the single sex rooms that are still not accessible?

Thanks,
Dana

Dana F. Mason, MPA, CFPS, MIFireE  
Georgia State University (404) 651-2168  
34 Broad Street, Suite 1200 (404) 651-1681 (fax)  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3084  
dmason@gsu.edu

From: Marty Waterfill  
To: Dana Mason  
Date: 8/9/2002 10:08:03 AM  
Subject: Re: Kell 2nd Floor Rest Room Renovation  
CC: Caroline Gergely; Susan Easterbrooks; William McCullum

Dana

We have no plans to add a unisex rest room to the fourth floor. The men’s restroom and the interior of the women’s meet ADA. It’s just that step up to the women’s that causes non compliance.

As for the second floor I am not the project manager. You may want to talk to Lavert or Frank.

Marty Waterfill  
Facilities Engineer  
Georgia State University  
120 Collins Street  
Atlanta, GA 30303

>>> Susan Easterbrooks 08/14/02 14:11 PM >>>

This doesn’t make sense. She says that the women’s room is compliant, you just can’t get into it to use it.

Am I missing some bit of logic here?

From: Dana Mason  
To: SPESRE,EPSE.ED,disceg.NETPO3.NETDOM1  
Date: Wed, Aug 14, 2002 8:46 PM  
Subject: Re: Kell 2nd Floor Rest Room Renovation

Welcome to the logic that I have to deal with!

EXAMPLE 3

The new Student Commons Building was designed in a manner that individuals in wheelchairs could not pass through the turnstiles necessary to enter the facility. The key
card sliders were installed out of their reach, as were the key card sliders for the study rooms and several other doorways. These had to be fixed retroactively.

EXAMPLE 4
The new Science Building has raised utility ports in the lobby area that is dangerous even for able-bodied individuals, much less those on crutches or in wheelchairs. These need to be removed.

Appendix 8

2009 Report on Georgia State University and Peer Institutions’ Ratio of Disability Staff per Students

Georgia State University and Peer Institutions’ Ratio of Disability Staff per Students

Purpose: The purpose of gathering these data was to discern where GSU stands relative to its peer institutions regarding dedicated staff per disabled student in their availability to serve students with disabilities.

Process: An email was sent to all the directors of Disability offices at the 15 peer institutions, with the exception of Mr. Pennamon who provided the information verbally. Information received from the director was the primary source of data. When emails were not returned (about 1/3), data were gleaned from that university’s Disability Services website. In many cases it was difficult to discern the exact ratio as some schools had staff not listed on their websites, some served multiple campuses (number of students on all campuses used in these cases unless otherwise indicated), and a couple had separate services for employees. Most had one office that served both students and employees.

Results: The results of this data collection process, conducted over a 4-5 month period of time by Dr. Susan Easterbrooks, demonstrate that relative to our 15 peer institutions, Georgia State University has THE worst staff per student ratio of employees assisting individuals with disabilities. Table 1 provides a ranking in descending order starting with worst staff per student ratio. Georgia State University has the worst staff per student ratio among all its peer institutions.

Summary: (Written by Dr. Christine Gallant)

Congress passed the ADA Amendments Act (ADAAA) in late 2008, expanding the definition of “disabled” and lowering the bar for ADA coverage. Clearly this will result in a larger number of individuals covered for disabilities, and a greater legal necessity to accommodate them by our University. Even before the ADAAA widened our responsibility to accommodate students, faculty and staff with disabilities, the inadequacy of our present Office of Disability Services (ODS) was detailed in the June, 2008, report on the office by the Administrative Support Unit Committee. First, the man-power of the ODS is significantly limited, with one director, one assistant, and one secretary/receptionist (student assistants are also utilized). Also, several systemic problems were noted in the report. Its case load includes University employees (faculty and staff) as well as students, and the number of students seeking its assistance has increased from 2005-2008. Further, it serves as the office for ADA-compliance as well as disability services, with its Director also the University’s ADA-Compliance Officer. Comparisons with our 15 peer institutions show that they have resolved these potential problems by having a higher ratio of specialized office staff per students and by requiring their employees with disabilities to be served by a different office connected with Human Resources. They also house the ADA-Compliance Officer elsewhere. Given the imminent, additional legal pressures of the ADAAA, Georgia State should follow the lead of its peer institutions in all of these areas.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School, # of Students, and Director</th>
<th># ODS Staff Lis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

...
| Staff to Student Ratio | Rodney E. Pennamon, M.Ed  
Director  
New Student Center, Suite 230  
404/413-1560  
404/413-1563 fax  
disrep@lanstate.gsu.edu  
*Note that there are only two professional staff members with knowledge to make eligibility and accommodation decisions. This is the key problem. All peer institutions have more professional staff except UAB and SUNY-Albany, but both of those schools have 10,000 fewer students than GSU. | Professional Staff  
Penman, Direct  
Warren, Instructur  
Services Coord./Offi  
disab. specialist  
Non-Professional Staff  
(Amesha Hosley, T  
Admin. Coord./Offi  
tngt.)  
(Sarentha Pryan, Ti  
Admin. Coord.  
St./Testing)  
3 Grad assistants (ap  
30 hours total/wk; 1  
are presently away  
internships)  
4 Work study stud  
part-time basis  
(approx 30 hrs  
total/wk)  
Secretary/receptor  
Director  
Associate Director  
Coordinator of Disab  
Services  
Coordinator of Dea  
and Hard of Heari  
2 Admin. Support |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **George Mason University**  
~ 30,000 students  
1 per 5000  
(direct providers such as interpreters, readers, proctors not available, so ratio is actually less) | Christopher Moy  
George Mason University  
Director, Office of Disability Services  
Student Union Building 1 Rm. 222  
Phone: 703-993-4617  
Fax: 703-993-4306  
cmoy@gmu.edu  
[John Bennett](mailto:johnbennett@gmu.edu), Director | Director  
Secretary  
Learning Disabilities Coordinator  
Assistant Director  
Associate Director  
Student Services Coordinator  
Student Services Coordinator (Adap. Technology) |
| **University of South Florida**  
46,000  
1 per 4600 | Lorene Bumam, M.A. - Interim Director -  
[Lbumam@admin.usf.edu](mailto:Lbumam@admin.usf.edu)  
Students with Disabilities Services - 4202 E Fowler Ave  
SVC1133 - Tampa, FL 33620-6923 - (813) 974-4309 | Director  
5 Coordinators  
Coordinator/Interpreters at each of the 4 campuses  
Contract services (estimated as 2;½ campus)  
Director  
Accommodation |
| **University of Cincinnati** | DISABILITY SERVICES | Director  
Associate Director  
Coordinator of Disability Services  
Coordinator of Access and Accommodations  
Coordinator of Disability Services (Adap. Technology) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Alabama, Birmingham</th>
<th>University of Alabama, Birmingham</th>
<th>University of Alabama, Birmingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36,500 Students</td>
<td>1 per 4560</td>
<td>17,000 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 4000</td>
<td>325 registered with DDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jane DePrestor-Morandini, M.Ed.**
Interim Director
**Education Accessibility Services**
5155 Gullen Mall
1600 UGL
Detroit, MI 48202
(313) 577-1851 Office
(313) 577-3365 TTY
(313) 577-4898 Fax

disabilities@ uncmail. unc.edu

**Wayne State University**

**Arizona State University**
Number of students: 51,000
1272 registered
51000/32=
1 staff per 1575 students

**Jim Hemauer**
Associate Director
480.965.1392 (Voice)
480.965.0441 (Fax)
gimpy@asu.edu

**Director**: Full-Time
**Coordinator (1)**: Disability Specialis
**Coordinator (2)**: Disability Specialis
**CART/Interpreter Coordinator**: Disability Specialis
**Office Manager**: Disability Specialis
**Graduate Assistant**: Disability Specialis

**Director**: Part-Time
**Readers**: Disability Specialis
**Interpreters**: Disability Specialis
**CART Reporters**: Disability Specialis
**Proctors**: Disability Specialis
(Counted as three)

**Disability Access**
**Blind/Visually Impaired**: Disability Access
**Deaf/Hard of Hearing**: Disability Access
**Disabilities**: Disability Access
**Consultant, Psychological**: Disability Access

**Disability Access**
**Consultant, General**: Disability Access
**Disability Access**
**Consultant, General**: Disability Access
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Richmond, VA 23284-2529</td>
<td>Disability Support Services 907 Floyd Ave. Room 102 P.O. Box 842529 Email: <a href="mailto:jtknight@vcu.edu">jtknight@vcu.edu</a> Cheryl Chesney-Walker, M.Ed. Executive Director of Health Careers/Education and Special Services for Students. MCV Campus Phone: 804-828-9782 Fax: 804-828-4609</td>
<td>32,000 (two campuses) 5.5 staff at one campus And 4.5 at the medical campus 10 staff= 1 per 3200 Main Campus Dire Full time staff (#1) Full time staff (#2) LD Specialist Program support technician Graduate assistant least 2) PLUS Medical Campus Director 1 Full time test pro 5 part time test pro (approx ½ each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York, Albany</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:NBelowich@uamail.albany.edu">NBelowich@uamail.albany.edu</a> Nancy Belowich-Negron, Director</td>
<td>550 registered with ODS 1 per 3000 (est) Director Assistant Director/ Specialist Office Manager Graduate Assistant (each work 20 hou per week) = 1.5 Paid Consultant to Weekly Asperger's Support Group 15 Volunteer Test Proctors (feels they need an additional fulltime person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>Center for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 Students</td>
<td>Cheryl Amoruso - Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.uh.edu/csd/camoruso.htm">www.uh.edu/csd/camoruso.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td><a href="http://louisville.edu/disability/">http://louisville.edu/disability/</a> Director: Cathy Patus</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Coordinator of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program Coordina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tive Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 689 Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 staff member per 2711 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Accessibility Resource Center</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jgreen@unm.edu">jgreen@unm.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computing Service Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://as2.unm.edu">http://as2.unm.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office phone: (505) 277-3506</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Student Success Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: (505) 277-3750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistive Technolo Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 University of New Mexico School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Interpreter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Testing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3810</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Media Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 2575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Chicago</td>
<td>Disability Resource Center</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Disability Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Their employee center is separate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disability Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 Students</td>
<td>Roxana Stupp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistive Technolo Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Service Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312-996-8332</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Services, Communication Ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rstupp@uic.edu">rstupp@uic.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/disability_resources/index.html">http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/disability_resources/index.html</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinates servi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx 1 per 2250</td>
<td></td>
<td>ce for deaf and hard c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(interpreters not listed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hearing students, pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>omotes student cen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tered practices s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ervice provision, p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rovides a link be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tween UIC and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surrounding deaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Access Consultant
Plans and promotes disability awareness and education within and outside the University, and works with organizations to ensure access to campus facilities, including buildings, classrooms, and transportation services.

Information Access Consultant
Assists students with disabilities gain access to classroom instruction, universal design, and university library resources.

Facility Access Consultant
Fosters partnerships between the Disability Resource Center and other campus units to increase disability awareness and understanding, and provides disability training to staff.

University of Tennessee

26,000
13 FTE = 1 staff per 2000 students

Disability Services
2227 Dunford Hall
Knoxville, TN 37996-4020
Phone: (865) 974-6087 (voice)
Fax: (865) 974-9552
Email: ods@utk.edu

Director
Assistant Director (PhD)
Coordinator
LD Specialist
Test Administrator
Secretary 1
Secretary 2
4 Interpreter/Transcriber FT
1 Interpreter PT
1 Transcriber PT
| #1 Best Ratio | UWM Student Accessibility Center  
|              | Mitchell Hall Room 112  
|              | P.O.Box 413  
|              | Milwaukee, WI 53201-0413  
|              | Vtty (414) 229-6287  
|              | Fax: (414) 229-2237  
| 23,265       | Director  
|              | Office manager  
|              | Program assistant  
| University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee | Specialist, Phys M-Psychiatric  
|              | Specialist, Psych, Physical, Systemic  
|              | LD Specialist  
|              | Senior Disab Coun  
|              | Disab Counselor  
|              | VI Program manag  
|              | DHH Program man  
|              | Outreach specialis  
|              | DHH Student Adv  
|              | 9 staff interpreters  
|              | 6 C-print/captionist  

Email sent to all email addresses available for Directors of services.

Dear

I am the chair of the Disability Initiatives Committee of the Faculty Senate at Georgia State University. Our Board of Regents has identified your university as a peer institution. I am trying to find out how our peer institutions are serving their disabled population. Would you be so kind as to tell me how many staff members you have serving the campus, the size of the student population, and how many individuals with disabilities you serve. Please include office staff and part time staff in your list.

Thank you so much for your time.

Susan

This report is respectfully submitted by:

Susan R. Easterbrooks, Chair, Senate Disability Initiatives Committee  
Educational Psychology and Special Education  
Georgia State University  
seasterbrooks@gsu.edu

January 26, 2009