Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students With Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education Grantee-level Performance Results: 2006–07

Introduction

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) is committed to continually improving its management of programs and improving the educational outcomes of students. One tool for program improvement is providing program performance data to grantees, key stakeholders and the public in a way that encourages reflection, action and collaboration.

The *Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students With Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education* program consists of twenty-three postsecondary institutions in the current grant cycle being awarded three-year grants starting in 2005-06 and ending in 2007-08. This current grant cycle is the third cycle with previous grant cycles in FY 1999 and FY 2002. This performance evaluation looks at results from 2006-07, the second year of the three-year grant. Performance evaluations will be reported for the third (final) year of the grants for this cohort. Grantees in this cycle included eighteen public universities and five private institutions. The grantees also varied in size, with five grantees with student enrollments under 10,000 and eighteen grantees with over 10,000 students.

Selected Findings

Outcome measures for the program were two: percentage of faculty trained through project activities who incorporate elements of their training into their classroom teaching (calculation methodology in Appendix A) and the difference between the rate at which students with documented disabilities complete courses taught by faculty trained through project activities and the rate at which other students complete the same courses (calculation methodology in Appendix B).

Data collected through surveys in the fall of 2007 resulted in the following:

- The percentage of faculty trained through project activities that incorporate elements of their training into their classroom teaching exceeded targets in the 2006-07 school years. (94 percent, target = 88 percent) (Table 1)
- Students with documented disabilities complete courses taught by faculty trained through project activities at a higher rate than students with no documented disabilities. The rate difference was lower than the 2006-07 school year target, demonstrating better than expected performance (-1 percent, target = 5.1 percent) (Table 1).
- Overall the program is performing better than the established target goals.

Disabilities Demo Grantee-level Performance Results: 2006–07

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Calculation methodology for percent of faculty trained through project activities who incorporate elements of their training into their classroom teaching

Determination of the percentage of faculty who incorporated training into their classroom teaching was done using qualitative surveys of faculty members at each participating grantee university. Faculty were asked if they had incorporated training into their classroom curriculum. The median percentage of all grantees was compared with the target of all the grantees participating in the program.

Appendix B. Calculation methodology for the difference between the rate at which students with documented disabilities complete courses taught by faculty trained through project activities and the rate at which other students complete the same courses

The rate was determined by subtracting the course completion rate for the general student population against course completion rates for students with disabilities. This being the case a smaller number is desirable and a negative number indicates that students with disabilities had a higher course completion rate than the general population.

Figure 1. Performance Matrix for Grantees Based on Faculty Integration of Curriculum and Disabled Students Completion of Courses: 2006-07

		Rate difference between students with disabilities and other students completing courses with trained faculty $(Target=5.1\%)$	
		Did not meet target	Met target
Percentage of faculty trained through project activities who incorporate elements of their training into their classroom teaching. (Target = 88%)	Met target	-Baruch College -Claflin University -Renton Technical College -University of Minnesota -University of Southern Mississippi	-Hancock JCC District -Kent State University -San Diego State University -Sonoma State University -St. Petersburg College -University of Alaska -University of Hawaii -University of Massachusetts -University of Washington -University of Arkansas
	Did not meet target	-Depaul University	-Bank Street College -Landmark College -Texas A&M University -Universidad Metropolitana -University of Wisconsin
Pei w	Ω	(n=1)	(n=5)

^{*} Colorado State University and Eastern Washington University did not provide one of the two measures and so were not included in the matrix.