Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations

Office of Graduate Studies

12-2020

AN ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR THE INCLUSION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN MEXICO

Lilia G. Lopez Arriaga

AN ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR THE INCLUSION OF

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN MEXICO

_____

A Dissertation

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership

_____

by

Lilia Guadalupe López Arriaga

December 2020

AN ANALYSIS OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR THE INCLUSION OF

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN MEXICO

_____

A Dissertation

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Lilia Guadalupe López Arriaga

December 2020

Approved by:

Stanley L. Swartz, Committee Chair

Angela Louque, Committee Member

María Esther Vázquez García, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze the laws and regulations regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities in selected Mexican universities. Seven public autonomous universities on the northern border of Mexico were selected for participation. Official documents were reviewed and administrators were surveyed to determine the extent to which federal legislation requiring inclusion was implemented at their respective institutions. Faculty members of psychology were also surveyed regarding the guarantees and accommodations provided by their institutions and the effectiveness of those efforts. Principal findings were that the commitment to serve students with disabilities was high, however the existing plans and efforts were insufficient to accomplish the goal of inclusion and to provide the necessary accommodations. Administrators ranked institutional efforts higher than faculty members. Of particular note was the lack of clear diagnostic criteria, inadequate faculty and staff training, lack of information on best practices, and limited financial resources. Recommendations were provided that included greater centralization of services and an increase in financial resources.

El propósito de este estudio fue explorar las leyes y normativas acerca de la inclusión de alumnos con discapacidades en algunas universidades de México. Siete universidades autónomas públicas de la frontera norte del país fueron seleccionadas para participar. Se revisarón documentos oficiales y se encuestó a los admninistrativos para determinar en qué medida se implementan

las regulaciones federales sobre inclusión en las instituciones respectivas. Profesores universitarios de psicología también fueron encuestados con respecto a las garantías y adaptaciones proporcionadas por sus instituciones y la efectividad de esos esfuerzos. Los principales hallazgos fueron que el compromiso de servir a los estudiantes con discapacidades es alto, sin embargo, los planes y esfuerzos existentes son insuficientes para lograr el objetivo de inclusión y proporcionar las adaptaciones necesarias. Los administradores clasificaron los esfuerzos institucionales más alto que los profesores universitarios. De particular interés fue la falta de criterios de diagnóstico claros, la capacitación inadecuada del profesorado y del personal, la falta de información sobre las mejores prácticas y recursos financieros limitados. Se proporcionaron recomendaciones que incluyen una mayor centralización de los servicios y un aumento de los recursos financieros.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

"There would be no reason to talk about inclusion if we did not already have exclusion" (Swartz, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

It is a basic principle of equity and fairness that all citizens should have access to the services and benefits of society. Among those various benefits, education is a primary consideration. Is this important opportunity available to all regardless of their circumstances or membership in a minority group? Are individuals with disabilities, regardless of the nature or severity of their disability, provided equal access to education? Is the commitment to provide this access consistent with the law that requires this access? This is the standard that is considered under our understanding of the concept of inclusion. Are those with disabilities included in our efforts to provide education to all of our citizens? These questions were the focus of this research. Efforts to provide accommodations and services to include and support students with disabilities have become a priority for institutions of higher education in Mexico. Currently these efforts have been isolated and not part of a larger plan to coordinate efforts or to share resources or experiences. Given this lack of coordination, this study considered current attitudes regarding inclusion and reviewed practices that might be used to centralize and inform efforts to promote the inclusion of

students with disabilities. This study included a review of research and practices in the United States and in Mexico. This is due to the interaction and historical influence of states on the southern border of the U.S. on practices in Mexico. A primary objective of this study was to develop a set of recommendations regarding policy and regulations that might improve the inclusion and provision of services for students with disabilities in universities in Mexico.

This study was developed as an extension of earlier, preliminary work, "Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education" comparing practices in the United States and Mexico that support the inclusion of students with disabilities (Swartz, Lopez, Louque, & Swartz, 2018). The Constitution of the United Mexican States [Constitución de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos] (1917) and the General Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities [Ley General para la Inclusion de Personas con Discapacidad] (Diario Oficial, 2018) include important regulations that guarantee the rights of all Mexicans to the benefits of education and health. Nevertheless, the reality of these protections has not been realized in the public schools and by extension, the public universities.

Even though the laws are in place, there are insufficient regulations or systems of accountability to ensure that the prescribed benefits are ensured. This study focused on what practices are currently in place and what is necessary to accommodate and provide appropriate services for higher education students with disabilities. It is an end goal to influence Mexican public universities to develop and implement the necessary regulations and practices that will

accomplish the important goal of providing access to the benefits of education for all citizens with particular focus on those with disabilities.

The need is to define regulations and procedures that are necessary to accommodate students present some particular challenges to participation in higher education because of the nature of the disability and the extent to which accommodations will require exceptional efforts. Consideration was given to program entrance, retention, progress toward degree completion, and program exit. The study identified those personnel charged with this responsibility and under what authority they operate.

Conceptual Framework

This study was developed within the broader concept of educational leadership and how leadership can affect change. Because the full implementation of inclusion for students with disabilities is a goal not yet realized, how effective leadership can contribute to the accomplishment of this goal was an important consideration in the development of this research. How leadership is conceptualized shapes the way leaders take actions in their everyday activities. A clear understanding of what the duties and competences are in educational leadership positions is important. Regarding the inclusion of students in higher education the necessary question would be: Does the administrator have a knowledge base about disability and an understanding of the parameters of accommodations to provide access? These factors would form the basis for effective leadership in this context. Marion and Gonzalez (2013) outlined the

attributes of a leader as someone who is able to pursue a goal, individually or for a group, and perform activities to achieve it, mindful of the benefit to all, and someone who can made decisions that make sense to all the group members. Expectations developed in any organizational culture generate ways of understanding and behaving. The effective leader provides context and helps focus attention to what is meaningful in the decision-making process. Applying these standards to the inclusion of students with disabilities requires leadership that is informed about disability and supports the professional development necessary to provide the accommodations and services to the reach the goal.

Leadership in higher education is conceptualized differently in the United States and in Mexico. In the United States, being a leader in education implies a responsibility to develop financial, political, and fund-raising skills and abilities, collaborate with stakeholders, students, faculty, administrative staff and community, and meet all the social-economic expectations for educational goals (Selingo, Cohen, & Clark, 2017), with governance a key role in this leadership. In Mexico, Amador (2017) describes educational leaders as those in charge of managing resources, planning initiatives to achieve the objectives established by the educational system, as well as ensuring quality of professional training programs. The primary role is more focused with "a special emphasis on education systems, as far as to their possibilities to be able to generate the formative processes expected in the students, and with this, can fulfill the functions of educational institutions" (p. 4). Even though some leadership

4

activities are similar in both countries, authority is more closely controlled in Mexico where higher education is more prescribed.

Mexico has centralized decision-making in higher education, regulated by the Federal Education Act, which changes every six years with the national presidency change (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, 2019 a). Politicians are the ones who make decisions in education, plus each state has their own development plan and regulations, and participation at a formative level is less likely for those in leadership positions.

The result of this organization is that inclusion policies in higher education and the implementation of these policies are made at the political level. Leaders in politics rather than leaders in education control the education agenda (Juárez & Moreno, 2018). It is assumed that decision-making by educational leaders would be more informed by research and that efforts in implement inclusion policies would be evidence-based (Bossu & Stagg, 2018; Flores, Prescott, Hillman, Sponsler, Saenz, Zaback, Paulson, Baker & Drake, 2016). This is viewed as a major obstacle in governance in the Mexican system of education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the laws and regulations in both the United States and in Mexico to establish the basis for accommodating students with disabilities in the public higher education system in Mexico. In addition, to review what programs are currently in place to serve students with disabilities in public universities in Mexico, identify key personnel positions who

are charged with providing accommodations, determine how these services were developed, and analyze the impact of those services in reaching the goal of the inclusion of students with disabilities.

Research Questions

Four research questions (RQ) were explored in order to consider the various issues that impact higher education inclusion practices. These included:

RQ1: What authority for inclusion of students with disabilities is prescribed by Mexican law and how does it compare to similar requirements in the United States?

RQ2: What rules and regulations have been adopted by Mexican state universities and at what level have those provisions been implemented?

RQ3: What services are currently in place to accomplish the goal of inclusion of students with disabilities?

RQ4: What are the attitudes of various professional groups regarding inclusion and what obstacles to those efforts are identified by each group?

Importance of the Study

The need to provide higher education is a challenge for the Mexican government. The inclusion of various marginalized citizens has only recently become the focus of legislative initiatives.

Sistema Nacional de Información Estadística y Geográfica (National System of Statistics Information and Geography, SNIEG, 2012) has described Mexico's university system in a Mexican Classification of Academic Training

Field (Clasificación Mexicana de Programas de Estudio). This document includes all programs that offer a bachelor's degree after students finish high school. Students who finish high school and choose to attend the university select a career path or academic training field to enter the university. The programs offered in Mexico include all traditional fields of study and parallel international higher education programs (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía, INEGI, 2011).

The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization [Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura] (UNESCO, 2017) has determined that inclusive education must include educational policies and practices that protect the human rights of all citizens. Toscano de la Torre, Ponce, Cruz, Zapién de la Torre, Contreras and Pérez (2017), highlighted the importance of developing a social conscience about education and its importance in guaranteeing equality. The allocation of resources and how these resources are deployed should be a paramount consideration that not only can provide access but also promote student success. Even though the laws are in place, there are insufficient regulations or systems of accountability to ensure that the prescribed benefits are ensured.

<div align="center">Assumptions</div>

Two assumptions were operational during this study. The first assumption was that respondents to the survey were honest and thoughtful in their responses. It was expected that because the survey was confidential, responses

would be truthful (Fan & Yan, 2010). The second assumption was that the published documents from the seven public universities included in the study were accurate representations of the policies and procedures used in their institutions to provide for students with disabilities.

Limitations

The study was limited to the northern states that border the United States: Baja California, Sonora, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León, and Tamaulipas. The survey was also limited to psychologists typically charged with strategies and interventions to accommodate students with disabilities. The current policies were analyzed and both survey and interview formats were used to identify attitudes, practices, and obstacles to implementation.

Delimitations

Certain delimitations were imposed on this study relative to the sample of respondents and their various levels of understanding of inclusion. These factors included:

Significant differences in the training levels of administrators charged with oversight of inclusion at their institution.

Survey respondents' level of training and experience were various and unreliable indicators of effectiveness in program implementation.

Definition of Key Terms

Certain terms used in this study were defined for clarification and common understanding. These included:

Autonomous. The universities included in this study are designated as State Public Autonomous Universities. In the system of Mexican higher education, these universities were established under state authority as a decentralization effort and function independently of federal oversight (Tatto, 1999).

Inclusion. Though the term inclusion is used by various groups in other contexts, the use is this study was specific to students with disabilities. Including people with disabilities in everyday activities and encouraging them to have roles similar to their peers who do not have a disability is inclusion (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, 2020).

Psychologist. Psychologists in Mexico are awarded a general license to practice after earning a bachelor's degree. They are authorized to practice in schools, clinics, private practice, and important for this study, in university settings.

Summary

The inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education is best considered in the context of effective educational leadership, as this is a primary method to accomplish the goal. The research design used in this study proposed to analyze both the regulations developed by the participating institutions and the

implementation of those policies by both administrators and practitioners. This study can contribute to our understanding of the challenges and obstacles to efforts to provide accommodations to students with disabilities in higher education in Mexico.

CHAPTER TWO:

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to provide a deeper understanding of

the challenges encountered at the institutional level by students with disabilities

in their pursuit of higher education and to extend previous work by me and others

(Swartz, et al., 2018). The challenges discussed in this work were derived from a

comprehensive and integrative review of the extant literature. The literature

review for this study included and expanded on that reported in our initial work

designed to conceptualize inclusion issues (Swartz, et al., 2018). Ultimately, the

goal was to advance disability into the larger higher education discourse related

to social justice and equity and offer recommendations for colleges and

universities to translate this knowledge into action and create change. By

considering these challenges, the objective was to examine the status of

inclusion in Mexican public universities and to develop an agenda for inclusive

practices and to inform future scholarship.

Inclusion and Social Justice

The inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education is best

conceptualized as an issue of social justice. Though certainly a concept that

continues to develop, social justice in education, at its core, means the full and

equal participation of all groups in a quality education (Gewirtz, 1998).

Much of the conversation on social justice in our society focuses on university obligations to examine and challenge injustices and structures of oppression faced by students who have historically been excluded or underrepresented in higher education. Yet, disability has not received its fair measure of attention in discussions of intersectionality and has not been part of the overall political movement to ensure that institutions of higher education are exemplars of social justice and leaders in efforts to ensure inclusion (Annamma, Conner & Ferri, 2018; Erevelles & Minear, 2010; Goodley, Lawthom & Runswick-Cole, 2014). Intersectionality as a framework considers how multiple social identities intersect and interact with one another to shape people's experiences (Annamma et al., 2018; Swartz, et al., 2018).

Efforts to ensure inclusion assume: (a) an understanding of the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion, (b) the ability to identify sources of discrimination, (c) the willingness to gather information and analyze the impact of discriminatory practices, (d) develop plans that form relationships, (e) engage people, and communities, and (f) institute systems of delivery and support (Pugh & Doyle, 2019). It is an assumption that this approach will require changes in the system of governance and that affected parties need to acknowledge diversity in order to understand the differences that characterize our communities and educational institutions.

Theoretical Perspective

There are a number of theoretical perspectives that might be considered in how diversity generally, and disability specifically, are conceptualized. Understanding diversity is a prerequisite to the basic knowledge necessary to achieve equity. The Deficit Thinking perspective (Valencia, 1997) outlines how failures of educational systems were based on the perspective that limited intellectual abilities, linguistic differences, or motivational issues were primary causes. This is an example of "blaming the victim", and the oppression that results from using institutional power over those who are disadvantaged. False narratives are constructed about how individual characteristics and standards of behavior became part of the historical framework of discrimination. This perspective does not inform efforts to achieve equity but rather how the lack of equity has resulted in ineffective educational systems. Diversity will need to be central to any effort to accomplish social change and achieve educational equity.

Critical Theory, and the more specific Critical Race Theory and Critical Disability Theory that emerged from it, was developed as a perspective that diversity should be a central consideration of efforts to support emancipation and social transformation (Jones, 2019, in Abes, et al., 2019). Critical Theory considers the structures of inequality and proposes the integration of theory and practice to promote social change. Hooks (1994) suggested that it is necessary to use theory to bridge practice and to ensure that practice is indeed liberatory. "Educators are called on to elevate what we expect of theories to incorporate the

critical goals of emancipation and societal transformation" (p. 13). Using this

point of view, marginalized groups can be identified and represented, we can

understand how systems of power work, how these can be used to inform and

promote social justice as a method to view diversity, and to realize how

individuals understand and experience the world and communicate with it

(Wijeyesinghe, 2019, in Abes, et al., 2019).

Critical Race Theory as it applies to disability, recognizes that individuals

with disabilities representing various racial groups have been subjected to

various inequities in education because of class domination, intellectual abilities,

as well as physical features that society defined as those who can meet the

social expectations. Ray (2019) points out the importance of the social construct

of racism in organizations and that racial group membership is a disadvantage

because it legitimatizes the unequal distribution of resources. These schemes

are imbedded into organizations and perpetuate the use of power towards people

disadvantaged by race, ethnicity, or disability. As an example, organizations pay

differential wages and provide segregated services based on disadvantaged

groups and that discrimination needs to be addressed to ensure that stabilizing

social systems is mediated by attention to these historical biases. Petersen

(2006) considered the oppression faced by those with disability as one that is

continuous of that experienced as a function of race and social class.

Critical Disability Theory challenges the ableist assumptions that have

shaped most societal structures (Hoskings, 2008). The primary perspective in

this theory is that disability is a social construct rather than the inevitable result of impairment. The social disadvantage experienced by individuals with disabilities is the result of the failure of the social environment to respond adequately to the diversity presented by disability.

Leadership Perspective

The success of the inclusion of students with disabilities, as with any change effort, is directly related to various dimensions of effective educational leadership. The discussion about what makes an effective leader is ongoing and centers on both the administration of existing policies and initiatives that focus on reform. Is leadership about maintaining the status quo or is it about change, or perhaps a combination of both? Leadership in higher education requires financial, political and fundraising skills and abilities, collaborating with stakeholders, students, faculty, administrative staff, and community, and meeting all the social-economic expectations for educational goals (Selingo, et al., 2017). This multitude of tasks can also be an opportunity to accomplish necessary reforms; "leadership is about influence, change and goal achievement" (Marion & Gonzalez, 2013, p. 61).

Thompson (2018) describes leadership as how one creates relationships by cultivating connections in all contexts. Leaders build an identity that must be known to others and they need to acknowledge collaborators and the important role that they play. Both men and women occupy leadership roles and the gap is not one of abilities or skills but rather of opportunities (Place & Vardeman-Winter,

2018). It is important that the social construct of leadership be free of gender bias, in addition to other biases not related to performance. Leadership as a concept can shape the way leaders take actions in their everyday activities, so it is important to have a clear understanding of what duties and competences are necessary. The requisite base of knowledge, decision-making skills, and understanding those factors that are involved in leadership, are necessary to move a group towards a goal and to manage the activities that accomplish this goal. It is assumed that an effective leader is able to consider a variety of group characteristics and the organizational culture that has developed in considering strategies for change. The effective leader organizes group efforts by drawing attention to those factors that are meaningful to the group in a way that change can be accomplished (Marion & Gonzalez, 2013).

There are subtle practices in higher education that lead to various forms of discrimination. This kind of discrimination can be addressed "if we add multiple perspectives and equity-based leadership approaches to status quo leadership practices, educational leaders may be able to transform leadership and improve educational outcomes for larger numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners…" (p. 2) and by extension diversity that is characterized by disability (Santamaria, 2013). Leaders might contribute to discriminatory practices or they can provide the necessary leadership to ensure equity and access to the full range of educational benefits.

Likewise, higher education governance and policy are established as structures that appropriately applied, use data to reach the institutional mission that involves a full range of inclusive practices. This type of governance is defined as an "approach to help institutions progress without hampering the diversity of higher education" (Hérnard & Mitterle, 2010, p. 15). These governance structures are a device that protects the integrity of the institution by ensuring access in the context of social and economic considerations (Hérnard & Mitterle, 2010). Paramount to these efforts is the inclusion of various disadvantaged groups who have been historically marginalized.

Policy and Legal Context

The commitment that individuals with disabilities should be included in all aspects of our society and receive the benefits of this access has been established at both the international and national levels. Mexican legislation parallels international commitments and the United States preceded the international treaties and extends their authority in significant ways. The review of these authorities considers a significant difference in the approach used by Mexico when compared to that used in the United States. Mexico by federal legislation requires the inclusion of those with disabilities, however the implementation is relegated to state and local authorities. Those local efforts will be analyzed in Chapter 4. The United States, in addition to numerous pieces of federal legislation, issues specific rules and regulations for its implementation. These will be reviewed here.

17

International Commitment

After decades of work by the United Nations to change how persons with disabilities are viewed, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (International Disability Alliance, 2006) outlined in an international treaty, that persons with disabilities have rights and should be able to claim those rights as an active participant in society. The document was signed by 82 countries; this included Mexico in 2007, and the United States in 2009. Provisions in the treaty state that the rights provided in society to persons with disabilities must also extend to educational opportunities. Without this, the full development of human potential cannot be achieved. The article extends full rights to all students, school-aged and university, and includes the right to full and equal access to services and an expectation of positive outcomes. It is important to note that the United States Congress must ratify all treaties to which the U.S. is party. To date, this treaty has not been approved by Congress because it is viewed as an international intrusion on domestic policy. The main objection is that it will cause a reduction in the decision-making rights of parents of children with disabilities. Nevertheless, the United States has passed comparable legislation that outlines the same guarantees to individuals with disabilities (Swartz, et al., 2018). The major provisions of this treaty included:

- People are free to make their own choices.

- No one will be discriminated against.

- Disabled people have the same rights to be included in society as anybody else.

- Disabled people are to be respected for who they are.

- Everyone should have equal opportunities.

- Everyone should have equal access.

- Men and women should have equal opportunities.

- Disabled children should be respected for who they are as they grow up.

- Participation in this treaty was considered an important commitment by Mexico to extend the rights of their citizens to those reflected in the international community.

Mexican Legislative Authority

The inclusion of students with disabilities is both codified in federal legislation and extended by additional international treaties to which Mexico is a signatory. It should be noted that the law is inclusive of all citizens, in addition to being specific to individuals with disabilities.

Mexico has been part of the worldwide effort to acknowledge the rights of people with disabilities and to ensure their inclusion in all aspects of society. The international regulations that Mexico has participated in include the Comisión Nacional de Derechos Humanos in 2017, Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, Children's Rights Convention in 1990, Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities in

2001, and Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2006. Even with Mexico's agreement to these various declarations of rights, the implementation and realization of these agreements have not been entirely accomplished and remain an ongoing challenge for Mexican institutions of higher education.

The Constitución de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos [Constitution of the United Mexican States] (1917) and the General Law to Include Persons with Disabilities [Ley General de Inclusion de Personas con Discapacidad] (Diario Oficial, 2018) are the most important regulations that sustain the rights of education, health, and protection of all Mexicans. Even with these laws in place, implementation has been difficult for school-aged children and many children still do not receive the full benefit of the law. An even greater challenge has been providing services to students with disabilities at the higher education level. The lack of implementation in the primary and secondary grades has resulted in even less implementation at the postsecondary level.

General Law to Include People with Disabilities (2018)

This act is clear in the expectation that all Mexican citizens, including those with disabilities, have full rights to the benefits of society and those efforts to ensure these rights are mandated. The act requires that accessibility be ensured and that individuals with disabilities receive adjustments in social care, technical assistance, communication, and universal design to allow their full participation.

Article 12. The Secretary of Public Education shall promote the right to education for all individuals with disabilities, prohibiting any discrimination against them in schools, educational centers, daycare centers, or for the teachers or administrative staff.

This act requires that all teachers and education leaders promote the inclusion of people with disabilities at all levels of the national educational system in Mexico. Each state is required to set appropriate standards and methods to comply with this responsibility.

United States Legislative Authority

Building on a long history of the progressive expansion of services to individuals with disabilities, the Rehabilitation Amendments (Unites States, 1978) marked the entry of the Department of Rehabilitation into training for expanded employment outcomes. Though earlier establishment of sheltered workshops had employment as a goal, this legislation concentrates on integrated community settings. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 provided the statutory foundations for the Rehabilitation Services Administration and established priority for rehabilitation services to those with the most severe disabilities. It also initiated and expanded programs for individuals previously being underserved, including homebound and institutionalized clients. The act expanded employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities, including section 503, which eliminated architectural and transportation barriers impeding citizens with disabilities in public governmental buildings. In addition, the Rehabilitation Act required an

individualized written rehabilitation plan (IWRP) with an annual review, which outlines, in the form of a contract developed in conjunction with the client, the conditions and responsibilities under which services will be provided, funded research and demonstration projects concerned with the rehabilitation of individuals with severe disabilities, and included section 504, which prohibits discrimination against any individual solely by reason of the disability in any program or activity receiving federal funds.

Transition for school-aged children was important to give emphasis to the inclusion in educational sites for children with disabilities as one of the major features of the Rehabilitation Act, as children were served by the public schools it was guaranteed similar protections as adults served by rehabilitation and other service agencies. The U. S. Department of Education in 1975, specifically referenced it in the language of the law on the P.L. 94-142. The inclusion of school-aged children in the language of the law set the platform for the subsequent coordination of various agencies to provide services by the wide authority of this act. Programs were encouraged by this act, especially those that required an affirmative action-type push. Transition plans, at its origin, were a core effort, so the act authorized the use of funds to provide a variety of support mechanisms that allowed transition programs to be established.

A few years later in the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1986 notable changes were made to include the use of supported employment with ongoing support services, as outcome for the rehabilitation program. Much of the

historical emphasis of the state/federal rehabilitation agencies had been in rehabilitation that resulted in almost total independence of functioning for clients but had created an effect of exclusion of individuals with moderate and severe disabilities in some efforts. This vocational act legitimized and authorized funding for services that were supportive in nature and expected to be ongoing as far as needed.

There is a federal civil right legislation that bars job discrimination against individuals with physical or mental disabilities and is known as the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990), provide access for individuals with disabilities to mass transportation, public buildings and transportation and governmental services are assured by it. This act is considered an important extension of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 because of the dramatically increased number of employers that are affected (those employing more than fifteen). This act is seen as a last move in the process designed to warrant the integration of individuals with disabilities into the vocational majority of American society. The recognition that many individuals with disabilities will need support throughout their lives were vigilantly included in the provisions of the law.

One result of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, WIOA (U. S. Department of Labor, 2014) was that the Federal Partners in Transition Workgroup would coordinate transition services for students with disabilities to ensure a federal interagency strategy to improve the outcomes for students with disabilities. WIOA extended out-of-school services to students with disabilities up

to age 24 who are no longer attending school. New provisions in the WIOA emphasize community integrated employment opportunities where individuals work in the actual workforce over supported employment where jobs sites are sheltered and individuals require long-term support with competitive employment a low priority.

To chart the advancement of adjusting programs and laws for individuals with disabilities from traditional programs to a continuum of services beginning in the public schools and extending to community integration via adult service agencies, these pieces of legislation were taken together. A public recognition of the need to coordinate efforts on behalf of individuals with disabilities was made as various governmental agencies assumed responsibility for service provision. It is important to recall that new initiatives built into legislation did not develop in isolation and required constant reviews. Research validating program efficacy and professional practice evolved because of field-based experience. One good example of this influence can be seen in the review of the Education for the Handicapped Act implementation mandated by Congress in 1990, in the Annual Reports to Congress 1989-1999 (Congress Gov., 1990) the significance of transition services to the success of children as adults.

Comparative Review of the U.S. and Mexico Commitment

The American College Personnel Association (1996) in their document: *The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs*, stated that "higher education is in the throes of a major transformation" and that

24

transformation is happening because of "economic conditions, eroding public confidence, accountability demands, and demographic shifts resulting in increased numbers of people from historically underrepresented groups going to college." Almost 25 years later this statement still holds true. With this in mind, the student populations entering college, and those already attending, are the most diverse in our history. This is due to, but not limited to, the ever-increasing numbers of students of color, different sexualities, including transgender students, persons with disabilities, older students, students from low socio-economic families, students of varying religions and faiths, and immigrant students (Evans, Williams, King, & Metcalf, 2010). More people are attending colleges and universities, which in turn has caused a strain in resources and support. But one cannot deny that increased attendance in higher education is a good problem to have. In order to address this issue, colleges and universities need to reevaluate their purpose by examining their population, considering internal and external factors that may influence and affect this population, and reemphasize "student learning and personal development as the primary goals of undergraduate education" (American College Personnel Association, 1996).

The educational systems in Mexico and the U.S. are designed to develop citizens' access to knowledge and better life conditions by providing educational programs from childhood to adult. There is evidence that higher education has not made sufficient progress in serving and including students with disabilities (Swartz, et al., 2018). In Mexico, the General Law to Include People with

Disabilities (2018) outlines the expectations that all citizens, including people with disabilities have full rights to the benefits of society and those efforts to ensure these rights are mandated in order to guarantee equity and social justice. The act requires that accessibility is ensured and that the services provided are comprehensive. Article 12 states that special education will be available in all institutions; public or private, preparing adaptions to the curriculum based on the educations needs of the individual with the disability (p. 9). This act requires teachers and educational leadership the ability to promote the inclusion of persons with disabilities at all levels in Mexico's national education system. Each state is then required to set appropriate standards and methods to comply with this responsibility. It could be said that this act is Mexico's equivalent to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2015) is a law in the U.S. that ensures all school-aged children with disabilities receive a free and appropriate public education that is designed to meet their individual needs and to receive special related services to prepare for further education, employment, and independent living. This must also include a transition program from high school to higher education if requested (Glennon, 2016). The U.S. has developed policies and structured procedures in order to provide services. The goal of IDEA is to provide a common structure that schools work must use to provide a continuity of services. Mexico has created laws, regulations, and policies, all with clear intent, but still excludes persons with disabilities due to a lack of

infrastructure and strategies (Silva-Laya, 2012). This might be attributed to the variability and ambiguity of state-level implementation and compliance with federal standards. Inclusion of persons with disabilities in higher education is a difficult task with the lack of clarity in implementation standards and an inconsistent level of service provision in in the preK-12 system. The Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior [National Association Universities and Institutions of Higher Education] (ANUIES, 2019a) described the higher education system as complex, fragmented, without a clear mission, with different layers of policies that have not been coordinated but rather accumulated over time. In addition, there are multiple agencies in charge of the education system with overlapping functions, different criteria used in decision-making, and unnecessarily diverse policies.

In a report called The Future of Mexican Higher Education, OECD (2019 b) a series of recommendations were made a series of recommendations to policy makers based on a Secretaría de Educación Pública [Secretary of Public Education] (SEP) report from 2018 regarding governance and the lack of clarity in the federal and state management of regulations and administration of financial resources. They acknowledged current laws and policies, but made recommendations that stated institutions needed clear objectives, implementation strategies, monitoring and evaluation systems, and transparency regarding demographics, statistics, faculty, and services. There are some practices that promote inclusion in higher education across Mexican universities,

but those are isolated experiences. Universities have some policies, regulations,

strategies, and procedures in place, but they are not a part of a national plan or

system to guarantee implementation and no follow-up plan has been established.

In addition, the lack of agreement on how disabilities are defined in an

educational context has created an array of ambiguous services (Cruz &

Casillas, 2017; Arzate, 2015).

ANUIES (2012) reported that out of the 3098 higher education institutions

in Mexico (universities, technological institutes, normal schools, research

institutes, and private institutions), the total number of enrolled students in 2010

was 2,773,088. Of those students, 26,651 declared they had a disability,

representing less than one percent of the total population. The OECD (2019 b)

stated that in the 2016-2017 school year, there were 4.4 million students in

higher education systems but no clear information about how many had disability

status. The National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI, 2018) report

that six percent of the general population of Mexico have a disability, so if

inclusion were a reality, this percentage should be similar to the student

population in Mexican higher education. A clear difference between the U.S. and

Mexican higher education systems is the absence of information on the

characteristics of the university student population in Mexico. The information

gap between INEGI and the Secretary of Education makes it difficult to find

current, accurate data. This creates a barrier to identify students with disabilities

in higher education and to identify the services needed to provide and ensure equity in educational opportunities.

Differences in K-12 and University Protections

There are some important differences in the legal protections for students while attending the public schools who then transition to higher education. The IDEA provides for specific services while the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) has access as its primary focus. In the public schools, education is a right as part of the zero-reject principle, which is not the case in higher education. To participate in higher education students must meet admission criteria before there are any entitlements. Whereas, IDEA is about success in the least restrictive environment, ADA only ensures access. The personal services guaranteed under IDEA (i.e., various therapies and personal care) are not part of the accommodation requirement in higher education. Where the public schools are required to modify curriculum and instruction there is no parallel requirement in higher education.

Mexico's educational system has two methods of providing special education. One includes special education services for students with severe disabilities in K-9, which includes elementary schools and junior high schools only (Gobierno de México, 2020 a). The services provided are segregated in Multiple Services Centers [Centros de Atención Multiple] (CAM), and charged with providing comprehensive school care to children and youth with disabilities, multiple disabilities or serious developmental disorders conditions, making

29

inclusion in general education difficult. A second major service in special education is referred to as Regular Education Support Services Unit [Unidad de Servicios de Apoyo a la Educación Regular] (USAER). This service includes the necessary technical and methodological supports that guarantee quality care to the school population and particularly to those students who face barriers to learning and participation and who are at risk of exclusion. No transition programs or services are available as part of the educational system from K-9 to high school and higher education in Mexico.

Adult Education is also part of the educational system and provides services to students that did not complete elementary school. However, there are no provisions for transition planning for these young adults (Gobierno de México, 2017 b). Universities do not participate in secondary school to postsecondary transition planning.

In general, both the Mexican constitution and the Inclusion of Individuals with Disabilities Act, both provide the framework to include students in higher education, but no clear regulations have been established.

<center>Inclusion Begins in High School</center>

The IDEA (1997) extended mandatory public education to include planning and programs to ensure a successful transition from K-12 educational experiences to community integration, meaningful employment, and access to higher education. The reauthorization of the IDEA in 2004, revised the definition of secondary transition services. The law is very specific in requiring outcomes

<center>30</center>

with the goal of ensuring that students follow a plan that results in participation in postsecondary education and vocational programs. It is important to note that parents enjoy a level of protection that allows for legal challenges to programs and services that they consider inadequate to realize the goal of community integration and participation.

This statute makes it clear that if post-secondary goals are appropriate for a student with a disability, then it is the responsibility of the public schools to initiate the transition process to ensure access to higher education. Success in higher education will be, to a great extent, contingent on the effectiveness of this plan and the provision of the appropriate supports necessary to access higher education and to be successful in this experience. The preparedness of institutions of higher education to receive these students and provide the services necessary for their inclusion will be an ongoing consideration.

Issue of Outcomes

Poor post-school outcomes were reported in the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education (Government Printing Office, 2002). These findings helped drive changes to IDEA, 2004.

The Commission finds students with disabilities are significantly unemployed and have underemployment upon leaving school compared to their peers who do not have disabilities. Too many students with disabilities leave school without successfully earning any type of diploma, and they attend post-secondary programs at rates lower than their

nondisabled peers. Adults with disabilities are much less likely to be

employed than adults without disabilities. Unemployment rates for

working-age adults with disabilities have hovered at the 70 percent level

for at least the past 12 years, which the Commission finds to be wholly

unacceptable. Even when employed, too many adults with disabilities who

are employed earn markedly less income than their nondisabled peers.

These statistics reflect failures in the present systems' structures. We find

that the overriding barrier preventing a smooth transition from high school

to adult living is the fundamental failure of federal policies and programs to

facilitate smooth movement for students from secondary school to

competitive employment and higher education (p. 31).

The United States Government Accountability Office (GAO, 2012)

published a report emphasizing the nonstop need for successful transition

planning for children with disabilities due to continued poor results. As on the

most recent report in June 2020 (GAO,2020), it was estimated that "Agencies

hired about 143,600 persons with disabilities from 2011-2015—exceeding the

federal target of 100,000. Agencies made an additional 79,600 hires in 2016 and

2017." (p. 2), but the lasting time on the job was less than 1 year, and almost

60% of the employees lasted 2 years, so due to the inability to assess the

continued effectiveness of reasonable accommodations provided to employees

has become an obstacle to fulfil the laws, and shows the need to continue with

the efforts to have better transition and follow up procedures.

One clear concern emerging from the GAO (2012) report was the lack of coordination among agencies which results were that students with disabilities often had complications navigating through the various agencies, which could result in interruptions, delays or not access at all to services. The four agencies that administer key transition programs were: (1) Education, (2) the Departments of Health and Human Services (HHS) and (3) Labor, and (4) the Social Security Administration (SSA), as the Local Education Agency (LEA) were specifically responsible for coordinating the child's services (e.g., Individualized Education Program, IEP) so that the student can be prepared for gainful employment. Labor were designed to improve training and employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities. The SSA supervises Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income programs, as well as the Ticket to Work program. The said SSA programs were designed to provide supplemental cash awards as well as help individuals with disabilities find, enter, and retain employment. Finally, the HHS managed Medicare and Medicaid Services where both home and community-based services, could be provided and could include case management, personal care attendants, or day or residential habilitation. While there was no formal program to integrate all four agencies, the Federal Partners in Transition Workgroup in 2016, targets transition services and involves all four agencies, they are an informal workgroup, but encompasses information sharing and may serve as a helpful resource to IEP teams.

There are two key institutionalized and systemic barriers that make it difficult for individuals with disabilities to access transition services: (1) lack of adequate information or awareness, and (2) lack preparedness for postsecondary education or employment. Additionally, students in the juvenile justice system, those that are parents, and those who have less visible disabilities (e.g., mild cognitive delays and learning disabilities) may also have unique challenges when it comes to accessing transition services (Swartz et. al., 2018). It is important for IEP teams to keep in mind that children with disabilities enrolled in school are entitled to an IEP, but as an adult they must apply for federal and state services for individuals with disabilities. The IEP transition plan should be mindful of this and seek to develop goals and services that will facilitate successful access to post school services. The lack of coordination is reported across states, with Florida's Project 10 Transition Education Network (2020) and Minnesota's Department of Employment and Economic Development program (Minnesota Government, 2017) providing examples of ongoing collaborative efforts.

By June of 2020, GAO made recommendations as result of the annual examination of the agencies in charge of increase the employment of individuals with disabilities. Those recommendations are different of what was referenced at their report in 2012, but still represents lack of preparedness for employment: 1) Office of Personal Management (OPM) should track and report retention data; 2) Department of Justice (DOJ), Small Business Administration (SBA), and Social

Security Administration (SSA) should assess training impacts; 3) and DOJ and SBA should obtain employee feedback on reasonable accommodations. There are two key institutionalized and systemic barriers that make it difficult for individuals with disabilities to access transition services: (1) lack of adequate information or awareness, and (2) lack of preparedness for postsecondary education or employment. Additionally, students in the juvenile justice system, those that are parents, and those who have less visible disabilities (e.g., mild cognitive delays and learning disabilities) may also have unique challenges when it comes to accessing transition services. It is important for IEP teams to keep in mind that children with disabilities enrolled in school are entitled to an IEP, but as an adult they must apply for federal and state services for individuals with disabilities.

The Constitution of the Mexican United States, Article 123, states that all people in Mexico have the right to a decent and socially useful job. The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (International Disability Alliance, 2006), in its Article 27 establishes that persons with disabilities have the right to work on equal terms as others, including the right to participate in freely chosen work in an open, inclusive, and accessible work environment. The Federal Job Act [Ley Federal del Trabajo] (Camara de Diputados del H. Congreso de la Unión, 2015) in Article 4, states that no person can be prevented from dedicating himself to the profession, industry, commerce or work that suits him/her, being lawful, and this freedom can only be forbidden by judicial

determination, when the rights of third parties are impinged upon or those of society are violated (Camara de Diputados del H. Congreso de la Unión, 2015). Though strategies to accomplish this inclusion are established, no data are available to determine level of implementation or effectiveness as the Incluyeme: Programa Nacional de Trabajo para Personas con Discapacidad 2014-2018 reports (Gobierno de México, 2014 c).

The data reported by INEGI (2018) included numbers beginning at age five. It reported that persons with disabilities, beginning at age five, represent 6.7% of the Mexican population and that 51% are over the age of 60. The lack of differentiation of age categories makes this information difficult to analyze.

D'Artigues (2018) reported that only 39.1% of Mexicans with disabilities are employed. Official data on employment and unemployment are difficult to obtain but reasons cited for this low rate were likely discriminatory practices in the workplace. A salary gap for workers with disabilities was also identified.

Students with Disabilities in Higher Education

Mexican Context

There is considerable evidence that the higher education system has not made sufficient progress in serving and including students with disabilities. In their 2016 report, there were 3,915,971 students in higher education, which represent 16.6% of the general population in Mexico, with 5.7% reporting disabilities (ANUIES, 2019b).

The National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI, 2016 b) reported that:

- 22.7% of the disabled population, age 15 years old and more, are illiterate.

- 23.1% of the disabled population does not receive instruction, and do not attend school.

- Regarding those that have attended school:

- 44.7% of the disabled population attended elementary school.

- 15.3% attended the junior high school (7th to 9th grade).

- 10.9% attended high school.

- 5.7% attended the higher education system.

The number of students with disabilities who enter postsecondary institutions and programs is low relative to the numbers who are eligible. Some universities have reported efforts of inclusion but they appear to be dependent on the willingness of professors and administrative staff to implement these efforts. Mexican institutions identified with committees to implement disability policies include: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Universidad Iberoamericana, Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes and Universidad Autónoma de Baja California. These committees are typically charged with monitoring students with disabilities but regulations to implement the mandatory inclusion provided in the law appear to be absent.

<u>U.S. Context</u>

Enrollment trends in the U.S. indicate an increase in the number of students in postsecondary education with a disability (National Center for Education Statistics, NCES, 2016 a). In the 2007-2008 academic year, approximately 16 million students were enrolled in higher education. 10.9 % of undergraduates (almost 1.7 million students) reported having one or more disabilities including: a specific learning disability, visual impairment, hard of hearing, deafness, a speech impairment, or health impairment. During the 2011-2012 academic year, 11.1% of students (almost 2 million) reported having a disability (U.S Department of Education, 2019).

U.S. higher education's tripartite structure generally places institutions into one of three groups: community colleges, comprehensive universities, and research universities. Relying on NCES data, Raue and Lewis (2011) reported that 99% of both public two-year and four-year Title IV (federal financial aid funds) eligible institutions enrolled students with disabilities during the 2008-2009 academic year. However, students with disabilities are overrepresented in the two-year community college sector (Cohen & Kisker, 2010). In fact, more than 50% of all college students with a disability enroll in public two-year colleges (Raue & Lewis, 2011). According to the American Association of Community Colleges (2018), 20% of community college students have a disability. Enrollment patterns have been associated with the multiple barriers students face in their pursuit of higher education (e.g., entrance exams). Although

students with disabilities are disproportionately represented in the community college, they are also represented in other sectors of higher education, albeit at lower levels.

Common Barriers to Postsecondary Education

Pervasive and institutionalized barriers exist in the education pipeline for students with disabilities both in gaining access and those encountered after enrollment. Simon (2011), reported that "Access has many faces, including physical and communication access, programmatic access, and access to accommodations. The goal of access is to facilitate the increased integration of students with disabilities" (p. 98). Adopting and expanding Simon's (2011) notion of access to include access to degree completion is recommended.

Secondary Education to Postsecondary Education Support

The common barriers students with disabilities encounter while pursuing access to postsecondary education are related to the following: (a) recruitment and admissions, (b) consistent emphasis on self-determination and self-advocacy, and (c) inadequate transition planning. The latter barrier relates exclusively to first-time freshmen (direct-from-high school). These barriers are elaborated on in the following subsections.

Recruitment and Admissions

At the broadest and perfunctory level, U.S. colleges and universities have sought to recruit students who have historically been underrepresented or excluded from higher education. Certainly, most often these efforts are aimed at

diversifying student populations rather than truly promoting or achieving social justice (Dumas-Hines, Cochran, & Williams, 2001). Nonetheless, suitable and concerted efforts to recruit students with disabilities are limited.

Recruitment involves attracting, screening, and ultimately admitting students to the college or university. Recruitment practices include employing materials such as college view books and recruitment videos, as well as hosting events like recruitment fairs and visit days. However, it is the position of the American Psychological Association (n.d.), that individuals with disabilities "may not have the same access to your program's recruitment information and events, thereby leading to a missed opportunity for admitting and enrolling qualified students with disabilities". Although this statement is explicitly directed at training directors and faculty in psychology, it can be argued that it is applicable to all programs and universities at large.

In addition to being excluded from participating in certain recruitment activities, students with disabilities must contend with additional challenges related to fulfilling admissions criteria. For example, most four-year U.S. colleges and universities consider college entrance exams (e.g., ACT, SAT) in admission decisions. While students with disabilities are capable of achieving high scores, they are limited by inadequate and sometimes difficult to secure testing accommodations even though these are required by ADA. A 2011 report by the GAO entitled *Higher Education and Disability: Improved Federal Enforcement Needed to Better Protect Students' Rights to Testing Accommodations* indicated

that testing accommodations granted by ten testing companies, including the ACT and SAT, included 50% extra time (57%), more than 50% extra time (17%), extra/extended breaks (4%), alternate test format (7%), auditory or visual assistance (4%), adjustments in testing environment (7%), and other (3%). Nonetheless, individuals interviewed found "testing companies' documentation requirements difficult to understand and unreasonable" (p. 2). In fact, the testing companies themselves reported, "challenges with ensuring fairness to all test takers and maintaining the reliability of their tests when making accommodations decisions" (p. 2).

There is research that described some of the services provided to students with disabilities in higher education, however, recruitment procedures were not addressed (Pérez-Castro, 2019; Cruz & Casillas, 2017).

<u>Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy</u>

Discussions surrounding students with disabilities and participation in higher education, often center on self-determination and self-advocacy. Wehmeyer, Kelchner, and Richards (1996) defined self-determination as "acting as the primary causal agent in one's life and making choices and decisions regarding one's quality of life, free from undue influence or interference" (p. 632). Self-advocacy involves knowledge of self, knowledge of rights, communication, and leadership (Test, Fowler, Wood, Brewer, & Eddy, 2016). According to Kochhar-Bryant, Basset, and Webb (2009), individuals who demonstrate these abilities are found to be more academically, behaviorally, and socially successful.

Consequently, the authors highlighted ways in which colleges and universities might help to foster these skills. However, promoting self-determination and self-advocacy, might cause receiving institutions to neglect their roles and responsibilities to students with disabilities.

Rather than proactively reaching out to students, as suggested by Rendón's validation theory (1994, 2002), the push for self-determination and self-advocacy appears to place the responsibility on the student as opposed to the receiving institution. To be clear, validation theory, does not view students as incapable of making decisions or relieve them of their responsibilities, but rather holds colleges and universities accountable to students.

Secondary School Transition Planning

Kochhar-Bryant, Basset, and Webb (2009) identified "the most important element in ensuring successful transition to postsecondary education is effective and comprehensive transition planning" (p. 44-45).

Universities need to adapt due to the increasing number of persons with disabilities entering higher education. Historically, students with disabilities have not been accepted to universities, and for those few who were, they faced discriminatory practices (Belch, 2004). Cortiella and Horowitz (2014) found that 67% of students with learning disabilities enroll in higher education within eight years of high school graduation. Those numbers are comparable to non-disability students. Unfortunately, data regarding completion of post-secondary schooling

for persons with disabilities is not good. This could be due to insufficient transition planning from high school to college.

An Individualized Education Program (IEP) is required in order for a school transition program to be successful and needs to be conceived in four steps: 1) foundation, 2) process, 3) culmination, and 4) follow-up. In public schools in the United States, students with disabilities are given support through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). As previously noted, IDEA extended mandatory public education to include planning and programs to ensure a successful transition from K-12 educational experiences to community integration, meaningful employment, and access to higher education. The reauthorization of the IDEA in 2004 revised the definition of secondary transition services.

IDEA makes it clear that if post-secondary goals are appropriate for a student with a disability, then it is the responsibility of the public schools to initiate the transition process to ensure access to higher education. This is mainly left up to the schools to initiate because colleges and universities are not covered under IDEA. They do, however, have to follow the mandated ADA. ADA's purpose is to ensure equal access for students with disabilities and protect them against discrimination. Although colleges may provide accommodations, they are not required to provide transition plans.

Over the past 10 years, high school personnel have increasingly begun to help students transition from high school to two-and four-year colleges (Grigal,

Dwyre, & Davis, 2006). Transition planning offers increased opportunities for students with disabilities to expand their college experiences by taking classes, and participating in athletic and cultural events, as well as student organizations. The U.S. Department of Education's National Longitudinal Transition Studies (NLTS) collected data regarding the challenges that students with disabilities face in accessing services and programs (Wilson, Getzel & Brown, 2000). From the NTLS's 1994 study, "only 13% of students with learning disabilities (compared to 53% of students in the general population) have attended a four-year post-secondary school program within two years of leaving high school" (Stanberry, 2016, p. 2). Therefore, the process of transition planning is essential to assisting students in extending their goals to include postsecondary education.

Transition planning is required by IDEA for all students with Individual Education Plans (IEP) in K-12 schools. The plan is developed to provide guidance for helping student's progress from high school to post-graduation/post-secondary education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016 b). Personnel at the school, such as counselors, are usually involved in this process, along with parents, the student, and sometimes college representatives. The planning team usually focuses on the student's strengths and interests in developing the transition plan, considering the student's current capabilities, goals, and needed accommodations. Planning may also include raising expectations and providing ongoing support. The type of planning that is done depends on the transition models used.

Two of the most commonly used transition models are the program-based model and the individual support model. In the program-based model, a group of students attend the same college or university as degree seeking students without disabilities. The group takes courses towards earning a degree, while still receiving mandated educational services such as individualized instruction, social, and psychological skills (Hart, Mele-McCarthy, Pasternack, Zimbrich, & Parker, 2004). The individual support model differs from the program-based model with the individual student receiving support from a team. The student is guided through a support process and is given more individualized attention to opportunities and services. The program-based model is similar in some ways to the concept of universal learning in that is assumes that you can develop a program or service that fit a wide variety of student needs. The individual support model is more in keeping with services provided in the public schools, namely that each student receives a plan specific to their individual needs.

The differences in these models demonstrate different approaches, but focus on the same outcomes: (a) providing students with transition services in a college setting in order to facilitate job attainment, (b) providing the opportunity to participate in college classes and recreational and social activities, and (c) fostering a new level of independence and self-confidence (Grigal, Dwyre, & Davis, 2006).

Success in higher education, to a great extent, is contingent on the effectiveness of this plan and the provision of the appropriate supports necessary

to access higher education. The preparedness of institutions of higher education to receive these students and provide the services necessary for their inclusion will be an ongoing consideration.

<u>Once Enrolled in Higher Education</u>

The common barriers students with disabilities encounter once enrolled in higher education are related to the following: (a) verification and eligibility, (b) letter of the law vs. spirit of the law, (c) attitudinal barriers, (d) physical barriers, (e) universal design for learning, (f) faculty training, and (g) staff credentials and training. These barriers are elaborated on in the following subsections.

<u>Verification and Eligibility</u>

Not all students with disabilities who enroll in higher education are first-time freshmen (direct-from-high school). Therefore, not all students with disabilities who enroll in U.S. higher education have a transition plan in place. Moreover, not all students with disabilities are diagnosed prior to enrolling in higher education. In some cases, it is simply a late diagnosis. In other cases, it may be due to an adult occurring disability, such as a traumatic brain injury or adult onset diseases like diabetes. It is important to note that not all students who were identified by their secondary schools as having a disability will disclose their disability to their college or university (Newman, Wagner, Cameto, & Knokey, 2009). Unwillingness to report or delayed reporting is oftentimes related to some of the attitudes towards people with disabilities discussed below (Brown & Broido, 2015).

To receive accommodations, students must provide documentation and verify that they have a disability. For students who have not been previously diagnosed, this process proves to be costly. Students are faced with financial and time burdens. The costs associated with diagnosis are particularly troubling when we consider the intersection of students with disabilities and socio-economic status (Goodley, et al., 2014).

Letter of the Law vs. Spirit of the Law

Previously discussed legislation, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, is intended to protect students with disabilities. To receive federal funding U.S. colleges and universities must comply or risk losing federal monies and face litigation. To ensure compliance colleges and universities have established student services offices and oversight committees. Still others have engaged in cross-trainings and developed handbooks for faculty and staff. Universities fixated on avoiding lawsuits and the literal meaning of the law are said to follow the letter of the law. While those concerned with truly supporting students and moving beyond explanations such as "it's the law" are said to embrace the spirit of the law.

Kurth and Mellard (2006) discussed these two approaches: "Institutions that provide equal access by the letter of the law (i.e., primarily to avoid lawsuits) exhibit a philosophy that may not be verbalized on a campus but is felt and observed, and ultimately limits the success potential of a college and its students. Colleges

that embrace that spirit of the law, on the other hand are likely to

invest in an accommodation process that considers the entire

context of student life, individual functional needs, trade-offs

between the immediate and long-term costs and benefits, and

incorporates the system wide universal design concepts". (p. 83).

Existing literature suggests, that most colleges and universities continue to

operate under letter of the law. The focus on the letter of the law over the spirit of

the law is associated with attitudes of faculty, staff, administrators, and student

peers, which are discussed next.

Attitudinal Barriers

Services to students with disabilities are often considered a charity by the

public at large; witness the various telethons and fund-raising efforts that play to

the sympathy of the public. Those who work professionally with the disabled are

often admired for their patience. This ignores that the rights of individuals with

disabilities are the law. What we do for the disabled is not a charity, but a right.

This is an important distinction.

While some individuals demonstrate unwanted sympathy or pity, others

exhibit ableist attitudes. McClintock and Rauscher (1996) defined ableism as "a

pervasive system of discrimination and exclusion that oppresses people who

have mental, emotional, and physical disabilities …" (p. 198). Ableists devalue,

disregard, and mock people with disabilities. The [current] President of the United

States – Donald J. Trump - carried out clear illustrations of ableism while on the

campaign trail (Perry, 2016). In addition to mocking a reporter with a congenital condition, he consistently mocked his running mate Hillary Clinton and her physical ailments. In short, ableists question that people with disabilities can be contributing members of society.

Also related to attitudinal barriers is the notion of visible versus invisible disabilities. Students with invisible disabilities, such as depression or anxiety disorders, find themselves trying to legitimize their disability. Because their disabilities are not visible, or cannot be seen, the challenges they face are often undermined (Moriña, 2017).

It is ironic that inclusion efforts are typically more successful for students when the student has more severe disabilities (Swartz, 2014). It is likely related to the acceptance of a disability that is readily apparent compared to those that have no presenting characteristics. What we find is more acceptance when a student has a physical disability and needs a wheelchair, because the disability is visible, than to a student with a learning disability, where the disability is not readily observable and could result in an attitude of suspicion that efforts to gain accommodation are designed to receive an unfair advantage.

<u>Physical Barriers</u>

Although Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act require facilities to be accessible to people with disabilities, students with disabilities, particularly those with limited mobility, continue to encounter physical barriers on campus. In the United States, physical barriers

are particularly prevalent on early/colonial college campuses (Biemiller, 2016).

Biemiller (2016), for example, highlighted the challenges students with mobility

issues face at the University of Virginia. While the terraced grounds provide for a

distinctly beautiful campus, they are difficult to navigate. The omnipresence of

construction cranes and contractor fencing on college campuses, often related to

campus expansion, also present significant physical barriers for students with

disabilities.

Universal Design for Learning

That the needs of students with disabilities should be accommodated is

generally accepted in the academy, however, the methods by which to

successfully accomplish those accommodations are still unclear. As an

alternative to providing access to instruction on a case-by-case basis, there is

growing interest in what has been called universal access to learning where

access is ensured by its initial design making the need for changing how

instruction is provided unnecessary. The concept of universal design has its roots

in architecture where it was proposed that buildings and living environments be

built in a way to ensure access to anyone with physical limitations obviating

future needs for any alterations or redesign (Goldsmith, 2015). Given the barrier-

free requirement of the Americans with Disabilities Act, to meet the requirement

at the formative stage was both logical and in keeping with the societal

commitment to inclusion for all of its citizens.

Taking this inclusive concept to instruction is, however, no simple matter. We know how to build a ramp, but do we know how to modify instruction so that all students, regardless of their limitations, will have access to our courses and instruction? The commonly reported problem is not access to course information but the evaluation processes that are available to assess student mastery or learning. In other words, how do we test students and what might be gained or lost in the process? Some of the guidance on universal design comes from a framework developed by the Harvard Graduate School of Education that calls for multiple means of acquiring information and demonstrating learning (Shafer, 2017). Most university professors are open to some flexibility on how to acquire information, but many are intransigent when it comes to evaluation, fearing methods that might lower standards. So, beginning with a paper and pencil test, online tests might be acceptable, tests where the answers are read out might work, assistance from an aide to help the student respond perhaps, however, verbal answers to questions, group or individual projects, graphic displays, or acting out responses, might not meet the test of academic rigor. The *Chronicle of Higher Education* in a recent special supplement on Disability on Campus, included one professor's serious question of giving extra time on an examination to students with learning disabilities (Trachtenberg, 2016). The objection stated was not so much to the accommodation but rather that it appears to be a default setting for this group of students. The overarching question was if this is all we have, do we, in fact, know what we are doing?

Universal design for learning might represent an empty promise. The claim that it eliminates or reduces barriers to curriculum by providing a framework that challenges all learners is an attempt to revise how current instruction is differentiated and modified based on the claim that instruction is standardized.

The daunting task of instructional and learning environment modifications to meet the needs of all, neglects considering the needs of the individual based on claims that current learning environments are no longer productive ones. This raises the question as to whether universities need to develop programs that are appropriate for individuals with disabilities. We are excluding a population based on archaic traditions rather than establishing curricula that can be inclusive of those with disabilities. The scope of offerings should be broadened so that all of our citizens have higher education opportunities. We have evolved from the medieval university that focused on theology and law to the modern university where one might earn a bachelor's degree in real estate or culinary arts. How much farther would we stretch the question of what is higher education by offering programs of study for students with cognitive limitations?

Faculty Training and Commitment

At the center of curricular and pedagogical decisions, is the faculty. Broadly speaking, faculty members face significant demands to engage in quality research, teaching, and service. The amount of time faculty dedicate to each of the three tenets of faculty work is guided, of course, though not wholly determined, by the institutional type in which they are situated (O'Meara, Terosky

& Neumann, 2008; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; O'Meara, 2005). Moreover, faculty are increasingly expected to perform as hyperprofessionals. "Hyperprofessionality" is a term that highlights how faculty members are asked to "giv[e] more" and "go…beyond and above in the professional context" (Gornall & Salisbury, 2012, p. 150). As a result, faculty are likely to have less time and/or willingness to participate in trainings and workshops (if and when offered) related to maximizing opportunities for disabled student success and mentoring and advocating for students with disabilities. After all, faculty reward and incentive structures favor engagement in research (Fairweather, 2005).

In addition to time constraints, it is important to acknowledge that most doctorally trained faculty are trained and socialized as researchers, not teachers (Austin, 2002). In some cases, this may limit their commitment and ability to be effective in the classroom, in general, and arguably even more so, with students with disabilities.

Staff Credentials and Training

Similar to faculty, some staff members within various student service units are unprepared to work with and engage students with disabilities. As suggested by Wilson, Getzel, and Brown (2000):

Just because access to post-secondary education is increasing for students with disabilities, it does not always follow that students selecting this option will discover welcoming, supportive campus climates, programming and services that will facilitate choice, independence, and

53

social participation, or adequate supports to promote academic success (p. 37).

Although colleges and universities have made notable steps towards more inclusive environments for students with disabilities since the publication of this work, students continue to face barriers to co-curricular engagement (Brown & Broido, 2015).

Summary

The literature review identified numerous continuing issues in the inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education. Viewed as an issue of social justice, disability is not given the priority of other groups such as racial or ethnic minorities. The theoretical considerations of Critical Disability Theory inform the perspective that ableism continues as an obstacle to access to the benefits of higher education. An historical perspective of both the Mexico and the United States was reviewed with comparisons of both legislative authority of systems of service provision and monitoring of compliance. Problems with accommodations were identified and alternative systems of instructional delivery were reviewed.

What was most readily apparent in this review were the significant differences in how inclusion is accomplished in Mexico when compared to the United States. Though both have similar general mandates, implementation is quite different. Mexico is absent the clear regulations for inclusion that are used in the United States. This difference was the basis of the study. How does this lack of regulatory guidance impact the inclusion of students with disabilities in

higher education in Mexico? What changes in practice might this research

recommend?

CHAPTER THREE:

METHODS

This study was designed to assess and analyze the current status of efforts to accommodate students with disabilities in selected state universities in Mexico. A variety of procedures were used to accomplish this, including:(1) an analysis of the various laws and regulations governing the inclusion of students with disabilities in Mexican higher education, (2) a comparison of the authority for inclusion in the United States and its implications for similar efforts in Mexico, (3) a review of governing documents used in Mexican state universities to organize and provide services to student with disabilities, (4) a survey of faculty involved in the inclusion process relative to the current state of inclusion efforts, and (5) a survey of the administrators charged with the responsibility of implementing services for students with disabilities. In addition to the information regarding current efforts of implementation, data were collected regarding attitudes toward inclusion and perceived obstacles to accomplishing a comprehensive program of inclusion.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed as the primary focus of this study: RQ1: What authority for inclusion of students with disabilities is prescribed by Mexican law and how does it compare to similar requirements in the United States? RQ2: What rules and regulations have been adopted by

Mexican state universities and at what level have those provisions been implemented? RQ3: What services are currently in place to accomplish the goal of inclusion of students with disabilities? RQ4: What are the attitudes of various professional groups regarding inclusion and what obstacles to those efforts are identified by each group?

Research Design

Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected in this study. This study employed a non-experimental design that identified the alignment between the laws and regulations of inclusion and the practices of inclusion at the public autonomous universities in the north of Mexico. This design is considered advocacy/participatory in which educational equity can be determined by the extent to which the rules and regulations regarding inclusion are consistent with the laws that require services and accommodations for students with disabilities in higher education (Creswell, 2003). Because the purpose of this study was to explore the laws and regulations for accommodating students with disabilities in higher education, document analyses, surveys, and interviews were conducted to address the various research questions using an appropriate mixed-methods approach.

Participants

Institutions

Seven public universities on the north border of Mexico were selected for participation in the study. These institutions were selected because of their

proximity to the United States and the resultant cross influence relationship. The administrator in charge of inclusion efforts was interviewed regarding the institutional plan and ongoing efforts to provide services.

<u>Faculty</u>

Faculties of psychology at state universities were surveyed regarding their own involvement in inclusion efforts and their perceptions of commitment to inclusion by their respective institutions. Representatives from this group participate in the National Psychologists Association. This group piloted the survey and participated in the final version of the survey.

Procedures

<u>Document Analysis</u>

Two sets of documents were analyzed. First, the legislative authority for services for students with disabilities for both Mexico and the United States were analyzed for similarities and differences. This comparison will provide opportunities for recommendations for the expansion of Mexican legislation ensuring the rights of students with disabilities to be guaranteed services similar to those provided in the United States. Second, the implementation plan for each of the seven Mexican state universities included in the study were analyzed relative to the extent to which the requirements of Mexican law have been considered and included.

This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino. See Appendix A for the consent format approved by the IRB.

Faculty Survey (Appendix B)

Faculties of psychology have primary responsibility for the management and provision of services for students with disabilities. These groups were surveyed regarding current practices at their various universities and their perceptions of needs to realize full implementation. A pilot survey was conducted to revise and refine the final survey instrument.

Administrator Interview (Appendix C)

An administrator charged with program oversight were surveyed using the same instrument used for the psychology faculty. A structured interview was conducted with an administrator, which was informed by the results of the survey. This interview collected information on the current state of implementation and future plans and initiatives. The extent to which the implementation plan has fidelity with the legislative authority was analyzed.

Measures

The survey used in this study was developed specific to the stated research questions regarding attitudes toward inclusion and perceptions regarding institutional implementation. Because the group surveyed is a well-defined population this was an effective method of data collection (Visser, Krosnick & Lavrakas, 2000). Items specific to these data collection included: (1)

personal and institutional commitment to inclusion, (2) services in place to accommodate students with disabilities, and (3) obstacles to the implementation of a full inclusion model.

The structured interview was based on survey results and explored specific interpretations and implementations of an institutional plan for inclusion at the seven sample universities. Administrators were asked to reflect on the level of plan implementation and future efforts to ensure compliance with federal legislation.

Data Analysis

A variety of methods were employed to report and analyze data. Document analyses were reported in comparison matrices and narrative description. Similarly, results of administrator interviews were tabulated and compared to the written implementation plan.

Survey results were analyzed using non-parametric statistical tests because assumptions were made about the population distribution of the participants and the sample size. Responses were recorded and analyzed using Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

Limitations

Certain limitations are imposed upon this study regarding instrumentation, sampling, and controls.

1. The measurement of attitudes regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities is limited to a single measure produced by the survey constructed specific to this study.

2. The sample limits the generalization of findings to those universities on the Mexico-United States border.

3. This research is also limited to the degree that respondents understand the purpose of the survey questions and report their perceptions honestly.

4. The study is further limited by the fact that respondents were voluntary, which might result in a biased, self-selected internal sample.

CHAPTER FOUR:

RESULTS

This study focused on various factors that impact the inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education. The official statements regarding inclusion efforts were reported for the public universities on the northern border of Mexico. Surveys were conducted of administrators charged with policy implementation and faculty given responsibility for service provision. Research questions were addressed that considered the extent to which policy reflected federal legislation and what obstacles to inclusion were perceived by participants.

Official Statements of Inclusion Policy

It was clear from the review of the literature that there were no federal-level regulations that govern the services and accommodations provided to students with disabilities. Though the mandate to serve these students has been established, there are no rules issued to guide the implementation of federal law. This is in stark contrast to the approach used in the U.S. where regulations are imposed that are specific to the expected conditions for inclusion. Official policy statements were available for review from seven universities at the north Mexican border states. The services available at the participating universities have been compared with the requirements of the federal law. Each university was profiled and its institutional plan reviewed. It is important to note that these

plans are required to meet the quality indicators established by the Secretary of

Public Education as a contingency to receive federal funding. See Table 1.

Table 1. Sample demographics.

University	Enrollment		Programs		Faculty	Campus	Inclusion
	UNG	GRA	UNG	GRA			
One	63,728	1,800	63	63	1,322	7	Gender
Two	25,423	1,631	53	67	2,967	11	Indigenous people, Gender, Disabilities
Three	29,790	1,023	83	50	2,523	1	Gender
Four	24,119	1,879	87	55	3,162	4	N/A
Five	123,444	1,400	79	198	3,315	7	Gender
Six	32,969	1,723	96	89	2,300	8	N/A
Seven	25,904	1,108	7	77	2,501	6	Gender

Source: University website transparency access: Institutional Development Plans
and Annual Reports.

Figure 1. Source: INEGI (2016 a). Marco Geoestadístico.

University One

The University One Institutional Development Plan 2019-2023, represents the initial planning necessary to provide an inclusive environment at the university. This proposal would include students, faculty, and staff. The university one plan includes three overarching concepts: autonomy and governance, university social responsibility, and equity.

Policies to achieve the university mission are described in twelve points: 1) quality and relevance of educational offerings, 2) formative process oriented to students, 3) research, technological development, and innovation, 4) extension and collaboration with community partnerships and stakeholders, 5)

64

internationalization by establishing networks beyond borders, 6) faculty development, providing professional development resources, and technology, 7) education and access to digital culture, 8) communication with the university community, students, faculty and staff, and developing the university identity, 9) infrastructure, equipment, and security at all campuses, 10) organization and administrative management, 11) promoting respect and care of the environment, and, 12) commitment to university governance that is transparent and accountable.

The main emphasis of this plan is related to topics on governance, autonomy, social responsibility, and equity. Though no mention is made of the lack of historical efforts in this regard, it is implicit in the effort both by intent and the identified need for action. This is an ambitious proposal and will require substantial resources, both human and fiscal.

The plan proposes to identify the target populations and plan services and accommodations to ensure their inclusion in the university community. Administrative structure to plan and provide oversight is also outlined. Governance structure reported is primarily administrative and the involvement of students, faculty, and staff is unclear.

The populations specifically targeted are individuals with disabilities, indigenous populations, those incarcerated, and those in a class labeled vulnerable (gender and low socioeconomic background). Specific eligibility criteria for each of these groups are general. Minimal data are provided to

support the proposal. Gender percentages for the total university population are provided, but no numbers for the other populations. Some increases in gender are reported but it is unclear that these are related to any specific efforts. There are good intentions without specific actual implementations, especially if financial resources are needed.

University Two

The University Two Development Plan 2016-2025, has targeted a period of nine years to reach the goal of being one of the top tier universities in the country. A human rights perspective is acknowledged as necessary to reach this status. The plan is developed around five objectives: 1) educational innovation and comprehensive university teaching, 2) generation, application, and transfer of knowledge with an impact on society, 3) inclusive and innovative holistic management and administration, 4) extension and community collaboration with social awareness, and, 5) training for life and identity. The three overarching concepts are humanistic values, a culture of transparency, and structural reform to enhance university participation.

This plan establishes the university's role in enhancing productivity and competitiveness in the region's development. No additional information of how this might be achieved is provided and no reference is made to serving the student population with disabilities. The plan mentions that there are procedures to identify students with mental health issues and disabilities, however no procedures are provided to understand how this process is implemented. Student

services related to the identification process are unclear and there are no data reporting inclusion procedures. The topic of inclusion is primarily used to address gender issues as a university value.

University Three

The University Three Institutional Plan of Development 2018-2024, includes five major principles: 1) faculty development, enhanced infrastructure, technology, and excellence in training students, 2) generation, application, and diffusion of knowledge by using scientific research in the functions of teaching, and community collaboration, 3) develop community collaboration by establishing partnerships with stakeholders, 4) commit to strengthening the creation and dissemination of the arts and culture as mechanisms of social cohesion, and sustainable development, as well as promoting sports for student health and, 5) establish governance that values innovation, sustainability, plurality, inclusion, equity, transparency, and financial accountability.

The plan uses the terms human rights, equity, and inclusion as part of its commitment to the service region. There is no specific mention of strategies to guarantee the inclusion of people with disabilities or how the faculty, staff, and students will provide these services and systems of support. General data about the status of students with disabilities status are presented but no indication is made of support systems that are in place. Gender is specifically included in the description of inclusion initiatives. No descriptions are included for training efforts, use of technology, or physical adaptations.

University Four

The University Four Institutional Development Plan, 2018-2021 is based on five principles: 1) quality education and relevance of the programs, access by students, professional development for faculty, and updating the infrastructure of the university technology, communication systems, and buildings, 2) comprehensive and humanistic training of students, including social responsibility, 3) faculty innovative professional development on national research standards and pedagogical knowledge, 4) community partnerships with stakeholders and internationalization of students and faculty, and 5) modernization of university legislation to achieve effective, efficient, and transparent management.

The plan objectives related to inclusion describe the university commitment to guaranteeing access and graduation, supporting inclusion of the disabled and vulnerable populations, with a goal to increase enrollment of these groups. In particular, the focus in on those who are vulnerable, defined as low income, indigenous, from rural areas, and first-generation students. There are no relevant measures to ensure those goals, and there are no clear policies and processes described in the plan. No descriptors or services are provided to support students with disabilities.

University Five

The University Five Institutional Development Plan 2018-2030 is based on the university mission of training competent professionals who are innovative and

socially responsible, conscious of the regional, national, and international context, with values consistent with scientific development. The plan includes five guiding principles: 1) being recognized nationally and internationally for its quality, inclusive, equitable, and comprehensive educational transformation in all programs, 2) development of science, humanities, and technology, by being recognized for the research and its impact on sustainable development of the country, 3) creation, diffusion of culture, and the promotion of sports for human and community development, 4) develop community partnership with stakeholders, to promote the economic and social development in the region and the country, and 5) maintain governance committed to transformation and social responsibility.

University Five has a clear plan for inclusion of students with disabilities. The plan includes the concepts of inclusion and equity, guaranteeing services to the diversity in its student population. The plan describes a general procedure to ensure access and completion for all students, especially those who are disadvantaged. The plan also commits to increasing opportunities for students with disabilities to ensure participation in all educational, cultural, and social activities. Technology specifications as support systems for students with disabilities were not described, and student services and antidiscrimination measures were not addressed in the plan. Diversity is a terminology used as a social, cultural, economic, and race descriptor of student characteristics with

disadvantaged status. No further information was provided on how to accomplish the university mission for the inclusion of students with disabilities.

University Six

The University Six Development Plan 2018-2021 outlines the commitment to an inclusive process to promote consistency across all institutional goals. The plan includes five major principles: 1) accountability and gender equality, 2) efficient management and administration to ensure equity for all, 3) offer relevant and quality educative programs, 4) faculty professional development through scientific research, technology development, and innovation, and 5) internationalization including intra and inter-institutional collaboration and the improvement of infrastructure and communication systems.

University Six recognizes the importance of inclusion of students with disabilities, and has made efforts to accomplish the infrastructure requirements described as part of this plan, however clear procedures to identify students and provide support systems are not reported. University Six is the only university in the sample population that provides the basis of developing an infrastructure master plan to include students with disabilities. There are no clear plans, actions, or strategies to provide more than infrastructure adaptations for students with disabilities.

University Seven

The University Seven Institutional Development Plan 2017-2021 specifically addresses students with disabilities as a target population to receive

services and guarantee the same access and opportunities as other students. They indicated the need for a specialized system of support for students with disabilities. University Seven has developed a Center as part of their strategies to serve students with disabilities, and they provide remedies to decrease the exclusion practices on the university campus. However, no specific procedures or long-term objectives to guarantee the permanence of the Center's program, or other efforts that may be implemented, have been described. Inclusion and equity are terms used to describe the student's gender, low income, and disabilities characteristics.

Table 2. General Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities and
Institutional Development Plan review.

Promote, protect and ensure the full exercise of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons with disabilities.	University One, University Three, University Four, University Five, University Seven
Ensure full inclusion to society in a framework of respect, equality and equalization of opportunities.	University One, University Three, University Five, University Six, University Seven
There are relevant measures to ensure access for people with disabilities, on equal terms with others, to the physical environment, transportation, information and communications.	University One, University Five, University Six
There are necessary and appropriate modifications and adaptations that do not impose a disproportionate or undue burden to guarantee all human rights.	University One, University Three, University Five, University Six, University Seven
There is a set of actions aimed at modifying and improving social circumstances that impede the integral development of the individual.	University Five, University Six, University Seven
There are technological and material devices that enable, rehabilitate or compensate one or more functional, motor, sensory or intellectual limitations of persons with disabilities.	N/A
There are procedures to identify any distinction, exclusion or restriction due to disability.	University One, University Two, University Four, University Seven
Product designs, environments, programs and services that all people can use are planned, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.	University One, University Four, University Five, University Seven
There are anti-discrimination measures such as the prohibition of behaviors that have as an objective or consequence an attempt against the dignity of a person, to create an intimidating or hostile environment, due to the disability he or she possesses.	University One, University Four
They have implemented action measures to promote the right to equal opportunities for people with disabilities.	All Universities
The institution observes the principles of equity, social justice, equal opportunities, respect for the evolution of the faculties of students with disabilities and the preservation of their identity, as well as respect for their dignity and autonomy.	University One, University Seven

Source: Summary of the documents review from the web page of each Public Universities from
the north border of Mexico regarding inclusion.

Summary Analysis

The Institutional Development Plans for the sample population universities outline a basic commitment to inclusion, equity, equality, and quality of higher education to students with disabilities. Less apparent are those strategies or specific procedures that would accomplish this inclusion. Table 3 summarizes how each university addresses these inclusion standards.

When analyzing the development plans, there were clear indicators that human rights was part of their institutional plan. Human rights are part of the institutional social responsibility, equity, and inclusion statements.

Regarding full inclusion in society using a framework of respect, equality, and equalization of opportunities, five out of the seven universities mentioned in their plans a general statement to ensure inclusion, however there are no clear strategies or actions to accomplish this. There are general statements related to the framework of respect, equality, and social responsibility but none that targeted students with disabilities.

As for relevant measures to ensure access for people with disabilities, on equal terms with others, to the physical environment, transportation, information and communications, only three universities mention student services and infrastructure development to provide support to students with disabilities.

Relevant data to enhance the necessary and appropriate modifications and adaptations that do not impose a disproportionate or undue burden that would guarantee all human rights were not found in this analysis. Three out of

seven universities indicated in their plan the goal to guarantee and adapt administrative procedures to include students with disabilities.

Evidence on actions intended to modify and improve social circumstances that impede the integral development of the individual were not found in the development plans reviewed. Only three universities describe what it means to be inclusive and equitable, and identify the importance of the university commitment to reinforce those practices.

None of the universities in this study mention in their development plan if there are technological and material devices that enable, rehabilitate, or compensate one or more functional, motor, sensory, or intellectual limitations of persons with disabilities as part of the general practice to serve students with disabilities.

As for the evidence of procedures to identify any distinction, exclusion, or restriction due to disability in the student population, there was a desire reported to develop the practices that favor proper identification of needs and support systems to serve students with disabilities. An effort by University Two regarding health services to identify student needs is the only specific action reported.

Practices or planning procedures that evidence the product design, environment, programs, and services that all students can use at the university level are not clear, universal design for learning is not addressed clearly, and only one university, uses the concept of universal design as part of the development plan strategies to provide support to students with disabilities.

Three other universities mentioned the need to increase adaptation of infrastructure for the inclusion of students with disabilities.

Anti-discrimination measures such as the prohibition of behaviors that have the objective or consequence against the dignity of a person, to create an intimidating or hostile environment, due to the disability he or she possesses, only one university has in the development plan the strategy to promote respect and recognition of diversity and differences in all expressions and areas of the university life.

Three universities have addressed the implementation of measures to promote the right to equal opportunities for students with disabilities. Program completion is assured and other services have been identified such as a specific service center in one university.

Policies and practices to include students with disabilities in the universities on the northern border of Mexico have a long way to go to become a reality. Inclusion of the groups identified as vulnerable is presented as more of a policy issue where nondiscrimination becomes an institutional commitment. What is clear are good intentions with a lack of any specific plans for implementation. Nondiscrimination is a mandate and the understanding and acceptance of that fact is critical. Inclusion of those with disabilities is an effort of a much higher order. Accommodating this group will require substantial changes in how services are provided. Access is not only attitudinal, but requires a vast array of

services and supports. It is recommended that this group be targeted and planned for separately.

As for the Institutional Development Plans reviewed in this part of the study, the general conclusion is related to the lack of policies to guarantee inclusion, and though there are some practices that may serve some students with disabilities, they appear to be provided on demand and not as part of the university commitment to educate all Mexicans consistent with the Constitutional prohibition of discrimination and exclusion practices.

Administrator Survey

An administrator of services for students with disabilities from four states responded to the survey. University One has two major campuses with different administrators, which resulted in recording separate responses. This represents a student population of 257,377. These personnel are central office located and staff rather than line administrators. They have no direct supervisory responsibility and any services or accommodations would need to be arranged through college directors (deans).

Administrator Demographics

The administrators in the sample were two males, two females, and one reporting both genders. They reported more than five years of administrative experience in their respective institutions and the majority held doctoral degrees.

Regarding whether or not their institution met the legal standard of protecting and promoting the rights of students with disabilities, the response was consistently affirmative across all universities. Only two reported that their institution was able to ensure this equity in access to programs and services and were able to meet that goal. Three reported that there were measures available to them to accomplish the goal of inclusion with regard to access and information available in their institutions.

The Law for the Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Mexico requires service to people with disabilities and to promote, protect, and ensure the full exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons with disabilities and to ensure full inclusion to society in a framework of respect, equality, and equalization of opportunities. As it has been reported there are a lack of strategies to ensure this access to university programs, so providing access to technology support at the university sites, ensuring anti-discrimination measures, and the observance of equity and social justice in the universities are still a goal that is yet to be achieve. Implementing actions and measures to promote the right to equal opportunities for people with disabilities have been difficult to determine and whether or not efforts to reach this goal are not readily apparent. This is complicated by the fact that these institutions are autonomous and have full authority to choose to what extent inclusion is a

priority and how many institutional resources will be allocated to that effort. None of the institutions reported that an action plan was in place.

Three reported that their institution has a system of support for the inclusion of students with disabilities ranking their effort 4 on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was the lowest and 5 the highest rating. This ranking suggested an overall positive perspective regarding inclusion of students. See Table 3.

Table 3. Administrator report of legal implementation.

	University One	University One	University Three	University Five	University Six
Promote Rights	X	X	X	X	X
Measures for access	X	X	X	X	X
Appropriate modifications				X	X
Action plan					
Technology access	X	X		X	
Exclusion identification	X			X	X
Universal design			X	X	X
Anti-discrimination measures		X	X		X
Measures to promote rights	X			X	X
Observe principles of equity		X	X		X

Administrators reported which part of the General Law of Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities had been used to provide services in their respective institution. As seen in Table 3, all universities had promoted the right to have education and have taken measures to ensure the access for students with disabilities. As for access to technology, identify situations of exclusion, observe principles of equity, anti-discrimination and rights measures, and knowing about universal design for learning, some of them had some action in place. Regarding any action plan to serve and provide services to students with disabilities, there were none reported.

Table 4. Administrative responses on support services as diagnostic, physical and technology access, psychological support, curriculum modifications and specialized professionals.

Support Services	University One	University One	University Three	University Five	University Six
Diagnostic		X		X	X
Installations access/Free of barriers	X	X	X	X	X
Psychology Support			X	X	X
Curriculum modifications	X				X
Technology access	X	X			
Specialized professionals	X				

Support services reported in Table 4 included diagnosis, access free of barriers, psychological support, curriculum adaptations, technology, and specialized professionals. Four universities reported barrier free access with the installation of elevators and ramps at all facilities. Three universities reported diagnosis services for students, psychology support, and curriculum modifications to accommodate student needs. One university reported translators of Mexican Sign Language to deaf students as well some specialized services for students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).

Table 5. Disabilities to which universities provide services reported by administrators.

	University One	University One	University Three	University Five	University Six
Mental Iliness		X	X	X	X
Intellectual Disability	X			X	X
Autism Spectrum Disorder	X	X			X
Learning Disability	X		X	X	X
Attention Deficit Disorder	X				X
Sensory Disorders	X	X			X
Physical Disabilities	X			X	X

Responses by administrators, as seen in Table 5, indicates that all universities reported provide services to students with learning disabilities with a specific department providing support to students including organizational skills,

study techniques, after school classes, and study groups. Three universities provide services to students with physical and mobility disabilities as well to students with mild intellectual disabilities. Sensory disabilities (visual and hearing) are provided support services by two universities. Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and ASD support services are reported to be provided by two universities. This is an inconsistent pattern and suggests that a uniform diagnostic criterion is not in place.

Table 6. Support services to serve students with disabilities reported by administrators.

	University One	University One	University Three	University Five	University Six
Diagnostic		X		X	X
Physical access/Barrier free	X	X	X	X	X
Psychological support			X	X	X
Curriculum modifications	X				X
Technology access	X	X			
Specialized personnel	X				

Four of the seven public autonomous universities have reported support services to students with disabilities regarding free access and free barrier installations, by having elevators, and ramps at all facilities. Three of the four universities reported providing diagnosis services to students, psychology support, and curriculum modifications to adjust to the students' needs. Only one

university reported having specialized professionals in the area of inclusion of students with disabilities. See Table 6.

The survey also explored the extent to which administrators would be interested in training or professional development. The common response was a need for more information on Autism Spectrum Disorder specifically and inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education generally. The interest in these training opportunities was uniform across respondents.

Administrator Interview

An administrator was interviewed and provided clarification for administrator survey responses. High commitment to the principles of inclusion was reported. All federal guidelines were respected in the development of their plan. Specific procedures to accomplish this plan were less specific and, in some cases, appeared to be minimal. Lack of funding was identified as the major obstacle to implement accommodation necessary for the inclusion of students with disabilities. Training was also identified as a need for all personnel involved in the process.

Faculty Survey

It has been noted that psychology faculty have been given primary responsibility for designing accommodations for students with disabilities. Students are assigned to faculty as part of their workload on a case-by-case basis. These faculty members reported various levels of training and experience to perform this function.

Of the 26 respondents, eight were male and 18 were female. This ratio is typical of faculty composition. Training levels reported were 13 with master's degrees and 13 with doctorate degrees. This reflects that national initiative for university faculty to be trained at the doctoral level. The sample was a veteran group with 21 respondents reporting more than 10 years of experience. Ten states were represented in the sample including, Baja California, Jalisco, Coahuila, Sonora, Ciudad de México, Yucatan, Nayarit, Nuevo Leon, Queretaro, and Puebla.

Questions

Questions were framed as level of agreement to statements regarding inclusion on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high). To the statement, equitable access to services and resources is a fundamental right for people with disabilities, 21 rated their commitment 5, three at the 4 rating and one at the 3 rating. To the statement, persons with disabilities, including severe disabilities, have the right to receive higher education, a rating of 5 was reported 19 respondents, four at 4, two at three and one at 1. Asked to rate their own personal commitment to inclusion, 20 rated their commitment at 5, five at 4 and one at 3.

To the statement of commitment their institution to the inclusion of students with disabilities, four rated 5, 12 rated 4, eight rated 3, and two rated 2. Regarding the level of support for students with disabilities, one rated 5, 11 rated 4, 11 rated 3, and three rated 2.

Table 7. Type of services provided by universities to students with disabilities reported by professors.

Support Service	Frequency
Diagnostic	9
Physical access/Barrier free	20
Psychological support	15
Curriculum modified	8
Specialized Technology	6
Specialized staff	4
Other, e.g., independent living	1

Most professors reported that their universities provided support services provided to students with disabilities for physical access and barrier free spaces on campus. Psychological support was another support service reported by professors. Responses on diagnostic, curriculum modifications, and specialized technology were less frequently mentioned as support service. Specialized staff was the least frequent support system identified by professors as part of the support services provided by their universities to serve students with disabilities. One professor mentioned that in his university there are programs to support the development of independent living skills of students with disabilities.

Table 8. Disabilities identified by the universities as recipients of services reported by professors.

Disability	Frequency
Mental Health	7
Intellectual Disability	5
Autism Spectrum Disorder	11
Learning Disabilities	10
Attention Deficit Disorder	6
Sensory: Visual and Hearing	9
Physical/Motor Disabilities	1

Most professors reported that students with Autism Spectrum Disorder and learning disabilities as the most commonly identified disabilities by their universities. Psychological support was another support service reported by professors. After those, hearing impairments, mental health issues and attention deficit disorder were mentioned. The least frequently reported disabilities were intellectual disability and physical or motor disabilities.

Pearson Correlation Results

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to test statistical significance between the administrators of student services and faculty regarding their rating on institutional commitment to inclusion.

Table 9. Relationship between administrators and faculty ratings in institutional commitment to inclusion of students with disabilities at their universities.

		Inst. Commitment	Inst. Commitment
Inst. Commitment Administrator	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.408
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.495
	N	5	5
Inst. Commitment Faculty	Pearson Correlation	-0.408	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.495	
	N	5	26

The results are displayed in Table 9 and showed a negative correlation between the two variables, r= -0.408, n= 5, *p*= -0.495. Administrators and faculty disagreed on their rating, which might reflect the difference between policy and implementation.

Table 10. Relation between equitable access and the right to receive access to higher education for students with disabilities.

		Equitable access	Right to HE
Equitable access	Pearson Correlation	1	0.288
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.154
	N	26	26
Right to HE	Pearson Correlation	0.288	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.154	
	N	26	26

Analysis of faculty responses for the question of the right to access to higher education compared to administrators to provide equitable access are displayed in Table 10. There was a positive correlation between the two variables, r= 0.288, n= 26, *p*= 0.154, which is a weak positive correlation.

Table 11. Relationship between the institutional commitment and the institutional support system to include students with disabilities in the higher education system.

		Inst. Commitment	Inst. Support
Inst. Commitment	Pearson Correlation	1	0.767**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000
	N	26	26
Inst. Support	Pearson Correlation	0.767**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	
	N	26	26

**. Correlation is significant at the level 0.01 (bilateral).

The relationship between institutional commitment and institutional support for students with disabilities are displayed in Table 11. There was a positive correlation between the two variables, r= 0.767, n= 26, *p*= 0.000, which is a strong, positive correlation.

Table 12. Relationship between the right to receive access to higher education and personal commitment to inclusion.

		Right to HE	Personal commitment
Right to HE	Pearson Correlation	1	0.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.64
	N	26	26
Personal commitment	Pearson Correlation	0.096	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.64	
	N	26	26

The relationship between the right to receive access to higher education and personal commitment to inclusion is shown in Table 12. There was a positive correlation, r= 0.64, n=26, and *p*= 0.96, which is a strong, positive correlation.

<u>Responses to Open-ended Questions</u>

In addition to ranked responses to survey questions, respondents were given the opportunity to respond to open-ended questions. Themes from these responses have been identified and summarized.

Q1. Have you taken a course on disability or inclusion? Please describe your training.

Fifteen of the respondents indicated that they had received some training on the issues of inclusion. These ranged from short workshops to graduate coursework. There was no consistency in these experiences and most were focused on issues of policy rather than procedures necessary for implementation.

Seventeen of the respondents (65%) indicated that they did not have training specific to inclusion. Even though institutions have been mandated to provide such training, the training was considered too general to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to support the inclusion of students with disabilities.

Q2. How much has your institution done for students with disabilities relative to the official commitment?

Most respondents indicated that support systems were initiated once a student begins to struggle with their course work. None reported any efforts to support transition of students from high school or any efforts to recruit students with disabilities. Most efforts were perceived as ones that focused on architectural barriers.

Q3. How would you rate the system of support for the inclusion of students with disabilities in your institution?

Respondents rated institutional efforts in the 3-4 range. Questions were raised regarding the ethical issue of disclosure of a disability and the process of accessing services. The availability of the range of services to support inclusion was not apparent.

Q4. Do you think that the lack of support services in higher education affects the participation of students with disabilities?

The perception that students with disabilities should be included in higher education was clear. The concern that these students do not see a place for

themselves in the university was also articulated. The lack of financial resources

was noted, as was the low-level of preparation from the public schools. Inclusion

of these students was perceived as an important part of Mexican society and

their commitment to the underserved.

CHAPTER FIVE:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is now a near universal commitment to provide equal access for all

citizens to the benefits and services of our society. Universities, because of their

fundamental mission of education, are expected to play a leadership role in these

efforts. To accomplish this goal, it will be necessary to identify those groups of

people who have been historically underrepresented, systematically excluded, or

the focus of various forms of discrimination.

Typically, the conversation about inclusion has elements of the concept of

fairness. Is it fair to provide extra services and supports to various groups?

Fairness in this context exceeds equality, where everyone receives the same,

and focuses on need, where each is provided for according to their needs. This is

the cornerstone of efforts to avoid discrimination based on individual

characteristics.

So how might we measure our efforts on behalf of students with

disabilities? What percentage of high school graduates with disabilities transition

to postsecondary opportunities? How many are admitted to college or university?

Are all of the programs available to nondisabled students also available to

students with disabilities? What efforts are made to ensure accessibility and

inclusion? Do we measure compliance with the law as our major indicator of

success? These are surface measures and indicate effort without considering

outcomes. The better questions might be, do we actively recruit students with disabilities for programs designed specific to their needs? Are students with disabilities genuinely included as important and contributing members of the community or are they just accepted and tolerated? And perhaps the most important measure, how many students with disabilities graduate from their program and are successfully placed in careers? Have we provided the full measure of opportunity for these students and have we done our part in ensuring their quality of life? These questions have guided this research project.

<p style="text-align:center">Conclusions</p>

The analysis of the data provided the opportunity for some conclusions on the plan for inclusion developed by the sample universities as well as the perceptions of both administrators and faculty regarding the implementation of these plans. These conclusions are the basis for recommendations to improve the higher education experience for students with disabilities.

<u>Comparisons of Mexico and the United States</u>

The legislative process in Mexico differs significantly from that in the United States. Once laws are passed in the United States, regulatory language is developed to guide the implementation of the law. Specific provisions are provided to ensure that the intent of Congress is preserved. There is no similar process in Mexico, which assigns the interpretation and implementation of laws delegated to state governmental offices and individual universities. It might be said that the federal government tells you what needs to be done and it is up to

you to figure out how to do it, sometimes with extraordinary funds, and most of the time just with the policy enforcement.

Is there a clear definition of who qualifies as disabled? Who makes this diagnosis? What service criteria have been identified? Who is qualified to provide these services? Documents available for analysis demonstrated that a comprehensive plan to implement the federal law regarding the inclusion of students with disabilities is minimal.

It is a uniform practice in the United States for universities to have a designated office to provide services for students with disabilities. Mexico relies on a case-by-case configuration of services and it is difficult to identify who is in charge of providing services and support. Many universities in the U.S. actively recruit students with disabilities, not so in Mexico. This comparison suggests that Mexico is reactive whereas the United States is more proactive.

Issues of training are comparable between universities in Mexico and the U.S. though personnel in the specific office that serves students with disabilities are trained, the same is not true for faculty. This is a significant obstacle to inclusion efforts. In Mexico, members of the psychology faculty have been given primary responsibility for working with students with disabilities. Training for this specific responsibility is not apparent in this group. Training as a psychologist is general and qualifications for specific areas of practice have not been formed. This has resulted in an ad hoc preparation for the task of arranging and

managing accommodations necessary for the participation of students with disabilities.

The training of psychologists in Mexico results in a license for unrestricted practice in both public and private settings. Specializations are by inclination and those who work with the disabled do so by choice. There is no specific training available to specialize in treatment of individuals with disabilities.

University Plan Conclusions

The plans reviewed appear to represent the initial planning necessary to provide an inclusive environment at the university. Most proposals would also include students, faculty, and staff. Though no mention is made of the lack of historical efforts in this regard, it is implicit in the plan both by intent and the identified need for action. These proposals are ambitious and will require substantial resources, both human and fiscal.

Plans to identify the target populations and planned services and accommodations to ensure their inclusion in the university community are outlined. Administrative structure to plan and provide oversight is also outlined. Governance structure reported is primarily administrative and the involvement of students, faculty and staff is unclear.

The populations specifically targeted are individuals with disabilities, indigenous populations, those incarcerated, and those in a class labeled vulnerable. Specific eligibility criteria for each of these groups are general. Minimal data are provided to support the proposal. Gender percentages for the

total university population are provided, but no numbers for the other populations. Some increases in gender are reported but it is unclear that these are related to any specific efforts. Gender disparities appear to be a higher priority than disability in most university plans.

Financial support, staff and faculty training, and other resources, are not specifically addressed in the plans.

Institutional Recommendations

1. A clear definition of the target groups is necessary to identify and develop appropriate services. For example, disability is identified as intellectual and mental disabilities, multiple disabilities, sensory and communications disabilities, and disability caused by motor vehicles. These categories are too broad to generate the necessary accommodations. It is recommended that the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF, 2019) developed by the World Health Organization, which includes health disorders and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 5th (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), that focuses on mental disorders, be used to generate the necessary parameters for the target group.

The groups described as vulnerable is particularly problematic. In the United States these categories usually include a policy of nondiscrimination because of age, disability (physical and mental), gender (or sex), gender Identity (including transgender), gender expression, genetic information, marital status, medical condition, nationality, race or ethnicity (including color or ancestry),

religion (or religious creed) and sexual orientation. Many who might fit this group would not readily identify with the classification and underreport.

The plans also include those who are economically deprived which will generate an entirely different set of services.

2. Data specific to the target groups will be an important part of the planning process. One of the benchmarks that can be used is the comparison between the university population and the state or even national populations. If the state population is 50% female and 50% male, how does that compare to the university student, faculty, and staff populations? Mexico, by some estimates, has 7.5% of its population with disabilities (Global Disabilities Rights Now, 2020), so this number could be compared to the percentage representation at the universities. Similar data would need to be collected on all of the target groups. A substantial difference would be *prima facie* evidence of discrimination. A system to collect these data will need to include those currently part of the community and those from new students, faculty and staff, as a national standard policy/indicator for public education.

3. Is the plan to be affirmative or reactive? Do plans accommodate those who already attend or does it plan to actively recruit students, faculty, and staff who are members of the target groups? It is important that the plan be specific in this regard.

It is important that the planning groups at both the formative and action stages include faculty and staff, who will be responsible for implementation, and

students, who will be most affected. Permanent founds are as well as important in the planning.

4. Access is the overall objective. The commitment to serve all members of our community is the primary goal. Access begins with policy, but also includes physical access, which means a barrier free environment and access to services, instruction in particular. The plan mentions computer access but additional examination of the uses of technology need exploration. One solution that holds great promise is converting most class materials to online platforms to increase access unrelated to location or other limitations.

5. Federal, state, and institutional policies and regulations in inclusion must be considering in every development plan, as base of decision making to provide permanent resources and services for access, permanence and graduation of students with and without disabilities.

General Conclusion

Inclusion of the groups identified as vulnerable is more of a policy issue where nondiscrimination becomes an institutional commitment. Nondiscrimination is a mandate and understanding and acceptance is critical. Inclusion of those with disabilities is an effort of a much higher order. Accommodating this group will require substantial change is how services are provided. Access is not only attitudinal but requires a vast array of services and supports. It is recommended that this group be targeted and planned for separately.

Recommendations

Based on the common barriers that students with disabilities face in their pursuit of higher education, there are a number of recommendations that might be considered in efforts to improve the services to students with disabilities provided by colleges and universities.

1. It is a requirement of the public schools that students with disabilities receive services from highly qualified personnel. This same requirement is not evident in higher education. Some standard for personnel who serve students in higher education needs to be established.

2. The accommodations necessary for success in college have not been clearly identified and the need for research focused in this area is clear.

3. The identification of best practices for the inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education should be established as a high priority.

4. It is apparent that services provided by universities are separate from and not coordinated with the faculty. Faculty expertise in higher education, special education, psychology, counseling, and rehabilitation has not been used to address the issues of this student population.

5. Training for faculty is sporadic at best. Successful inclusion of students with disabilities will require a well-informed faculty who have the tools to accommodate the needs of these special learners. This will require a specific program of professional development.

Summary

The inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education is a moral

imperative. If a society is measured by how they treat their members with the

greatest needs, then providing equal access to all of the services and benefits of

the society is both right and just. In addition, the evidence is clear. Students with

disabilities flourish in higher education and the accommodations necessary for

their inclusion are a reasonable expectation. Anything less than this full access

and inclusion is discriminatory at best and inhumane at worst.

In Mexico's system of higher education, there is a need for leaders to

develop the issue of inclusion from the legal and policy point of view, so those

regulations can be supported by the appropriate implementation, with all the

necessary resources.

In a country where 57% of the student population drops-out of school

before entering the secondary level (OECD, 2019 b), attending higher education

becomes a difficult journey, regardless of whether or not those students have

disabilities.

A Final Consideration

Nihil de nobis, sine nobis, translated from Latin as nothing about us

without us, is the unofficial slogan of the worldwide community of individuals with

disabilities. Their clearly stated objection is to governments or institutions that

plan services without including their voices. Inclusion should mean not only

where we go but also how we get there. There was no mention in this research of

efforts at any level, institutional or individual, that included the participation of

students with disabilities. The importance of this consideration cannot be

overstated. It should not be expected that if inclusion effort, absent the

participation of those with disabilities, would be successful. This is an issue of

social justice and social responsibility.

APPENDIX A:

CONSENT FORMAT

ENGLISH AND SPANISH FOR

ADMINISTRATORS AND

FACULTY

Policies and Practices of Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Mexican Public Autonomous Universities
Administrators Informed Consent

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate policies and practices for inclusion of students with disabilities in public universities in Mexico. This study is being conducted by Lilia López Arriaga under the supervision of Dr. Stanley Swartz, Professor of Education in the College of Education, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

Purpose:
The purpose of this research study is to investigate the status of inclusion for students with disabilities at Mexican public autonomous universities.

Description:
This is an online survey via the Google Survey Forms website.

Participation:
Your participation in this project is voluntary. You can decide to not answer all or parts of the surveys and questionnaires associated with this study or the questions in the interview, even if you have signed this letter of consent. Your decision to not participate in this study's activities will have no penalty of any kind. We will ask other administrative in this position if they would like to voluntarily participate in the study activities for which you may decline. Only who agree to participate at those times will be included. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this electronic survey, you can withdraw at any time.

Duration:
The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential. The survey questions will be focused on attitudes and current practices for inclusion of students with disabilities at the university.

You will be asked to identify yourself by job status and the Mexican state in which you work only. There are no risks associated with participating in this research. It is understood that the Investigator will protect confidentiality by keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location data base, some interview records in writing notes will be taken. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only, which includes the dissertation, professional academic conferences, and CSUSB's Scholar Works system.

Risks and Benefits
- There are minimal risks associated with participating in this research. I understand that the Investigator will protect my confidentiality by keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location.
- All information will be identifier-redacted, and my confidentiality will be maintained. All data and consents will be securely stored for three years after completion of data collection and confidentially shredded or fully deleted.
- The possible benefit of this study to me is that my input may help add to the research regarding inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education. The findings will be available to me at the conclusion of the study and will provide new insights about the strategies for inclusion. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation.
- If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Stanley L. Swartz (advisor) at sswartz@csusb.edu.
- My participation in this research study is voluntary. I may decide to not participate in the study, and I can withdraw at any time. I can also decide not to answer particular questions if I so choose. I understand that I may refuse to participate or may withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences.
- No information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be so informed, and my consent re-obtained.
- I have read and understand the consent document and agree to participate in your study.

Clicking on all checkboxes indicates that you have read the informed consent form and the information in this document and that you voluntarily agree to participate.
If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may decline participation by not clicking on one or all checkboxes.
The survey will not open for responses unless you agree to participate.
Contact information for questions or additional information:
The principal investigator is Lilia Lopez-Arriaga, 002428152@coyote.csusb.edu
The faculty advisor for this project is Dr. Stanley L. Swartz, sswartz@csusb.edu.

CONFIRMATION STATEMENT:
I have read the information above and agree to participate in your study.

SIGNATURE:

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Politicas y Practicas de Inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad en las
Universidades Mexicanas
Consentimiento Informado para Funcionarios

El estudio en el que se le solicita participar está diseñado para investigar
políticas y prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en
universidades públicas de México. Este estudio está siendo realizado por Lilia
López Arriaga bajo la supervisión del Dr. Stanley Swartz, Profesor de Educación
en la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad Estatal de California, San
Bernardino. Este estudio ha sido aprobado por la Junta de Revisión Institucional,
California State University, San Bernardino.

Propósito del estudio:
El propósito de este estudio es investigar el estado de inclusión de estudiantes
con discapacidades en universidades autónomas públicas de México.
Esta es una encuesta en línea a través del sitio web de Formatos Google. Su
participación en este proyecto es voluntaria y confidencial. Puede decidir no
responder todas o algunas de las encuestas y cuestionarios asociados con este
estudio o a las preguntas de la entrevista, incluso si ha firmado esta carta de
consentimiento. Su decisión de no participar en las actividades de este estudio
no tendrá penalidad de ningún tipo. Le preguntaremos a otros funcionarios en
este puesto si les gustaría participar voluntariamente en las actividades del
estudio, las cuales usted puede rechazar. Solo los que acepten participar en
todos los componentes serán incluidos. Si decide participar en esta encuesta
electrónica, puede retirarse en cualquier momento de todas formas.

Encuesta:
Esta es una encuesta en línea, vía formatos Google website. Su participación en
esta encuesta es voluntaria y confidencial. Usted puede elegir no participar. Si
decide participar en esta encuesta electrónica, usted puede decidir salir en
cualquier momento.

La encuesta llevará 20 minutos aproximadamente para completarse. Sus
respuestas serán confidenciales. Las preguntas se enfocan en actitudes y
prácticas actuales de inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad.

Se le requiere identificarse solamente en relación a su puesto y el Estado
Mexicano al que pertenece su trabajo. No existen riesgos asociados con su
participación en esta investigación. Se entiende que el investigador protegerá la
confidencialidad protegiendo los códigos de investigación identificando códigos y
materiales de investigación en una base de datos de ubicación segura, se
tomarán algunos registros de entrevistas por escrito. Los resultados de este
estudio se utilizarán solo para fines académicos que incluyen el documento de

tesis, conferencias académicas profesionales y el sistema de trabajo académico de CSUSB, por lo pronto.

Riesgos y Beneficios

- Existen riesgos mínimos asociados con mi participación en esta investigación. Entiendo que el investigador protegerá mi confidencialidad al mantener los códigos de identificación y los materiales de investigación en un lugar seguro.

- Toda la información será redactada con identificadores y se mantendrá mi confidencialidad. Todos los datos y consentimientos se almacenarán de forma segura durante tres años después de la finalización de la recopilación de datos y se triturarán de forma confidencial o se eliminarán por completo.
- El posible beneficio que este estudio tendrá mí, es que mi aporte puede ayudar a agregar datos a la investigación sobre la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en la educación superior. Los resultados estarán disponibles para mí al final del estudio y proporcionarán nuevas ideas sobre las estrategias para la inclusión. Entiendo que no se me compensará por mi participación.
- Si tiene alguna pregunta o inquietud sobre la investigación, no dude en comunicarse con el Dr. Stanley L. Swartz (asesor) al correo sswartz@csusb.edu o con la mtra. Lilia López Arriaga investigadora principal al correo 002428152@coyote.csusb.edu
- Mi participación en este estudio de investigación es voluntaria. Puedo decidir no participar en el estudio y puedo retirarme en cualquier momento. También puedo decidir no responder preguntas particulares si así lo elijo. Entiendo que puedo negarme a participar o retirarme de este estudio en cualquier momento sin consecuencias negativas.
- No se divulgará ninguna información que me identifique sin mi consentimiento por separado y toda la información identificable estará protegida dentro de los límites permitidos por la ley. Si se va a cambiar el diseño del estudio o el uso de los datos, se me informará y se volverá a obtener mi consentimiento.

Al dar clic en todas las casillas indica que ha leído el formulario de consentimiento informado y la información en este documento, y que acepta voluntariamente participar.

Si no desea participar en esta encuesta electrónica, puede rechazar la participación no eligiendo una de las casillas o todas.

La encuesta no se abrirá para recibir respuestas a menos que acepte participar.
Contactar para mayor información a:
Investigador principal Lilia López Arriaga 002428152@uabc.edu.mx
Profesor director del proyecto Dr. Stanley L. Swartz sswartz@csusb.edu

Este estudio ha sido aprobado por la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad Estatal de California, San Bernardino

CONFIRMO QUE:

He leído la información que se me presenta y estoy de acuerdo en participar en su estudio.

Firma:

Firma: _____   Fecha: _____

Policies and Practices of Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Mexican Public
Autonomous Universities
Faculty Informed Consent

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate
policies and practices for inclusion of students with disabilities in public
universities in Mexico. This study is being conducted by Lilia López Arriaga under
the supervision of Dr. Stanley Swartz, Professor of Education at College of
Education, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been
approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San
Bernardino.

Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of this research study is to investigate the status of inclusion for
students with disabilities at Mexican public autonomous universities.
This is an online survey via the Google Survey Forms website. Your participation
in this project is voluntary. You can decide to not answer all or parts of the
surveys associated with this study, even if you have signed this letter of consent.
Your decision to not participate in this study's activities will have no penalty of
any kind. We will ask other Faculty if they would like to voluntarily participate in
the study activities for which you may decline. Only who agree to participate at
those times will be included. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. If you
decide to participate in this electronic survey, you can withdraw at any time.

Survey
The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will
be confidential. The survey questions will be focused on attitudes and current
practices for inclusion of students with disabilities at the university.

 You will be asked to identify yourself by job status and the Mexican state in
which you work only. There are no risks associated with participating in this
research. It is understood that the Investigator will protect confidentiality by
keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location data
base. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only that
includes the dissertation paper, professional academic conferences, and
CSUSB's scholar works system, at the moment.

Risks and Benefits
- There are minimal risks associated with participating in this research. I
understand that the Investigator will protect my confidentiality by keeping
the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location.
- All information will be identifier-redacted, and my confidentiality will be
maintained. All data and consents will be securely stored for three years

after completion of data collection and confidentially shredded or fully deleted.

- The possible benefit of this study to me is that my input may help add to the research regarding inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education.
- The findings will be available to me at the conclusion of the study and will provide new insights about the strategies for inclusion. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation.
- If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Stanley L. Swartz (advisor) at sswartz@csusb.edu.
- My participation in this research study is voluntary. I may decide to not participate in the study, and I can withdraw at any time. I can also decide not to answer particular questions if I so choose. I understand that I may refuse to participate or may withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences.
- No information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be so informed, and my consent re-obtained.
- I have read and understand the consent document and agree to participate in your study.

Clicking on all checkbox indicates that you have read the informed consent form and the information in this document and that you voluntarily agree to participate.

If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may decline participation by not clicking on one or all checkboxes.

The survey will not open for responses unless you agree to participate.

Contact information for questions or additional information:
The principal investigator is Lilia Lopez-Arriaga, 002428152@coyote.csusb.edu
The faculty advisor for this project is Dr. Stanley L. Swartz, sswartz@csusb.edu.

Politicas y Practicas de Inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad en las
Universidades Mexicanas
Consentimiento Informado para Profesores

El estudio en el que se le solicita participar está diseñado para investigar
políticas y prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en
universidades públicas de México. Este estudio está siendo realizado por Lilia
López Arriaga bajo la supervisión del Dr. Stanley Swartz, Profesor de Educación
en la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad Estatal de California, San
Bernardino. Este estudio ha sido aprobado por la Junta de Revisión Institucional,
California State University, San Bernardino.

Propósito del estudio:
El propósito de este estudio es investigar el estado de inclusión de estudiantes
con discapacidades en universidades autónomas públicas de México.
Esta es una encuesta en línea a través del sitio web de Formatos Google. Su
participación en este proyecto es voluntaria y confidencial. Puede decidir no
responder al cuestionario asociado con este estudio o algunas de las preguntas,
incluso si ha firmado esta carta de consentimiento. Su decisión de no participar
en las actividades de este estudio no tendrá penalidad de ningún tipo. Le
preguntaremos a otros profesores en este puesto si les gustaría participar
voluntariamente en las actividades del estudio, las cuales usted puede rechazar.
Solo los que acepten participar en todos los componentes serán incluidos. Si
decide participar en esta encuesta electrónica, puede retirarse en cualquier
momento de todas formas.

Encuesta:
Esta es una encuesta en línea, vía formatos Google website. Su participación en
esta encuesta es voluntaria y confidencial. Usted puede elegir no participar. Si
decide participar en esta encuesta electrónica, usted puede decidir salir en
cualquier momento.

La encuesta llevará 20 minutos aproximadamente para completarse. Sus
respuestas serán confidenciales. Las preguntas se enfocan en actitudes y
prácticas actuales de inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad.

Se le requiere identificarse solamente en relación a su puesto y el Estado
Mexicano al que pertenece su trabajo. No existen riesgos asociados con su
participación en esta investigación. Se entiende que el investigador protegerá la
confidencialidad protegiendo los códigos de investigación identificando códigos y
materiales de investigación en una base de datos de ubicación segura. Los
resultados de este estudio se utilizarán solo para fines académicos que incluyen
el documento de tesis, conferencias académicas profesionales y el sistema de
trabajo académico de CSUSB, por lo pronto.

Riesgos y Beneficios

- Existen riesgos mínimos asociados con mi participación en esta investigación. Entiendo que el investigador protegerá mi confidencialidad al mantener los códigos de identificación y los materiales de investigación en un lugar seguro.

- Toda la información será redactada con identificadores y se mantendrá mi confidencialidad. Todos los datos y consentimientos se almacenarán de forma segura durante tres años después de la finalización de la recopilación de datos y se triturarán de forma confidencial o se eliminarán por completo.

- El posible beneficio que este estudio tendrá mí, es que mi aporte puede ayudar a agregar datos a la investigación sobre la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en la educación superior. Los resultados estarán disponibles para mí al final del estudio y proporcionarán nuevas ideas sobre las estrategias para la inclusión. Entiendo que no se me compensará por mi participación.

- Si tiene alguna pregunta o inquietud sobre la investigación, no dude en comunicarse con el Dr. Stanley L. Swartz (asesor) al correo sswartz@csusb.edu o con la mtra. Lilia López Arriaga investigadora principal al correo 002428152@coyote.csusb.edu

- Mi participación en este estudio de investigación es voluntaria. Puedo decidir no participar en el estudio y puedo retirarme en cualquier momento. También puedo decidir no responder preguntas particulares si así lo elijo. Entiendo que puedo negarme a participar o retirarme de este estudio en cualquier momento sin consecuencias negativas.

- No se divulgará ninguna información que me identifique sin mi consentimiento por separado y toda la información identificable estará protegida dentro de los límites permitidos por la ley. Si se va a cambiar el diseño del estudio o el uso de los datos, se me informará y se volverá a obtener mi consentimiento.

Al dar clic en todas las casillas indica que he leído el formulario de consentimiento informado y la información en este documento, y que acepto voluntariamente participar.

Si no desea participar en esta encuesta electrónica, puede rechazar la participación no eligiendo una de las casillas o todas.

La encuesta no se abrirá para recibir respuestas a menos que acepte participar.

Contactar para mayor información a:
Investigador principal Lilia López Arriaga 002428152@uabc.edu.mx
Profesor director del proyecto Dr. Stanley L. Swartz sswartz@csusb.edu

APPENDIX B:

FACULTY SURVEY GOOGLE FORMAT

Policies and Practices of Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Mexican Public Autonomous Universities
Faculty Online Survey

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate policies and practices for inclusion of students with disabilities in public universities in Mexico. This study is being conducted by Lilia López Arriaga under the supervision of Dr. Stanley Swartz, Professor of Education at College of Education, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the status of inclusion for students with disabilities at Mexican public autonomous universities.
This is an online survey via the Google Survey Forms website. Your participation in this project is voluntary. You can decide to not answer all or parts of the surveys associated with this study, even if you have signed this letter of consent. Your decision to not participate in this study's activities will have no penalty of any kind. We will ask other Faculty if they would like to voluntarily participate in the study activities for which you may decline. Only who agree to participate at those times will be included. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this electronic survey, you can withdraw at any time.

Survey
The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential. The survey questions will be focused on attitudes and current practices for inclusion of students with disabilities at the university.

 * You will be asked to identify yourself by job status and the Mexican state in which you work only. There are no risks associated with participating in this research. It is understood that the Investigator will protect confidentiality by keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location data base. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only that includes the dissertation paper, professional academic conferences, and CSUSB's scholar works system, at the moment.
 Required

Email address*

Consentient. I understand:*

Check all that apply.

☐ There are minimal risks associated with participating in this research. I understand that the Investigator will protect my confidentiality by keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location.

☐ All information will be identifier-redacted, and my confidentiality will be maintained. All data and consents will be securely stored for three years after completion of data collection and confidentially shredded or fully deleted.

☐ The possible benefit of this study to me is that my input may help add to the research regarding inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education.

☐ The findings will be available to me at the conclusion of the study and will provide new insights about the strategies for inclusion. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation.

☐ If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Stanley L. Swartz (advisor) at sswartz@csusb.edu.

☐ My participation in this research study is voluntary. I may decide to not participate in the study, and I can withdraw at any time. I can also decide not to answer particular questions if I so choose. I understand that I may refuse to participate or may withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences.

☐ No information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be so informed, and my consent re-obtained.

☐ I have read and understand the consent document and agree to participate in your study.

☐ I have read the information above and agree to participate in your study.

Clicking on all checkbox indicates that you have read the informed consent form and the information in this document and that you voluntarily agree to participate.

If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may decline participation by not clicking on one or all checkboxes.

The survey will not open for responses unless you agree to participate.

**Attitudes and practices for the inclusion of students with disabilities
in Higher Education Survey.
Faculty**

As you know, Mexican laws require "the right to education of persons with disabilities, prohibiting any discrimination."
My name is Lilia López and I am a full-time professor at the Autonomous University of Baja California, I am researching this issue to help my university with its implementation plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities. This work is also part of my research for the PhD in Educational Leadership at California State University, San Bernardino.
I appreciate your help and I will share with you the results once this project is finished. All your answers will be confidential.

3. How do you agree with the following sentence? "Equitable access to services and resources is a fundamental right for people with disabilities"

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Low			High	

4. How do you agree with the following sentence? "Persons with disabilities, including severe disabilities, have the right to receive Higher Education"

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Low			High	

5. What is your personal commitment in relation to inclusion?

Mark only one oval.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Low			High	

6. Have you taken a course on disability or inclusion? Please describe your training

7. Do you think you have specialized training to work in inclusion of students with disabilities?

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the commitment of the higher education institution to which you belong with the inclusion of students with disabilities.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	
Low					High	

9. How much has the Institution where you work for the inclusion of students with disabilities compared to the commitment it offers?

10. How would you rate the system of support for the inclusion of students with disabilities in your institution of higher education?

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	
Low					High	

11. Do you know if there is a transition plan for students with disabilities between upper and upper secondary education levels?

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

12. Do you think that the lack of support services in higher education affects the participation of students with disabilities? Yes/No, Why?

13. Mark what your university provides as support services to students with disabilities.
   Check all that apply.

   ☐ Diagnostic

   ☐ Access to

       installations/barriers Free

   ☐ Psychological support

   ☐ Curriculum modified

   ☐ Specialized Technology

   ☐ Specialized staff

   ☐ Other: _____

14. Which of these disabilities does your university provide services for?
   Check all that apply.

   ☐ Mental Health

   ☐ Intellectual Disability Mod.

   ☐ Autism Spectrum Disorder

   ☐ Learning Disabilities

   ☐ Deficit Attention Disorder

   ☐ Sensory: Visual and Hearing

   ☐ Physical/Motor disabilities

15. Which topics of inclusion in higher education would you like to have training?

16. Size of your institution, in terms of student's population:
   Mark only one oval.

   ◯ Small up to 150

   ◯ Up to 5000

   students

   ◯ More than 5000 students

17. Gender
   Mark only one oval.
   ◯ Man
   ◯ Woman
   ◯ Other _____

18. Academic grade
   Check all that apply.
   ☐ Bachelor
   ☐ Master
   ☐ Doctorate

19. Years of experience as professor/researcher
   Check all that apply.
   ☐ 1-5 years
   ☐ 6 -10 years
   ☐ More 10 years

20. State in which you University is at:

21. Will you attend a conference about this topic?
   Mark only one oval.
   ◯ Yes
   ◯ No
   ◯ May Be

22. * I appreciate any comments and suggestions on the subject.

Encuesta Profesores

Encuesta de actitudes y prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad en Educación Superior.

Seccion 1

Consentimiento Informado. Profesores

El estudio en el que se le solicita participar está diseñado para investigar políticas y prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en universidades públicas de México. Este estudio está siendo realizado por Lilia López Arriaga bajo la supervisión del Dr. Stanley Swartz, Profesor de Educación en la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad Estatal de California, San Bernardino. Este estudio ha sido aprobado por la Junta de Revisión Institucional, California State University, San Bernardino. El propósito de este estudio es investigar el estadode inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en universidades autónomas públicas deMéxico.

Esta es una encuesta en línea a través del sitio web de Formatos Google. Su participación en este proyecto es voluntaria y confidencial. Puede decidir no responder al cuestionario asociado con este estudio o algunas de las preguntas, incluso si ha firmado esta carta de consentimiento. Su decisión de no participar en las actividades de este estudio no tendrá penalidad de ningún tipo. Le preguntaremos a otros profesores en este puesto si les gustaría participar voluntariamente en las actividades del estudio, las cuales usted puede rechazar. Solo los que acepten participar en todos los componentes serán incluidos. Si decide participar en esta encuesta electrónica, puede retirarse en cualquier momento de todas formas.

Esta es una en cuesta en línea, vía formatos google website. Su participación en esta encuesta es voluntaria y confidencial. Usted puede elegir no participar. Si decide participar en esta encuesta electrónica, usted puede decidir salir en cualquier momento.
La encuesta llevará 20 minutos aproximadamente para completarse. Sus respuestas serán confidenciales. Las preguntas se enfocan en actitudes y prácticas actuales de inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad.

Este estudio ha sido aprobado por la Junta de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad Estatal de California, San Bernardino

Se le requiere identificarse solamente en relación a su puesto y el EstadoMexicano al que pertenece su trabajo. No existen riesgos asociados con su participación en esta investigación. Se entiende que el investigador protegerá la confidencialidad protegiendo los códigos de investigación identificando códigos y materiales de investigación en una

base de datos de ubicación segura. Los resultados de este estudio se utilizarán solo para fines académicos que incluyen el documento de tesis, conferencias académicas profesionales y el sistema de trabajo académico de CSUSB, por lo pronto.

Al dar clic en todas las casillas indica que he leído el formulario de consentimiento informado y la información en este documento, y que acepto voluntariamente participar.

Si no desea participar en esta encuesta electrónica, puede rechazar la participación no eligiendo una de las casillas o todas.

Requerida
Email address*

_____

Consentimiento. Entiendo que:*

Elija todo lo que aplique.

☐ Existenriesgosmínimosasociadosconmiparticipaciónenestainvestigación.Entiendoqueel investigadorprotegerámiconfidencialidadalmantenerloscódigosdeidentificaciónylosmateriales de investigación en un lugarseguro.

☐ Toda la información será redactada con identificadores y se mantendrá mi confidencialidad. Todoslosdatosyconsentimientossealmacenarándeformaseguradurantetresañosdespuésdela finalización de la recopilación de datos y se triturarán de forma confidencial o se eliminarán por completo.

☐ Elposiblebeneficioqueesteestudiotendrámí,esquemiaportepuedeayudaraagregardatos alainvestigaciónsobrelainclusióndeestudiantescondiscapacidadesenlaeducaciónsuperior.Los resultados estarán disponibles para mí al final del estudio y proporcionarán nuevas ideas sobre las estrategiasparalainclusión.Entiendoquenosemecompensarápormiparticipación.

☐ Si tiene alguna pregunta o inquietud sobre la investigación, no dude en comunicarse con el Dr.StanleyL.Swartz(asesor)alcorreosswartz@csusb.eduoconlamtra.Lilia

120

LópezArriaga investigadora principal al correo[002428152](#)@[coyote.csusb.edu](#)

☐ Miparticipaciónenesteestudiodeinvestigaciónesvoluntaria.Puedodecidir noparticiparenel estudio y puedo retirarme en cualquier momento. También puedo decidir no responder preguntas particulares si así lo elijo. Entiendo que puedo negarme a participar o retirarme de este estudio en cualquier momento sin consecuenciasnegativas.

☐ Nosedivulgaráningunainformaciónquemeidentifiquesinmiconsentimient oporseparadoy todalainformaciónidentificableestaráprotegidadentrodeloslímitespermiti dosporlaley.Sisevaa cambiar el diseño del estudio o el uso de los datos, se me informará y se volverá a obtener mi consentimiento.

☐ He leído la información que se me presenta y estoy de acuerdo en participar en su estudio.

Sección 2

Encuesta de actitudes y prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad en Educación Superior.

Como saben, las leyes mexicanas exigen "el derecho a la educación de las personas con discapacidad, prohibiendo cualquier discriminación".
Mi nombre es Lilia López y soy profesora de tiempo completo en la Universidad Autónoma de BajaCalifornia, estoy investigando este tema para ayudar a mi universidad con su plan de implementación para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad. Este trabajo también es partede mi investigación para el doctorado en Liderazgo Educativo de la Universidad del Estado de California, San Bernardino.
Aprecio su ayuda y compartiré con ustedes los resultados una vez terminado este proyecto.
Todas sus respuestas seránconfidenciales.

3.¿Quétandeacuerdoestasconlasiguientefrase?"Elaccesoequitativoaserviciosyre cursos es un derecho fundamental para las personas condiscapacidad"

Marque solo una opción.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Bajo   Alto

4.¿Qué tan de acuerdo estas con la siguiente frase? "Las personas con discapacidad, incluyendo a aquellas con discapacidades severas, tienen derecho a recibir Educación Superior"

Marque solo una opción.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Bajo   Alto

5. ¿Cuál es tu compromiso personal en relacion a la inclusion?
Marque solo una opción.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Bajo   Alto

6.¿Has tomado algun curso sobre discapacidad o inclusión?
Por favor describe tu capacitación

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. ¿Consideras que tienes capacitación especializada para trabajar en inclusión de alumnos con discapacidad?
Marque solo una opción.
_____ Si
_____ No

8. En la escala de 1 a 5 califica el compromiso que tiene la institución de educación superior a la que perteneces con la inclusión de alumnos con discapacidad.
Marque solo una opción.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Bajo　　　　　　　　　Alto

9. ¿Qué tanto ha hecho la Institución en la que trabajas por la inclusión de alumnos con discapacidad comparado con el compromiso que ofrece?

10. ¿Cómo calificarías el sistema de apoyos a la inclusión de alumnos con discapacidad en tu institución de educación superior?
Marque solo una opción.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

Bajo　　　　　　　　　Alto

11. ¿Conoces si hay un plan de transición para alumnos con discapacidad entre los niveles de educación media superior y superior?

Mark only one oval.

_____ Si

_____ No

12. ¿Crees que la falta de servicios de apoyo en la educación superior afecta la

participación de los alumnos y alumnas con discapacidad? Si/No- ¿Porqué?

13. Marca lo que tu universidad provee como servicios de apoyo para atender a alumnos y alumnas con discapacidad.
Check all that apply.

☐ Diagnóstico
☐ Acceso a las instalaciones/libre de barreras
☐ Apoyo psicológico
☐ Modificaciones curriculares
☐ Equipo especializado (Tecnología)
☐ Personal especializado
☐ Other: _____

14. ¿Tu universidad provee servicios para estas discapacidades?

Check all that apply.

☐ Problemas de salud mental
☐ Discapacidad intelectual leve
☐ Trastorno del Espectro Autista
☐ Trastornos específicos del aprendizaje/Problemas de aprendizaje
☐ Trastorno por Déficit deAtención
☐ Trastornos sensoriales: Ceguera y Sordera
☐ Discapacidad motriz

15. ¿Sobre qué temas de la inclusión en educación superior le gustaria tener mas capacitación?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. El tamaño de tu universidad es
Marque solo una opción.
☐ Pequeña hasta 150 alumnos
☐ Hasta 5000 alumnos
☐ Mas de 5000 alumnos

17. Género
Mark only one oval
☐ Hombre
☐ Mujer
☐ Other:

18. Ultimo grado académico
Check all that apply.
☐ Licenciatura
☐ Maestria
☐ Doctorado

19. Años de experiencia como docente/investigador universitario
Check all that apply.
☐ 1-5 años
☐ 6 - 10 años
☐ Más de 10 años

20. ¿De qué estado es la universidad a la que pertenece?

_____

21. ¿Apoyaría, participando o asistiendo, a un Congreso Nacional sobre Inclusión?
Mark only one oval.

☐ Si

☐ No

☐ Tal vez

*Agradezco cualquier observación y sugerencias sobre eltema.

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C:

ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY

Policies and Practices of Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Mexican Public Autonomous Universities
Administrators Interview

Section 1

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate policies and practices for inclusion of students with disabilities in public universities in Mexico. This study is being conducted by Lilia López Arriaga under the supervision of Dr. Stanley Swartz, Professor of Education at College of Education, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the status of inclusion for students with disabilities at Mexican public autonomous universities.
This is an online survey via the Google Survey Forms website. Your participation in this project is voluntary. You can decide to not answer all or parts of the surveys and questionnaires associated with this study or the questions in the interview, even if you have signed this letter of consent. Your decision to not participate in this study's activities will have no penalty of any kind. We will ask other administrative in this position if they would like to voluntarily participate in the study activities for which you may decline. Only who agree to participate at those times will be included. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this electronic survey, you can withdraw at any time.

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential. The survey questions will be focused on attitudes and current practices for inclusion of students with disabilities at the university.

You will be asked to identify yourself by job status and the Mexican state in which you work only. There are no risks associated with participating in this research. It is understood that the Investigator will protect confidentiality by keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location data base, some interview records in writing notes will be taken. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only that includes the dissertation paper, professional academic conferences, and CSUSB's scholar works system, at the moment.

Consent. I understand that:
  Check all that may apply

- ☐ There are minimal risks associated with participating in this research. I understand that the Investigator will protect my confidentiality by keeping the identifying codes and research materials in a secure location.
- ☐ All information will be identifier-redacted, and my confidentiality will be maintained. All data and consents will be securely stored for three years after completion of data collection and confidentially shredded or fully deleted.
- ☐ The possible benefit of this study to me is that my input may help add to the research regarding inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education. The findings will be available to me at the conclusion of the study and will provide new insights about the strategies for inclusion. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation.
- ☐ If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Stanley L. Swartz (advisor) at sswartz@csusb.edu.
- ☐ My participation in this research study is voluntary. I may decide to not participate in the study, and I can withdraw at any time. I can also decide not to answer particular questions if I so choose. I understand that I may refuse to participate or may withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences.
- ☐ No information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be so informed, and my consent re-obtained.
- ☐ I have read and understand the consent document and agree to participate in your study.

Clicking on all checkbox indicates that you have read the informed consent form and the information in this document and that you voluntarily agree to participate.

If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may decline participation by not clicking on one or all checkboxes.

The survey will not open for responses unless you agree to participate.

Contact information for questions or additional information:
The principal investigator is Lilia Lopez-Arriaga, 002428152@coyote.csusb.edu
The faculty advisor for this project is Dr. Stanley L. Swartz, sswartz@csusb.edu.

Section 2

Policies and practices for the inclusion of students with disabilities in Higher Education.

As you know, Mexican laws require "the right to education of persons with disabilities, prohibiting any discrimination."
My name is Lilia López and I am a full-time professor at the Autonomous University of Baja California, I am researching this issue to help my university with its implementation plan for the inclusion of students with disabilities. This work is also part of my research for the PhD in Educational Leadership at California State University, San Bernardino.
I appreciate your help and I will share with you the results once this project is finished. All your answers will be confidential.

3. Please check the boxes that you consider are covered by the services offered by your university to students with disabilities in the bachelor's degree programs.
General Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities, articles 1 to 5. Reformed in 2018.

Check all that apply.

☐ Promote, protect and ensure the full exercise of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons with disabilities
☐ Ensure full inclusion to society in a framework of respect, equality and equalization of opportunities
☐ There are relevant measures to ensure access for people with disabilities, on equal terms with others, to the physical environment, transportation, information and communications.
☐ There are necessary and appropriate modifications and adaptations that do not impose a disproportionate or undue burden to guarantee all human rights.
☐ There is a set of actions aimed at modifying and improving social circumstances that impede the integral development of the individual.
☐ There are technological and material devices that enable, rehabilitate or compensate one or more functional, motor, sensory or intellectual limitations of persons with disabilities.
☐ There are procedures to identify any distinction, exclusion or restriction due to disability.
☐ Product designs, environments, programs and services that all people can use are planned, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.

☐ There are anti-discrimination measures such as the prohibition of behaviors that have as an objective or consequence an attempt against the dignity of a person, to create an intimidating or hostile environment, due to the disability he or she possesses.

☐ They have implemented action measures to promote the right to equal opportunities for people with disabilities.

☐ The institution observes the principles of equity, social justice, equal opportunities, respect for the evolution of the faculties of students with disabilities and the preservation of their identity, as well as respect for their dignity and autonomy

☐ Other:

4. How would you rate the system of support for the inclusion of students with disabilities in your institution of higher education?
Mark only one.

1	2	3	4	5
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
Low				High

5. Mark what your university provides as support services to serve students with disabilities.
Mark all that apply.

☐ Diagnostic
☐ Installations access/Free of barriers
☐ Psychology Support
☐ Curriculum modifications
☐ Technology access
☐ Specialized professionals
☐ Other: _____

6. Does your university provide services for these disabilities?
Mark the ones that may aplly.

☐ Mental Health
☐ Mild Intelectual Disability
☐ Autism Spectrum Disorder
☐ Learning Disabilities
☐ Attention Deficit Disorder
☐ Sensory Visual and Hearing
☐ Physical/movility Disability

7.How many undergraduate students attend the department / program / coordination in which you work?

8. Gender

Mark the one that apply

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Otro

9. Last academic degree
Mark what apply.
☐ Bachelor
☐ Master
☐ Doctorate

10. Years as administrative or in charge of the office/coordination/department
Mark one that apply.
☐ *1-5 ańos*
☐ 6-10 años
☐ Mas de 10 años

11. From which state is the university in which you work?

_____

12. On what topics of inclusion in higher education would you like to have more information?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Would you support, participating or attending, a National Congress on Inclusion?
Marque una opción

☐ Si
☐ No
☐ Tal vez

I appreciate any comments and suggestions on the subject

_____

_____

Politicas y Practicas de Inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad en las
Universidades Mexicanas
Entrevista Funcionarios

Políticas y Prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad en
Educación Superior.
El estudio en el que se le solicita participar está diseñado para investigar
políticas y prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en
universidades públicas de México. Este estudio está siendo realizado por Lilia
López Arriaga bajo la supervisión del Dr. Stanley Swartz, Profesor de
Educación en la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad Estatal de California,
San Bernardino. Este estudio ha sido aprobado por la Junta de Revisión
Institucional, California State University, San
Bernardino.

El propósito de este estudio es investigar el estado de inclusión de estudiantes
con discapacidades en universidades autónomas públicas de México.
Esta es una encuesta en línea a través del sitio web de Formatos Google. Su
participación en este proyecto es voluntaria y confidencial. Puede decidir no
responder todas o algunas de las encuestas y cuestionarios asociados con este
estudio o a las preguntas de la entrevista, incluso si ha firmado esta carta de
consentimiento. Su decisión de no participar en las actividades de este estudio
no tendrá penalidad de ningún tipo. Le preguntaremos a otros funcionarios en
este puesto si les gustaría participar voluntariamente en las actividades del
estudio, las cuales usted puede rechazar. Solo los que acepten participar en
todos los componentes serán incluidos. Si decide participar en esta encuesta
electrónica, puede retirarse en cualquier momento de todas formas.

Esta es una encuesta en línea, vía formatos Google website. Su participación en
esta encuesta es voluntaria y confidencial. Usted puede elegir no participar. Si
decide participar en esta encuesta electrónica, usted puede decidir salir en
cualquier momento.

La encuesta llevará 20 minutos aproximadamente para completarse. Sus
respuestas serán confidenciales. Las preguntas se enfocan en actitudes y
prácticas actuales de inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad.

Se le requiere identificarse solamente en relación a su puesto y el Estado
Mexicano al que pertenece su trabajo. No existen riesgos asociados con su
participación en esta investigación. Se entiende que el
investigador protegerá la confidencialidad protegiendo los códigos de
investigación identificando códigos y materiales de investigación en una base de
datos de ubicación segura, se tomarán algunos registros de entrevistas por

escrito. Los resultados de este estudio se utilizarán solo para fines académicos que
incluyen el documento de tesis, conferencias académicas profesionales y el sistema de trabajo académico de CSUSB, por lo pronto.

Contactar para mayor información a:
Investigador principal Lilia López Arriaga   002428152@uabc.edu.mx
Profesor director del proyecto Dr. Stanley L. Swartz   sswartz@csusb.edu

Dar clic en todas las casillas indica que he leído y entiendo el documento de consentimiento y acepto participar en su estudio.
Si no desea participar en esta encuesta electrónica, puede rechazar la participación no eligiendo una de las casillas o todas.
* Required

1. Email address *

_____

☐ Existen riesgos mínimos asociados con mi participación en esta investigación. Entiendo que el investigador protegerá mi confidencialidad al mantener los códigos de identificación y los materiales de investigación en un lugar seguro.

☐ Toda la información será redactada con identificadores y se mantendrá mi confidencialidad. Todos los datos y consentimientos se almacenarán de forma segura durante tres años después de la finalización de la recopilación de datos y se triturarán de forma confidencial o se eliminarán por completo.

☐ El posible beneficio que este estudio tendrá mí, es que mi aporte puede ayudar a agregar datos a la investigación sobre la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidades en la educación superior. Los resultados estarán disponibles para mí al final del estudio y proporcionarán nuevas ideas sobre las estrategias para la inclusión. Entiendo que no se me compensará por mi participación.

☐ Si tiene alguna pregunta o inquietud sobre la investigación, no dude en comunicarse con el Dr. Stanley L. Swartz (asesor) al correo sswartz@csusb.edu o con la mtra. Lilia López Arriaga investigadora principal al correo 002428152@coyote.csusb.edu

☐ Mi participación en este estudio de investigación es voluntaria. Puedo decidir no participar en el estudio y puedo retirarme en cualquier

momento. También puedo decidir no responder preguntas particulares si así lo elijo. Entiendo que puedo negarme a participar o retirarme de este estudio en cualquier momento sin consecuencias negativas.

☐ No se divulgará ninguna información que me identifique sin mi consentimiento por separado y toda la información identificable estará protegida dentro de los límites permitidos por la ley. Si se va a cambiar el diseño del estudio o el uso de los datos, se me informará y se volverá a obtener mi consentimiento.

Al dar clic en todas las casillas indica que ha leído el formulario de consentimiento informado y la información en este documento, y que acepta voluntariamente participar.

Si no desea participar en esta encuesta electrónica, puede rechazar la participación no eligiendo una de las casillas o todas.

La encuesta no se abrirá para recibir respuestas a menos que acepte participar.

Políticas y prácticas para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad en Educación Superior.

Como saben, las leyes mexicanas exigen "el derecho a la educación de las personas con discapacidad, prohibiendo cualquier discriminación".
Mi nombre es Lilia López y soy profesora de tiempo completo en la Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, estoy investigando este tema para ayudar a mi universidad con su plan de implementación para la inclusión de estudiantes con discapacidad. Este trabajo también es parte de mi investigación para el doctorado en Liderazgo Educativo en la Universidad del estado de California, San Bernardino.
Aprecio su ayuda y compartiré con ustedes los resultados una vez terminado este proyecto. Todas sus respuestas serán confidenciales.

3. Favor de marcar las casillas que considere se cubren en los servicios que ofrece su universidad a los estudiantes que participan en los programas de licenciatura.
Ley General para la Inclusión de las Personas con Discapacidad, artículos 1 al 5. Reformada en 2018.

Check all that apply.

- ☐ Promover, proteger y asegurar el pleno ejercicio de los derechos humanos y libertades fundamentales de las personas con discapacidad
- ☐ Asegurar la plena inclusión a la sociedad en un marco de respeto, igualdad y equiparación de oportunidades
- ☐ Existen las medidas pertinentes para asegurar el acceso de las personas con discapacidad, en igualdad de condiciones con las demás, al entorno físico, el transporte, la información y las comunicaciones.
- ☐ Existen modificaciones y adaptaciones necesarias y adecuadas que no impongan una carga desproporcionada o indebida para garantizar todos los derechos humanos.
- ☐ Secuentaconunconjuntodeaccionestendientesamodificarymejorarlascircun stanciasde carácter social que impidan el desarrollo integral del individuo.
- ☐ Se cuenta con dispositivos tecnológicos y materiales que permiten habilitar, rehabilitar o compensar una o mas limitaciones funcionales, motrices, sensoriales o intelectuales de las personas con discapacidad.
- ☐ Se cuenta con procedimientos para identificar cualquier distinción, exclusión o restricción por motivos de discapacidad.
- ☐ Se planifican diseños de productos, entornos, programas y servicios que puedan utilizar todas las personas, en la mayor medida posible, sin necesidad de adaptación ni diseño especializado.
- ☐ Existen medidas contra la discriminación como la prohibición de conductas que tengan como objetivo o consecuencia atentar contra la dignidad de una persona, crear un entorno intimidatorio u hostil, debido a la discapacidad que esta posea.
- ☐ Tienen implementadas medidas de acción para impulsar el derecho a la igualdad de oportunidades de las personas con discapacidad.
- ☐ La institución observa los principios de equidad, justicia social, igualdad de oportunidades, respeto a la evolución de las facultades de los alumnos con discapacidad y la preservación de su identidad, así como respeto a su dignidad y autonomía
- ☐ Other:

4. ¿Cómo calificarías el sistema de apoyos a la inclusión de alumnos con discapacidad en tu institución de educación superior? *

Marque solo una opción.

	1	2	3	4	5	
	⬭	⬭	⬭	⬭	⬭	
	Bajo				Alto	

5. Marca lo que tu universidad provee como servicios de apoyo para atender a alumnos y alumnas con discapacidad. *

Marque todos los que apliquen.

☐ Diagnóstico
☐ Acceso a las instalaciones/libre de barreras
☐ Apoyo psicológico
☐ Modificaciones curriculares
☐ Equipo especializado (Tecnología) Personal especializado
☐ Other: _____

6. ¿Tu universidad provee servicios para estas discapacidades? *

Marque todas las que apliquen.

☐ Problemas de salud mental Discapacidad intelectual leve
☐ Trastorno del Espectro Autista
☐ Trastornos específicos del aprendizaje/Problemas de aprendizaje
☐ Trastorno por Déficit de Atención
☐ Trastornos sensoriales: Ceguera y Sordera
☐ Discapacidad motriz

7. ¿Cuántos alumnos de licenciatura atiende el departamento/ programa/ coordinación en la que trabaja?

8. Género

Marque solo una opción.

☐ Hombre
☐ Mujer
☐ Otro

9. Ultimo grado académico
Marque la que aplique.
☐ Licenciatura
☐ Maestría
☐ Doctorado

10. Años de experiencia como funcionario
Marque la que aplique.
1-5 años
6-10 años
Mas de 10 años

11. ¿De qué estado es la universidad a la que pertenece?*

_____

12. ¿Sobre qué temas de la inclusión en educación superior le gustaría tener
mas información?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. ¿Apoyaría, participando o asistiendo, a un Congreso Nacional sobre
Inclusión?
Marque una opción
☐ Si
☐ No
☐ Tal vez

*Agradezco cualquier observación y sugerencias sobre el tema

_____

_____

Powered by

Google Forms

APPENDIX D:

FACULTY SURVEY RESPONSES IN SPANISH AND ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Respuestas a ¿Has tomado algun curso sobre discapacidad o inclusión? Por favor describe tu capacitación.

No
No
ATENCIÓN A LA DIVERSIDAD
No
Fue una actividad denominada Misión Académica Internacional "Inclusión educativa y Neuroposicología", en la que se compartieron las estrategas de las Universidad del Bosque de Cali, Colombia para integrar a estudiantes con diversidad funcional a la educación universitaria.
No
talleres sobre inclusión educativa para docentes en mi universidad
La he recibido y la he impartido en temas de educación para personas con discapacidad motora y debilidad visual de forma general
No
Sensibilización para la inclusión de alumnos con discapacidad intelectual a educación superior. Sensibilización para la inclusión en educación básica. Elaboración de adecuaciones curriculares.
Inclusión y discapacidad PRONAPRED, lenguaje de señas Mexicanas
Si
No
Capacitaciónes en CRIT Teletón.
Sí, un curso básico sobre estrategias de inclusión educativa
si, es mi linea de trabajo
Maestría en Artes con énfasis en educación especial en California State University , San Bernardino. Pasante de Doctorado en Ciencias psicológicas, con énfasis en educación Especial en la Universidad de Cuba
Varios, sobre inclusión de personas con Autismo.
No
una maestría y especialidades
No
No
si, pero fue muy corto y no se cumplieron mis expectativas
Sí he tomado seminarios y trabajo en investigación en esa área.
Seminarios de <inclusión y discapacidad
Si, sobre política educative

Responses to professional development training on inclusion topics. Translation from the original in Spanish.

No
No
Services for diversity
No
It was an activity called the International Academic Mission "Educational Inclusion and Neuropsychology", in which the strategists of the Universidad del Bosque in Cali, Colombia shared to integrate students with functional diversity into university education.
No
Workshops on educational inclusion for teachers at my university.
I have received it and I have taught it in workshops for people with motor disabilities and visual impairments in general.
No
Awareness for the inclusion of students with intellectual disabilities in higher education. Awareness for inclusion in basic education. Development of curricular adaptations.
Inclusion and disability PRONAPRED, Mexican sign language.
Yes
No
Training at CRIT Teletón program.
Yes, a basic course on strategies on educational inclusion.
Yes, it is my line of work.
Master of Arts with emphasis in special education at California State University, San Bernardino. Intern of Doctorate in Psychological Sciences, with emphasis in Special education at the University of Cuba.
Several on inclusion of people with Autism.
None
A master's degree and specialties.
No
No
Yes, but it was very short and my expectations were not met.
I have taken seminars and I do research work in this area.
Inclusion and disability seminars.
Yes, about educational policy.

¿Qué tanto ha hecho la Institución en la que trabajas por la inclusión de alumnos con

discapacidad comparado con el compromiso que ofrece?

Han implementado algunos adecuaciones en cuanto a infraestructura, capacitado a los docentes en relación al tema, desarrollado políticas internas sobre inclusión, como el identificar en el ingreso las personas con discapacidad y buscar la mejor adecuación a aulas y clases, integrando docentes con alguna discapacidad, entre otras cosas.
Hemos atendido a alumnos con discapacidad solo un casos ha concluido la licenciatura
Crear la unidad de inclusión, hacer esfuerzos para dar seguimiento a alumnos en adecuaciones y ajustes razonables, contratar a un maestro para LSM de alumna sorda, capacitar a docentes, hacer ajustes en examenes de admisión con tutoría.
Poco
La institución recibe a estudiantes con necesidades educativas especiales y proporciona orientaciones básicas a los docentes para incluirlos en la dinámica educativa.
Pocas acciones. Muchas declaraciones
Han implementado algunos adecuaciones en cuanto a infraestructura, capacitado a los docentes en relación al tema, desarrollado políticas internas sobre inclusión, como el identificar en el ingreso las personas con discapacidad y buscar la mejor adecuación a aulas y clases, integrando docentes con alguna discapacidad, entre otras cosas.
En la mayoría de los campus ha hecho modificaciones arquitectónicas
Accesos universales, programa de equidad educativa
Unica universidad privaca en el Estado de Yucatán que ofrece esa posibilidad.
Elevadores, rampas, capacitación de profesores para atender personas con discapacidad mental (espectro autista, depresión, etc.), énfasis en el programa de tutorías sobre la atención a dicha población.
Ha buscado utilizar recursos para atender la necesidad pero no es suficiente
Para el estudiante han mejorado la infraestructura, programas educativos abiertos a inscripción, alcance de servicios en biblioteca y apoyo personal
Adecuaciones arquitectónicas y de mobiliario. Adaptaciones curriculares para el aprendizaje/
Actualmente desarrolla espacios de capacitación para profesores, programas de atención a estudiantes ciegos y sordos, equipamiento para estudiantes ciegos.
Tiene políticas de inclusión pero, lo que ha realizado tiene mas que ver con accesibilidad en infraestructura
en mi experiencia: proyectos inconclusos, propuestas con fines políticos, y sin seguimientos serios. falta de apoyos económicos, de recursos y de infraestructura
Se capacita y cuenta con programas de inclusión
En mi Universidad este término no se utiliza porque los estudiantes con discapacidad son tratados como un alumno de educación superior, no se hace segregación por las discapacidades que presentan los jóvenes, no hay tratos preferenciales
Faltan más acciones
Un esfuerzo importante reflejado en el PDI de ña universidad
porque lo marca como importante en el ingreso,si no seria descriminacion
En realidad no mucho, sólo han llegado a aceptar jóvenes con discapacidad leve.
Medidas de accesibilidad y presencia de interpretes
El trabajo se ha fundado principalmente en la elaboración de políticas, hace falta integrarlas de manera formal a las Facultades, adaptar programas y entrenamiento de profesores.

How much has done the Institution in which you work, for the inclusion of students with disabilities compared to the commitment it offers? Responses.

It strives to include students, although it seems that they understand inclusion by passing them in the subjects and doing tasks that are not related to the competence that is desired to develop in the subject.
We have assisted students with disabilities, only one case has completed the degree.
Create the inclusion unit, make efforts to follow up on students in reasonable accommodations and adjustments, hire a teacher for LSM of deaf student, train teachers, adjusting in entrance exams with tutoring.
Little
The institution receives students with special educational needs and provides basic guidelines for teachers to include them in the educational dynamic.
Few actions. Many statements.
They have implemented some adaptations in terms of infrastructure, trained teachers on the subject, developed internal policies on inclusion, such as identifying persons with disabilities at admission and seeking the best adaptation to classrooms and classes, integrating teachers with disabilities, among other things.
Most of the campuses it has made architectural modifications
Universal access, educational equity program.
The only private university in the State of Yucatan that offers this possibility.
Elevators, ramps, training of teachers to provide services to people with mental disabilities (autistic spectrum, depression, etc.), emphasis on mentoring program and services for this population.
I have sought to use resources to meet the need but it is not enough
For the student, infrastructure, educational programs open to enrollment, scope of library services and personal support have improved.
Architectural and furniture adjustments. Curriculum adaptations for learning.
Currently, it develops training spaces for teachers, care programs for blind and deaf students, equipment for blind students.
It has inclusion policies, but what it has done has more to do with infrastructure and accessibility.
In my experience: unfinished projects, proposals for political purposes, and without serious follow-up. lack of financial, resource and infrastructure support
There is training and had have inclusion programs.
None
In my University this term is not used because students with disabilities are treated as a student of higher education, there is no segregation due to the disabilities presented by young people, there are no preferential treatment.
More actions are missing.
An important effort reflected in the university's Development Plan.
Because it is an important for the access policy, otherwise it would be discrimination.

Not really much, they have only accepted young people with mild disabilities.
Measures of accessibility and presence of interpreters.
The work has been based mainly on the elaboration of policies, it is necessary to formally integrate them into the Faculties, adapt programs and teacher training.

Translation from Spanish.

APPENDIX E:

IRB APPROBAL LETTER

Lilia Lopez-Arriaga <002428152@coyote.csusb.edu>

IRB-FY2020-201 - Initial: IRB Expedited Review Approval Letter

mgillesp@csusb.edu <mgillesp@csusb.edu>   Tue, Mar 3, 2020 at 9:49 AM
To: 002428152@coyote.csusb.edu, SSwartz@csusb.edu

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN BERNARDINO

March 3, 2020

CSUSB INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Expedited Review
IRB-FY2020-201
Status: Approved

Ms. Lilia Lopez-Arriaga and Prof. CO_PI]
COE - Doctoral Studies, COE - SpecEd Rehab&Counslg SRC
California State University, San Bernardino
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Ms. Lopez-Arriaga and Prof. Swartz:

Your application to use human subjects, titled "An Analysis of Policies and Practices for the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Public Universities in Mexico" has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The informed consent document you submitted is the official version for your study and cannot be changed without prior IRB approval. A change in your informed consent (no matter how minor the change) requires resubmission of your protocol as amended using the IRB Cayuse system modification (protocol change) form.

Your application is approved for one year from March 2, 2020 through March 2, 2021.

Please note the Cayuse IRB system will notify you when your protocol is up for renewal and ensure you file it before your protocol study end date.

Your responsibilities as the researcher/investigator reporting to the IRB Committee include the following four requirements as mandated by the Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46 listed below. Please note that the protocol change form and renewal form are located on the IRB website under the forms menu. Failure to notify the IRB of the above may result in disciplinary action. You are required to keep copies of the informed consent forms and data for at least three years.

You are required to notify the IRB of the following by submitting the appropriate form (modification, unanticipated/adverse event, renewal, study closure) through the online Cayuse IRB Submission System.

1. If you need to make any changes/modifications to your protocol submit a modification form as the IRB must review all changes before implementing in your study to ensure the degree of risk has not changed.
2. If any unanticipated adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research study or project.
3. If your study has not been completed submit a renewal to the IRB.
4. If you are no longer conducting the study or project submit a study closure.

Please ensure your CITI Human Subjects Training is kept up-to-date and current throughout the study.

The CSUSB IRB has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional approvals which may be required. If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, the IRB Compliance Officer. Mr. Michael Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at mgillesp@csusb.edu. Please include your application approval identification number (listed at the top) in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Donna Garcia

Donna Garcia, Ph.D., IRB Chair
CSUSB Institutional Review Board

DG/MG

REFERENCES

Amador, C. M. (2017). Ventajas del liderazgo distribuido en instituciones de educación superior/Advantages of distributed leadership in institutions of higher education. *RIDE Revista Iberoamericana para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Educativo*, *8*(15), 817–832. https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v8i15.322

American Association of Community Colleges. (2018). *Data points: students with disabilities*. https://www.aacc.nche.edu/2018/09/26/datapoints-students-with-disabilities/

American College Personnel Association. (1996). *Student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs*. https://www.myacpa.org/equity-and-inclusion-statement

American Psychiatric Association. (2013*). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). https://www.psychiatry.org/psychiatrists/practice/dsm

Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 104 Stat. 328. (1990). https://www.ada.gov/

Annamma, S. A., Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2018). Disability critical race theory: Exploring the intersectional lineage, emergence, and potential futures of DisCrit in education. *Review of Research in Education, 42*(1), 46–71. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18759041

Arzate, S., J. (2015). Políticas de inclusión educativa para los jóvenes en

México. Un análisis desde un contexto de desigualdad y violencia. *Revista

de Paz y Conflictos*, *8*(1), 103-134.

Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

(2019a). *Reseña historica.* http://www.anuies.mx/anuies/acerca-de-la-

anuies/resena-historica

Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

(2019b). *Anuarios Estadísticos de Educación Superior*.

http://www.anuies.mx/informacion-y-servicios/informacion-estadistica-de-

educacion-superior/anuario-estadistico-de-educacion-superior

Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

(2012). *Inclusión con responsabilidad social: Elementos de diagnóstico y

propuestas para una nueva generación de políticas de educación

superior*. http://www.anuies.mx/gestor/data/personal/anuies05/doc/4-

2_Diciembre_2012-Inclusion_con_responsabilidad_social-

Documento_extenso.pdf

Austin, R. (2006). The role of ICT in bridge-building and social inclusion: Theory,

policy and practice issues. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 29*(2),

145-161. DOI: 10.1080/02619760600617284

Belch, H., A. (2004). Retention and students with disabilities. *Journal of College

Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 6*(1), 3–22.

https://doi.org/10.2190/MC5A-DHRV-1GHM-N0CD

Biemiller, L. (2016). College facilities evolve from accommodation to inclusivity.

    Chronicle of Higher Education. http://www.chronicle.com/article/ College-

    Facilities-Evolve-From/237779

Bossu, C., & Stagg, A. (2018). The potential role of open educational practice

    policy in transforming australian higher education. *Open Praxis, 10*(2),

    145–157. https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.10.2.835

Brown, K., & Broido, E. (2015). Engaging students whit disabilities. Chapter 12.

    In S. Quaye & S. Harper (Eds), *Student engagement in higher education:*

    Theoretical perspectives and practical approaches for diverse populations

    (2nd ed., pp. 187-207). Routledge.

Cámara de Diputados del H. Congreso de la Unión. (2015). *Ley Federal del*

    Trabajo.

    https://www.gob.mx/cms/uploads/attachment/file/156203/1044_Ley_Feder

    al_del_Trabajo.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). *Disability Inclusion.*

    https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/disabilityandhealth/disability-inclusion.html

Cohen, A. M., & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education:*

    Emergence and growth of the contemporary system (2nd ed.). Jossey-

    Bass.

Congress Gov (1990). S.1824 - Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments

    of 1990. https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/senate-bill/1824

Cortiella, C., & Horowitz, S. (2014). e State of learning disabilities: Facts, trends

and emerging issues. National Center for Learning Disabilities.

https://www.ncld.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/2014-State-of-LD.pdf

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *A framework for design. Research design: Qualitative,

quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Chapter 1* (2nd ed.). Sage

Publications.

Cruz, R., & Casillas, M. Á. (2017). Las instituciones de educación superior y los

estudiantes con discapacidad en México. *Revista de la Educación

Superior*, *46*(181), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resu.2016.11.002

D'Artigues, K. (2018, June 4). El empleo más difícil. *Milenio 2020.*

https://www.milenio.com/negocios/el-empleo-mas-dificil

Diario Oficial. (2018). Ley general para la inclusión de las personas con

discapacidad, 233,1-42.

http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Documentos/Federal/pdf/wo61725.pdf

DOI: 10.1080/08856257.2016.1254964

Dumas-Hines, F. A., Cochran, L. L., & Williams, E. U. (2001). Promoting

diversity: Recommendations for recruitment and retention of minorities in

higher education. *College Student Journal, 35*(3), 433.

Erevelles, N., & Minear, A. (2010). Unspeakable offenses: Untangling race and

disability in discourses of intersectionality. *Journal of Literary & Cultural

Disability Studies*, *4*(2), 127–145. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2010.11

Evans, C., Williams, J. B., King, L., & Metcalf, D. (2010). Modeling, guided

    instruction, and application of udl in a rural special education teacher

    preparation program. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 29*(4), 41–48.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/875687051002900409

Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of

    teaching and research in faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education,*

    76(4), 401–422.

Fan, W., & Yan, Z. (2010). Factors affecting response rates of the web surveys:

    A systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 132-139.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.10.015

Flores, E. M., Prescott, B. T., Hillman, N., Sponsler, B., Saenz, V., Zaback, K.,

    Paulson, K, Baker, D., & Drake, A. (2016, October). Translating research

    into policy to increase equity in higher education: Lessons learned from

    the ASHE-WICHE collaborative. *Policy Insights*. Western Interstate

    Commission for Higher Education. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED573100

Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: Mapping the

    territory. *Journal of Education Police, 13*(4), 469-484.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093980130402

Glennon, T. J. (2016). Survey of college personnel: preparedness to serve

    students with autism spectrum disorder. *The American Journal of*

    Occupational Therapy. DOI: 10.5014/ajot.2016.017921

Gobierno de México. (2014c). *Inclúyeme: Programa Nacional de Trabajo para Personas con Discapacidad 2014-2018* https://www.gob.mx/conadis/acciones-y-programas/programa-nacional-de-trabajo-y-empleo-para-las-personas-con-discapacidad-2014-2018

Gobierno de México. (2017b). *Instituto Nacional para la Educación de los Adultos.* https://www.gob.mx/inea/acciones-y-programas/nuestra-institucion-57139

Gobierno de México. (2020a). *Guía completa de los centros educativos en México.* https://portaldeeducacion.com.mx/educacion-especial-cam/index.htm

Goldsmith, S. (2015). *Universal Design.* Routledge.

Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2014). Dis/ability and austerity: beyond work and slow death. *Disability and Society*, *29*(6), 980–984. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2014.920125

Gornall, L., & Salisbury, J. (2012). Compulsive working, 'hyperprofessionality' and the unseen pleasures of academic work. *Higher Education Quarterly, 66*(2), 135-154. DOI:10.1111/j.1468-2273.2012.00512.x

Government Accountability Office. (U. S. GAO, 2011). Higher education and disability: Improved federal enforcement needed to better protect students' rights to Testing Accommodations GAO-12-40. https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-40

Government Accountability Office. (U. S. GAO, 2012). *Transportation-disadvantaged populations: 2012. Federal coordination efforts could be further strengthened.* https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-12-647

Government Accountability Office. (U. S. GAO, 2020). *Hiring has increased but actions needed to assess retention, training, and reasonable accommodation efforts. Disability Employment.* https://www.gao.gov/assets/710/707504.pdf

Grigal, M., Dwyre, A., & Davis, H. (2006). Transition services for students aged 18-21 with intellectual disabilities in college and community settings: Models and implications of success. *Information Brief, 5*(5), 1-5. http://www.ncset.org/publications/info/NCSETInfoBrief_5.5.pdf

Hart, D., Pasternack, R. H., Mele-McCarthy, J., Zimbrich, K., & Parker, D. (2004). Community college: A pathway to success for youth with learning, cognitive, and intellectual disabilities in secondary settings. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities, 39*(1), 54–66. https://bit.ly/3hniXc4

Hérnard, F., & Mitterle, A. (2010). *Governance and quality guidelines in Higher Education: A review of governance arrangements and quality assurance guidelines.* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. http://www.oecd.org/education/imhe/46064461.pdf

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.

Hoskings, D. (2008, September 2-4). *Critical disability Theory* [paper

presentation]. Lancaster University at the 4th Biennial Disability Studies

Conference, UK.

https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/events/disabilityconference_archive/2008

/papers/hosking2008.pdf

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (2015). https://sites.ed.gov/idea/

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2011). *Clasificación mexicana de*

programas de estudio por campos de formación académica 2011:

Educación superior y media superior. México.

https://www.snieg.mx/contenidos/espanol/normatividad/normastecnicas/C

MPE_2011.pdf

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2016a). *Marco Geoestadístico:*

Mapas Pinterest.

https://www.google.com/url?sa=i&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.pinterest.co

m.mx%2Fpin%2F847380486121777652%2F&psig=AOvVaw3v9ZuJw4Us

K7eb7aGJKRys&ust=1596396238026000&source=images&cd=vfe&ved=

0CAMQjB1qFwoTCLiemczd-uoCFQAAAAAdAAAAABAJ

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2016b). *La discapacidad en*

México, datos al 2014.

http://coespo.qroo.gob.mx/Descargas/doc/DISCAPACITADOS/ENADID%

202014.pdf

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. (2018). *Discapacidad.*

    https://www.inegi.org.mx/temas/discapacidad/

International Disability Alliance. (2006). *United Nations Convention on the Rights*

    of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

    https://www.internationaldisabilityalliance.org/CRPD

Jones, S. R. (2019). Waves of change: the evolving history of student

    development theory. In E. S. Abes, S. R. Jones & D. L. *Stewart,*

    Rethinking college student development theory using critical frameworks

    (p. 7-16). Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Juárez, P. E., & Moreno, R. M. (2018). *Líderes escolares: Pilares del sistema*

    educativo mexicano. Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa.

    https://www.inee.edu.mx/lideres-escolares-pilares-del-sistema-educativo-

    mexicano/

Kochhar-Bryant, C., Bassett, D., & Webb, K. (2009). *Transition to postsecondary*

    education for students with disabilities. Corwin Press*.*

Kurth, N., & Mellard, D. (2006). Student perceptions of the accommodation

    process in postsecondary education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education*

    and Disability, 19(7), p. 71-84. https://collegeautismnetwork.org/wp-

    content/uploads/2018/02/Kurth-Mellard-Annotation.pdf

Marion, R., & Gonzales, L. D. (2013). *Leadership in education: Organizational*

    theory for the practitioner. Waveland Press.

McClintock, M., & Rauscher, L. (1996). Ableism Curriculum Design. In M. Adams,

    L. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice* (pp.

    198-229). Routledge.

Minnesota Government. (2017). *Employment resource workbook: successfully*

    prepared students with disabilities for competitive employment.

    https://mn.gov/deed/assets/employment-resource-workbook_tcm1045-

    315677.pdf

Moriña, A. (2017). Inclusive education in higher education: Challenges and

    opportunities. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32*(1), 3-17.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016 a). *The condition of education*

    2016. https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2016144

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016 b). *Fast facts: students with*

    disabilities. https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=60

Newman, L., Wagner, M., Cameto, R., & Knokey, A. M. (2009, April). *The post-*

    high school outcomes of youth with disabilities up to 4 years after high

    school: A report from the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2.

    National Center for Special Education Research.

    https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED505448.pdf

O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty

    reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher*

    Education, 46(5), 479-510.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). Faculty careers and work

    lives: a professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Report,*

    34(3), 1-221.

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura.

    (2017). *Guía para asegurar la inclusión y la equidad en la educación.*

    https://bit.ly/3fSKHF3

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2019 b). Educación

    Superior en México: Resultados y relevancia para el mercado laboral

    https://www.oecd.org/centrodemexico/medios/educacion_superior_en_me

    xico.pdf

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2019a). The future of

    mexican higher education: Promoting quality and equity, reviews of

    national policies for education. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264309371-en.

    https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/the-future-of-mexican-higher-

    education_9789264309371-en#page23

Pérez-Castro, J. (2019). La inclusión de los estudiantes con discapacidad en dos

    universidades públicas mexicanas. *Innovación Educativa, 19*(79).

    https://www.ipn.mx/assets/files/innovacion/docs/Innovacion-Educativa-

    79/La-inclusion-de-los-estudiantes-con-discapacidad-en-dos-

    universidades.pdf

Perry, D. (2016, October 17). Op Ed: Trump is not just racist and sexist: He is

ableist. *Los Ángeles Times.* https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-

perry-trump-ableism-20161017-snap-story.html

Petesen, A. (2006). An African-American woman with disabilities: The

intersection of gender, race and disability. *Disability & Society, 21*(7), 721-

734. DOI:10.1080/09687590600995345

Place, K. R., & Vardeman-Winter, J. (2018). Where are the women? An

examination of research on women and leadership in public

relations. *Public Relations Review, 44*(1), 165–173.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.10.005

Project 10. (2020). *Transition Education Network*. http://project10.info/

Pugh, C., & Doyle, B. (2019). Equity, diversity, inclusion: Seattle's 'Loud at the

library' collaboration. *Child and Libraries, 17*(3), 27-29.

https://bit.ly/3juYYKv

Raue, K., & Lewis, L. (2011). *Students with disabilities at degree-granting

postsecondary institutions (NCES 2011–018).* U.S. Department of

Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011018.pdf

Ray, V. (2019). A Theory of Racialized Organizations. *American Sociological

Review, 84*(1), 26–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418822335

Rendón, L. (1994). Validating culturally diverse students: Toward a new model of

    learning and student development. *Innovative Higher Education, 19*(1),

    33-51. DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2010.549456

Rendón, L. (2002). Community college puente: A validating model of education.

    Educational Policy, 16(4), 642-667.

Santamaria, L. J. (2013). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural

    perceptions in educational leadership toward social justice and equity.

    Educational Administration Quarterly, *50*(3), 1-45.

    DOI:10.1177/0013161X13505287

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *e American faculty: e restructuring of*

    academic work and careers. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Selingo, J., Chhen, S., & Clark, C. (2017). *Pathways to the university presidency:*

    The future of higher education leadership. Deloitte Center for Higher

    Education Excellence.

    https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/public-sector/college-

    presidency-higher-education-leadership.html

Shafer, L. (2017). *Making student feedback work. Usable knowledge*. Harvard

    Graduate School of Education.

    https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/17/11/making-student-feedback-

    work

Silva-Laya, M. (2012). Equidad en la educación superior en México: La

necesidad de un nuevo concepto y nuevas políticas. *Archivos Analíticos*

de Políticas Educativas, 20(4). https://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/96

Simon, M. (2011). Equity, status and freedom: A note on higher education.

Cambridge Journal of Education, 41(1), 23-36.

Sistema Nacional de Información Estadística y Geográfica. (2012). *Clasificación*

mexicana de programas de estudio por campos de formación académica

2011.

https://www.snieg.mx/contenidos/espanol/normatividad/normastecnicas/C

MPE_2011.pdf

Stanberry, K. (2016). Transition planning for students with IEPs.

Greatschools.Org. https://www.greatschools.org/gk/articles/transition-

planning-for-students-with-ieps/

Swartz, P., López, A. L. G., Louque, A. & Swartz, S. L. (2018). Inclusion of

Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education. In G. E. Vazquez &

V. M. Villa, *Perspectivas Internacionales sobre inclusión, discapacidad y*

diversidad: Tópicos Selectos (p. 29-62). Editorial Artificios.

Swartz, S. L. (2014). *Inclusión: Un acceso equitativo para estudiantes con*

discapacidad. Ediciones Sin Fin.

Tatto, M. (1999). Education reform and state power in Mexico: The paradoxes of

decentralization. https://doi.org/10.1086/447563

Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., Wood, W. M., Brewer, D. M., & Eddy, S. (2016). A

    conceptual framework of self-advocacy for students with disabilities.

    Remedial and Special Education, 26(1), 43-54.

    https://doi.org/10.1177%2F07419325050260010601

Thompson, B. (2018). Presidential spotlight: Reflection and advocacy: Creating

    and addressing elements central to leadership and higher education.

    Communication Studies, 69(5), 453–460. DOI:

    https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2018.1502674

Toscano de la Torre, B. A., Ponce, G. J. C., Cruz, J. A. Á., Zapién de la Torre, A.,

    Contreras, V. G., & Pérez, A. J. C. (2017). Análisis de la inclusión en la

    educación superior en México. Una propuesta de indicadores para los

    organismos acreditadores. *Tecnología Educativa Revista CONAIC*, *4*(2),

    35–51.

    https://conaic.net/revista/publicaciones/Vol_IV_Num2_2017/Articulo_3.pdf

Trachtenberg, A. (2016, September 18). *Extra time on an exam: Suitable*

    accommodation or legal cheating? https://www.chronicle.com/article/extra-

    time-on-an-exam-suitable-accommodation-or-legal-cheating/

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office for Civil Rights.

    (1978). Section 504 of the Rehabilitation act of 1973: fact sheet:

    handicapped persons rights under Federal law. Washington: Dept. of

    Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Secretary, Office for Civil

    Rights.

    https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/ocr/civilrights/resources/factsheets/

    504.pdf

U. S. Department of Labor. (2014). *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.*

    https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/wioa

U. S. Department of Labor. (2016). *Youth in transition - federal partners in*

    transition. Office of Disability Employment Policy.

    https://www.dol.gov/odep/pdf/FPT_Fact_Sheet-Transition_02_05_15.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (1975). *Education for all Handicapped Children*

    Act Public Law 94-142.

    https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/idea35/history/index_pg10.ht

    ml

Universidad Autónoma de Baja California. (2015). *Distribución de alumnos.*

    Coordinación de Planeación y Desarrollo.

    http://www.uabc.mx/planeacion/sii/Alumnos/Absoluto/

Universidad Autónoma de Baja California. (2019). *Plan de desarrollo institucional*

    2019-2023. http://www.uabc.mx/planeacion/pdi/2019-2023/PDI_2019-

    2023.pdf

Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua. (2016). *Plan universitario de desarrollo 2016-2025.* http://transparencia.uach.mx/transparencia_proactiva/PDU-2016-2025.pdf

Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua. (2018, September 20). *UACH Historia.* https://uach.mx/acerca/historia/

Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez. (2018). *Plan institucional de desarrollo 2018-2024.* http://www3.uacj.mx/DGPDI/Documents/evaluacioninstitucional/Documents/PIDE/PIDE_2018-24_UACJ.pdf

Universidad Autónoma de Coahuila. (2018). *Plan de desarrollo institucional.* http://www2.uadec.mx/pub/pdf/2018-PDI.pdf

Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (2019). *Información Estadística UANL 2019.* http://transparencia.uanl.mx/secciones/informacion_general/agenda_estadistica/archivos/agenda_2019.pdf

Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León. (2018). *Plan de desarrollo institucional 2018-2030: Visión 2030.* https://www.uanl.mx/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/PDI-2018.pdf

Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León. (2020). *Antecedentes.* https://www.uanl.mx/antecedentes/

Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas. (2018). *Plan de desarrollo institucional 2018-2021.*

http://www.uat.edu.mx/SACD/ICA/Documents/Plan_de_Desarrollo_Institu cional_UAT2018-2021.pdf

Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas. (2020). *Antecedentes.*

https://www.uat.edu.mx/paginas/universidad/historia-antecedentes.aspx

Universidad de Sonora (2017). *Plan de Desarrollo Institucional 2017-2021.*

https://www.unison.mx/institucional/pdi2017-2021.pdf

Valencia, R. (1997). *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice.* The Flamer Press.

Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2000). Survey Research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology, 404-442*. Cambridge University Press.

Wehmeyer, M. L., Kelchner, K., & Richards, S. (1996). Essential characteristics of self-determined behavior of individuals with mental retardation. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, *100*(6), 632–642.

Wijeyesinghe, C., L. (2019). Intersectionality and student development: centering power in the process. In Abes, Elisa S., Jones, Susan R., & Stewart, Dafina, Lazarus. (2019). Rethinking college student development theory using critical frameworks (p. 26-34). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Wilson, K., Getzel, E., & Brown, T. (2000). Enhancing the post-secondary campus climate for students with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 14*(1), 37–50.