

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2009

Is public education preparing learning disabled to succeed at the college level?

John Fermin Ramirez

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#), and the [Education Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ramirez, John Fermin, "Is public education preparing learning disabled to succeed at the college level?" (2009). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3626.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3626>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

IS PUBLIC EDUCATION PREPARING LEARNING
DISABLED TO SUCCEED AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL?

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Public Administration

by
John Fermin Ramirez

December 2009

IS PUBLIC EDUCATION PREPARING LEARNING
DISABLED TO SUCCEED AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL?

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
John Fermin Ramirez


December 2009


Approved by:



Montgomery Van Wart, Chair,
Public Administration

12-4-09
Date


Michael Clarke


Anna Ni

ABSTRACT

The American Disabilities Act (ADA) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) establish that all special education students must be guaranteed an equal opportunity to become contributing members of society. Each state must follow the federal mandates for high quality educational programs and services for special need students and training for parents and educators.

This study will use a qualitative and quantitative methodology to investigate and analyze if special education departments of school districts and universities are following the federal law in preparing students with learning disabilities to succeed in college.

Even though there are federal guidelines, research indicates that some school districts are complaining that special education is too expensive; therefore some schools are reducing the number of special education classes. According to research, students with learning disabilities who don't have a strong foundation from preschool to 12th grade will have difficulty in performing well at the university. Moreover, research indicates universities are not complying with the federal mandates for learning disabled students. This research project will investigate

whether or not some school districts and universities are implementing programs consistent with the federal law.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my mom, dad, and sister, and Niece who are responsible for inspiring me and providing me with love motivation and support to accomplish my Goals.

Dr. Clarke, thank you for all your help, and for your interest in my endeavors. Special Thanks to the following people:

Provost Fernandez, Dr. Tom Rivera, Dr. Rizzo, Dr. Correa, Mr. Trujillo, Dr. Gonzalez, Dr. Pritchard, Dr. Murillo, Dr. Swartz, Dr. Anna Ni, The MPA Program, and others who have helped me at CSUSB.

I hope this project does not go un-notice and administrators who deal with these issues could do something to help the learning disabled community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Introduction	1
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	
Qualitative Approaches	7
CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW	
The Controversy Surrounding Inclusive Education	9
CHAPTER FOUR: THE 2002 PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION	
President's Commission 2002	18
CHAPTER FIVE: CASE STUDIES AND INTERVIEWS	
Case Studies	27
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	
Discussion	52
APPENDIX A: ACRONYMS USED IN RESEARCH	64
APPENDIX B: RESPONDENTS	66
REFERENCES	70

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The aim of this research project is to examine the compliance of some school districts and universities with federal mandates. The issue is whether or not special education departments of school districts and student disability departments of universities are following the federal law in preparing students with learning disabilities to succeed in college. This investigation is based on interviews and case studies from respondents, previous research and my own personal experience.

Federal Mandates for School Districts

The American Disabilities Act (ADA), passed in 1990, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), created in 1975, establishes that all special education students must be guaranteed an equal opportunity to become contributing members of society.

Each state must follow the federal mandates for high quality educational programs and services for special needs students and training for parents and educators. Some of the major federal programs are implemented and carried out

by the states; for example these are Child Find, Free Appropriate Public Education, Due process, Individualized Educational Planning (IEP) and Transition from School to Post secondary Education and Employment (California Special Education Local Plan Areas (Selpa) p.1).

Nature of the Problem at the School District Level

Even though there are federal mandates, research indicates that some school districts are complaining that special education is too expensive. Some school districts are using a controversial method called "inclusive education," which puts disabled students in regular classrooms. School districts use this method to reduce the number of special education classes and save money (Wisconsin Counsel, 2007).

The IDEA holds two positions on the subject of inclusion. First, the IDEA does not support inclusion if special education classes are cut to save money. For the IDEA, each student should be placed based on their individual needs. On the other hand, the IDEA supports inclusive programs as long as the student has the necessary educational foundation. This foundation is established via the instruction of qualified special education instructors who teach techniques and strategies in order to reduce the

learning gap between disabled and non-disabled students (Wisconsin Counsel, 2007).

Federal Mandates for Higher Education

Colleges are required to follow the American Disabilities Act Title II Section 504. This act requires that services to students should be determined based on the needs of the disabled individual's. Such services include academic accommodations, supplementary aids, and modifications necessary in order to ensure equal educational opportunity (Civil Rights of Students with Hidden Disabilities Under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973).

Nature of the Problem in Higher Education

However, according to Doug Lederman (2005) some universities are not complying with the federal mandates for learning disabled students (p.1). As a result, according to California Superintendent Jack O' Connell, students with learning disabilities who don't have a strong foundation from preschool to 12th grade will have difficulty in performing well at college (California Education Department ,2008, p.5). This suggests that not all universities or local school districts are following federal mandates properly. For example, one of the IDEA's

goals is to help students make a successful transition from school to post secondary education and employment. However, if these transitions are not successful, the learning disabled student must settle for a job that pays poorly, as most high paying jobs require a college education. For example, according to Transition to Adult living 2007 book disables make under \$15,000.00 a year (p. iv). However, non-disables with a Bachelors degree or higher make \$50,000.00 a year as of 2006 according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2008) (p.1).

Again, all of the above examples illustrate that because some local school districts are not following federal mandates concerning special education, the learning disabled students are paying the price, as they cannot succeed in college or cannot attend college due to the lack of a strong academic foundation. This foundation should be provided by the American Disabilities Act (ADA) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Furthermore, these examples illustrate that the problems do not lie solely with the local school district but with many Universities as well. If a student cannot graduate from college, then they cannot get a high paying job, which

translates into being given the equal opportunity to become a contributing member of society.

Respondents

All the respondents allowed me to put their experiences in this report as long as I didn't put their name. As well the interviews were done informally. I have known the majority of these people for years. I used these respondents to examine whether or not public education is preparing learning disabled students to succeed at the College level.

The following is a brief description of the respondents' background:

Respondent A:

He is visually impaired college student, currently working on his Bachelor's degree.

Respondent B:

He is Program manager for a non-profit organization who defends disabled students at the school district level, college level, and in government programs.

Respondent C:

She is disabled herself and also has a disabled daughter.

Respondent D:

He is an Associate Dean for a California State University campus.

Respondent E:

The mother of respondent C had a son, a daughter, and a grand daughter in special education. She has witnessed at the school district level from k-12 and at the college level the various obstacles of getting services her family members needed to succeed in school. She has advocated for her family members in order to get services.

Respondent F:

This individual has been a special education teacher for an elementary school for 31 years.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Qualitative Approaches

This graduate Research project used a qualitative research method of interviews, self testimony, previous research, and findings to support the argument. In this research project, I also employed a quantitative methodology by using statistical data from previous research to support the qualitative section of this project.

I interviewed a group of 6 anonymous individuals. These interviews provide personal narratives, which I use to support the claim that public schools do not properly or adequately educate learning disabled students, so that they may succeed at the college level. I also employed self testimony to support my argument surrounding the issues of special education and federal mandates. Moreover I used this method of self-testimony to illustrate that public schools do not properly or adequately educate learning disabled students so that they may succeed at college level.

Quantitative Approaches

I also used information from academic journals and government reports to illustrate my central thesis and I address the laws that concern disabled students. This data comes from both academic research as well as governmental reports from such agencies as The National Educational Statistics, President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education, Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and Civil Rights of Students with Hidden Disabilities Section 504 Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (it addresses similar regulations then the American Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990).

The purpose of these government reports is to demonstrate the various aspects and flaws in the educational system at the both the school district and college level.

CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Controversy Surrounding Inclusive Education .

For a student with a learning disability to be successful at the college level, the student must have a strong academic foundation from their primary education, so that they are able to perform at the college level. By having a strong foundation, the student will be able to graduate from college and become a contributing member to society.

However, this is not the case with all disabled individuals. The President's Commission of 2002 indicates that 70% of disabled individuals do not work because many American school districts wait for a disabled child to fail before they intervene (p. 43). The commission further suggests that school districts put little effort into identifying and preventing students' learning disabilities. In addition, the commission states disabled students should get help at an early age where assistance could be most effective (President's Commission, 2002 p.18).

The President's Commission of (2002) also states that there are various educational programs that can negatively impact disabled individuals academically (p.44). One such controversial method is known as inclusive education. Even though there are federal mandates, some school districts are using this controversial method which puts disabled students in regular classrooms. According to Dr James K Kaufman, some school districts use this method to reduce the number of special education classes and save money (Wisconsin Education Council 2007).

Again this method is controversial as some claim it is beneficial, while others claim that this method does nothing but harm to disabled students. For example, Lieberman, a special educational expert, believes that inclusion is harmful to learning disabled students as they do not progress academically in an inclusion setting because they need more individualized help (Lieberman 1996,18-26).

Therefore the implementation of "inclusion" causes many problems for both students and teachers. In Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behavior problems (2009), one of the anonymous regular teachers stated that many of the learning disabled students ask more

questions to obtain clarification. As a result, this teacher was upset that she wasn't able to spend more time with the class because the learning disabled students were taking too much of her time. Therefore, she believes that inclusion does more damage than good for both disabled and non-disabled students as well as special education teachers(150-153).

However, Susan and William Stainbeck, authors of Controversial Issues Confronting Special Education (1996), believe that inclusion is beneficial as "... diversity is valued and is believed to strengthen the school or classroom while offering all of its members greater opportunities for learning" (pg 36). They further suggest that inclusion has positive outcomes in the areas of social development, communication and goals of the Individual Education Plan (IEP). The IEP is a plan for the disabled child. The purpose is to assess the disabled child and to implement the appropriate services needed.

As well, Professor Stanley Swartz favors inclusion where he states "there wouldn't need to be a discussion about inclusion if there hadn't been exclusion. We now have mostly an integrated society, except for children with disabilities"(p.7). However, according to Dr Alan

Harchick(2005), "after several years of implementation, inclusion has not met its promise. Because inclusion is a philosophy about how children should be educated, it is sometimes recommended without prioritizing the needs of the individual child"(p.1). Therefore, inclusion remains a controversial solution to placing and educating individuals with learning and other types of disabilities.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

In 1975, Congress passed a bill, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act:

The purpose of this law was to ensure that local schools would serve the educational needs of the disabled students. It was the first special education law, and over the past 30 years has had several updates.

In 2004, this was renamed The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA). The most recent amendments were passed by Congress in 2004. IDEA gives states federal funds to help make special education services available to disabled students. It also provides very specific requirements to ensure a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for

students with disabilities. FAPE also 'provides specific requirements for students to receive a free appropriate public education and is the protected right of every eligible child in all 50 states and US territories.' (National Center for Learning Disabilities(NLCD)pg.1)

Federal Mandates for Higher Education

Colleges are required to follow the American Disabilities Act (ADA) Title II Section 504 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. According to this, services to students should be determined based on the disabled individual's needs. For example, according to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973:

Academic accommodations may include supplementary aids and modifications to academic requirements as to ensure equal educational opportunity. Examples of such adjustments may include priority registration, reducing a course load, substituting one course for another, providing note takers, recording devices, sign language interpreters, and extended time for testing and equipping school computers with en-reading, voice recognition or

other adaptive software or hardware. (Civil Rights of Students with Hidden Disabilities Section 504 Rehabilitation Act of 1973 p. 2)

The National Longitudinal Transition Study of 2005

The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2g (NLTS2) (2005) *has* investigated the effectiveness of these programs by examining various post-school outcomes, such as graduation and drop-out rates, postsecondary education, employment, income, living arrangements, and leisure activities. Research comparing individuals, both with and without disabilities, indicates that students with disabilities continue to experience lower high school graduation rates, lower college entrance and graduation rates, and higher rates of poverty. Statements from the National Leadership Summit on Improving Results for Youth support this statement. (Transition to Adult Living, 2007 p.iv)

The findings of this study suggest "that students with disabilities are less likely to graduate, to go on to

complete a college degree in comparison to non-disabled students (32%-81%)" (Transition to Adult Living,2007,p.v).

These students fail later in life due to the fact that these individuals were not provided with the necessary academic foundation needed to go on to college. Thus, being able to compete at the college level makes it difficult without a strong academic foundation established at the elementary education level.

As a result of not being able to compete at the college level, many students with disabilities do not live a satisfied and comfortable life. This is exemplified in the NLTS2 study (2005). It was found that "three times as many disabled persons become poverty stricken with household incomes below \$15,000 a year (26% percent compared to 9%)"(Transition Adult Living,2007, p.v).

Additionally, "they are less likely to have their needs met. Instead, their quality of life is poor, as they do not have access to adequate housing, transportation (31% compared to 13%) or health care (18% compared to 7%)"(Transition Adult Living,2007, p.v). Moreover, disabled people are less likely "to socialize, eat out or attend religious services than those without disabilities" (Transition to Adult living, 2007, p.v).

Therefore, because many disabled students are not academically prepared to pursue a higher education and then get a good paying job, their quality of life suffers. If this trend is to change, there needs to be changes made to both the American Disabilities Act of 1990 and the IDEA 2004 and its amendments that require and provide services and activities that prepare disabled individuals for the future.

The National Organization on Disability Reports
Similar Findings

The goal of the National Organization on Disability (NOD) is to encourage the contribution of America's 54 million men, women, and children with disabilities in all aspects of life by raising disability awareness through programs and information.

The NOD gathers information by conducting surveys, assessing the life quality and overall social statues of individuals with disabilities. The most recent survey, released June 24, 2004, indicates a continuing trend from previous surveys conducted in 1986, 1994,

1998, and 2000. (Transition to Adult Living, 2007, p. iv)

The most recent survey found that people with disabilities remain twice as likely to drop out of high school (21 percent compared to ten percent). Only 35 percent of people with disabilities reported being employed full or part time, compared to 78 percent of those who do not have disabilities. (Transition to Adult Living, 2007,p. v)

Obstacles of Disabled

Students with disabilities must overcome the serious obstacles that can interfere with their education. The problem is that they are held to the same standards as the general population. This is a problem because not all individuals with a disability can perform in the same capacity as those individuals who have no disabilities. The playing field is not even or fair.

Because the playing field is not even, these students may need to work harder, study longer, and have more one on one instruction according to their needs in order to graduate and find successful employment.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE 2002 PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

President's Commission 2002

On October of 2001, President Bush created the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education. In order to improve services for disabled individuals, the commission held 13 hearings and meeting throughout the United States, and the report was completed by July 2002. The Commission found many things that needed to be changed in order to provide and ensure that disabled individuals have access to the tools and services that ensure a strong academic foundation which is necessary to succeed in school and life.

According to the commission, the IDEA assists in creating and enforcing laws concerning disabled children. Unfortunately the IDEA puts more emphasis on procedures than on results. In other words, the IDEA should focus on seeing if their procedures are producing positive academic results in disabled children (p.7). The Commission (2002) also found that many school districts wait for a child to fail before they intervene, and sometimes, not even then. According to the President's

Commission (2002), the school districts put little effort into identifying and preventing learning problems of students. In addition, the Commission suggests that disabled students should get help at an early age where assistance could be most effective (p.7).

However, the current system lacks accuracy, in identifying students with disabilities. The result is that many children are misdiagnosed. The current system lacks teachers who have advanced training that deal with students with disabilities.

According to the Commission (2002), because disabled students require highly qualified instruction, the commission, instructors and educators must receive better preparation (p.8).

The Commission (2002) also reported that the current system lacks research into innovative techniques that may aid in the instruction of students with disabilities. This is because the current system focuses on regulations and not outcomes or learning strategies to benefit disabled students. To add salt to an already stinging wound, when a parent's child fails in special education, the parents don't have many resources to help their child succeed academically (p. 8).

President's Commission of 2002: Observations on Key Issues in Special Education

The following areas are mentioned because they are key issues that affect services that disabled students with learning disabilities could potentially take advantage in order to better their education. The commission outlines the problems of special education process it goes through from academics to funding.

Assessment and Identification

In the assessment and identification of disabled individuals, the President's Commission found that there was a lot of red tape and that the process needed to be less bureaucratic in order to provide accommodations. In an attempt to solve this problem the Commission recommends that research on learning disabled students should begin at an early age (p.21).

Postsecondary Results for Students with Disabilities and Effective Transition Services

Because the drop out rate among disabled individuals is high and the unemployment rate is close to 70%, the Commission proposes that the school districts should simplify the Federal Requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The Commission also recommends

changes to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. They state that these laws established in both IDEA and the Rehabilitation Act should work together in order to reduce the unemployment rate of disabled individuals (p.43).

Advisory Committee to Study the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

This is an extremely important Act for disabled students at the school district level and at the college level. Due to the amount of complaints from disability advocates, which included administrators, parents, and students, the advisory committee was formed. The objective of this committee was to review the regulations and requirements of this Act in order to determine why the majority of disabled individuals were, and still are, unemployed. The other objective was to increase the number of disabled individuals working. Yet another objective was to improve the transition services required by this act (p.45-46).

No Child Left Behind Act

On January 8, 2002 George W. Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act (NLCB) into law. The objective of this act was to make sure that every boy or girl, regardless of whether they are disabled or not, was learning. Thus, to

ensure and implement this act, President Bush requested a billion dollar increase to 8.5 billion dollars of funding for the IDEA. This means that the government will be spending an additional \$1,300.00 per student (pg.3-4). This proves there is funding. The question is it being spent appropriately to prepare disabled students to go to College.

Transition Services

According to the President's Commission (2002), transition services are not successful, because the high unemployment rate is still very high. In addition, the Commission states that the disability laws are too complicated, therefore it was recommended that there be less red tape so that all the people, from the student to the parents, educators, and administrators, would have a better understanding of their rights (p.46).

Competitive Employment and Postsecondary Education

Research indicates that an early foundation for the learning disabled is fundamental during the early years of the academic life of a child if they are to succeed in school and attend college. According to the President's Commission (2002), the majority of adults ages from 21-64 are unemployed. The Commission (2002) further states that

children with learning disabilities should be taught at an early age, so strategies and techniques used to teach learning disabled children can be employed to prepare these students for a higher education (p.47).

The Role of Parental Involvement

As I discuss in the introduction, the law states that parents have the right to be involved in their child's education. Parents complained to the Commission (2002) that there wasn't enough information about transition services. The Commission recommends school districts to provide to the parents all the services in relationship to transition services. This includes school district and outside sources such as services that help disabled students to succeed at the college level (p.49).

Teacher and Administrator Preparation Training and Retention

According to the Commission (2002), the United States does not provide adequate services to disabled students because many of the special education instructors are not properly being prepared, trained, or recruited (p.52).

The Shortages

According to the Commission (2002), there's a shortage in the instruction of special education and related

services. In the school year of 1999-2000 more than 12,000 for special education openings were left vacant according to the Department of Education and were filled by regular school teachers (p.52).

Teacher Certification and Licensure

The US Department of Education estimates 200,000 special education teachers will be needed by the end of 2010. However, universities only have the personnel to prepare 100,000 teachers. Even though, all states require special education instructors to be licensed, all states vary in procedures. According to the Commission (2002) there has to be better control over the results and preparation of teachers (p.52).

The National Shortage of Special Education and Related Services Professors

The President's Commission (2002) is concerned with the lack of available faculty to teach special education and train future special education instructors. Unfortunately, there are not that many special education instructors with doctorates. Having a PhD in special education allows individuals to become involved in research that may result in different and better pedagogical approaches. However, as more tenured faculty approach

retirement, there are fewer doctoral candidates to fill present and future opening. As a result, the Commission recommends that there should be a good foundation and training in the various areas of special education at the teaching and administrative level. Additionally, they should teach these doctorate students good research skills in order to teach the future educators of tomorrow (p.56-57).

Special Education Research and Dissemination of Information

At the federal level, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) supervises and funds personnel preparation as well as technical assistance in order to assist students with disabilities (p.59).

Improve the Current Grant Review Process

According to the President's Commission (2002), the OSEP has come to the conclusion that it needs to improve the grant review process. It appears to be focused on giving out services. Instead it should be there to review and improve the research. Several Special Education experts stated to the Commission how the grant review process is done. For them, it is not done appropriately. The special education experts state this is based on the fact they have

years of experience in doing federal grant applications. In order for disables to succeed their must be funding to spend money in research in Special education, so that the disabled community could benefit from this. Without research and appropriate funding the future of Special Education could be jeopardized (59-60).

CHAPTER FIVE
CASE STUDIES AND INTERVIEWS

Case Studies

Case Study A: Being Learning Disabled at the
Elementary Level

Respondent C, is from Southern California and has a developmental disability. She spent the majority of her time in special education classes throughout her K-12 academic life. Despite all of the academic troubles she had during elementary school, she did obtain an associate degree from a community college.

Respondent C's Child's Medical History

Respondent C has a child in kindergarten and receives special education services. She wants her daughter to pursue a college education, however, Respondent C understands that for this to become a reality, her daughter needs individualized attention and services in order to reduce the educational and achievement gap caused by her disabilities. Without these specialized services, Respondent C's daughter will be unable to compete at the college level.

The child has multiple disabilities and sicknesses, asthma, lara malasia, speech impairment, trachea malasia, auditory processing disorder, developmental delays, and gets febrile seizures.

Infant Program

Respondent C's daughter, has been considered permanently disabled by the Social Security Administration since she was 3 months old due to her disabilities. This allowed her to be part of an infant county program for almost three years, starting at the age of two months until the age of three years. The program employed an instructor who taught this child the necessary educational concepts that provided a strong academic and social foundation for her to succeed in preschool.

Rocket Program: Preschool for Disables

Respondent C's daughter was also a part of the Rocket Program; the purpose of which is to prepare disabled preschool children for kindergarten. She was in this program from 2006-2008. This program consisted of 3 instructional aids and a teacher, and the class size ranged from 4-8 students.

Respondent C was happy because her daughter was getting individualized help. This child obtained a strong

social and academic foundation through individualized help, where teachers taught her strategies and techniques to deal better with her disability.

However, when the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) meeting took place in April of 2008, the teacher from the Rocket program and the school district recommended regular kindergarten classes. However, she would also receive special education services such as speech therapy, adaptive PE, and resource help to accommodate her disabilities. Respondent C was extremely concerned as to why this school district was going to put her daughter in regular classes, when she had already been assessed and classified as an individual who would benefit more from a special day class versus a regular kindergarten class. The teacher saw her struggling to focus. She stated this on her past reports and verbal conversations (the teacher was more detailed about disability issues) indicated this child had several disabilities (medical documentation confirms that). As well, this teacher stated this child was going to be immersed slowly into a regular class.

According to Respondent C, the school district was penalizing the child for having a preschool teacher as a mother. The school district assumed that because she got

extra help at home she didn't need a special day class.

In the meeting, the idea that respondent C was an ex preschool teacher was reinforced constantly. Respondent C and Respondent E (her mother) felt this was an excuse to send this child to a regular class and perhaps save the school district money. It is reasonable to assume that the school district was trying to save money by placing Respondent C's daughter in regular classes, as the school district employees indirectly stated that Special Education funds could be cut due to the cutbacks in education in California. However, the California Special Education Code 56505 states that no school district can give the excuse to not provide services based on budget constraints (p.31). However, according to Respondent C, this school district indirectly did this (Respondent C interview).

According to Respondent B an advocate, who was not at this IEP meeting, the school district is considered to be one of the best school districts in Southern California; however it is not perfect. The school is considered to be the worst school in the school district because on the fact that that it is considered a Title I school. A Title one school is a school that is considered to be lowest school

based on the annual school test scores (Respondent B interview).

Respondent C and E were not happy with the outcome that Respondent C's child was going to a Title I school. Respondent C wants her child to go to college, but she understands that her child must have a strong foundation for this to become a reality. This is the reason why Respondent C was so insistent on getting her child into special day classes instead of regular kindergarten classes, as these day classes would better prepare disabled students by providing them with a strong academic foundation.

The Characteristics of the School that Respondent C's Child Would Attend

The school Respondent C's daughter attends is a title one school, which is considered a low status learning facility. According to Respondent C, at this school, 85% of the students speak Spanish as their primary language according to the principal of this school. A student with Special Education needs, such as Respondent C's daughter, will be better prepared because she has an academic foundation.

Differences Between Being Placed in a School with English and Non-English Speakers

Now what if this child attended kindergarten where the majority of the students are English speaking? Then the student's disabilities will show if their first language is English. This is based on observations made by Respondent C. For instance, during extra curricular activities, such as beginning ballet and piano, respondent C's child is the one who receives more personalized attention (in these classes these are pure English speakers) (Respondent C interview).

According to Respondent B, because this student is placed in a Spanish speaking class, her disabilities may not be that visible. She is only perceived as doing well in these Spanish dominant classrooms because these classes move at a slower pace, and she already has the necessary academic foundation to do well in school. Moreover, she appears to do well, and her disabilities go unnoticed because she already speaks English, so she has an advantage over the other children. Furthermore, because she appears to be doing well, she is not getting the necessary services she's entitled to. This could cause the school district to take away her services, as she appears to not need them

based on being in this classroom. As a result of her being placed in this class, there may be future consequences in terms of her being adequately prepared for college (Respondent B interview).

Academic Year 2008-2009

When the academic year 2008-2009 started, this child was in kindergarten. At various school events, Respondent C saw her child was in a class where more than half the students didn't speak a word of English (it is considered an English only class). Their mothers and fathers spoke little or no English at all.

Respondent C was concerned since the first day of school because her child was placed with Spanish speaking students. What respondents B, C, E and family members predicted was that this child would be more prepared than the rest, and this was true. The 1st two months the child got awards. According to the teacher, she was one of the top students due to the fact that this child had a foundation in English since an infant. This is when the teacher began to notice something was wrong.

Again, Respondent C's daughter is only perceived as doing well in these Spanish dominant classrooms because these classes move at a slower pace. However, due to the

communication barrier of the other students she's not benefitting because she is not getting the appropriate services. Also, everything she was taught at the rocket program (preschool for disables) is being repeated in kindergarten. If she continues in this setting until 12th grade, then the child will not be able compete at the college level (Respondent C interview).

The November Individualized Educational
Plan Meeting 2008

In a parent conference meeting held in October of 2008, the kindergarten teacher saw some disabilities that the mother and family members had also observed. This is when the teacher began to notice something was wrong. As a result, an IEP meeting was scheduled for November.

This wasn't an easy meeting according to Respondent C. One school district employee was infuriated that this child's mother requested a meeting. A program specialist observed this child for 5 minutes and stated she didn't need a special day class. Instead, the program specialist felt inclusion was the way to go, using a very systematic approach.

Respondent C was outraged because these specialists were not being advocates for her daughter. It became a

battle between this program specialist and Respondent C's family members. The family stated that the goal was for this child to attend college later in life. The family member emphasized the importance of being placed in a special day class. In a special day class, strategies could be taught to this child to better deal with her disability and prepare her to attend college. In this meeting, family members argued that if this child is not placed in a special day class with more individualized attention, then this child won't have the skills to succeed in college.

However, the program specialist had Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and despite this disability was able to get two Master's degrees. She felt based on personal experiences if she was able to be in regular classes and succeed, then all disabled individuals could succeed in regular classes as well.

Then when the family member of the child claimed that you couldn't compare ADD with a learning disability, the program specialist was quiet. In other words, this program specialist was treating all disabilities equally, which is a tendency that some people have based on my personal experience.

In this meeting, it was agreed that the child would have a psychological examination to see if she had a learning disability. This was done in order to make decisions about the child's appropriate placement for the academic year 2009-2010 (Respondent C interview).

Respondent B's Involvement

Respondent B, who is a friend of Respondents C's family, felt she may have an auditory processing disorder (Respondent B interview). In April 2009, an educational specialist tested her and she now officially has this disorder and was diagnosed with developmental delays also. Due to this condition the child does not process information correctly or quickly (Respondent C interview).

Annual Individualized Educational Plan Meeting April 2009

In April 2009, an IEP meeting was conducted. The principal of the child's school had been very supportive in this process. In this meeting, the speech therapist began doing her job by advocating for Respondent C's daughter weaknesses in comparison to November 2008 meeting where she is finally advocating to get Respondent's C's daughter better services for her disability.

The speech therapist opinion was that this child's disabilities cannot solely be corrected by regular class adjustments or special education services. Respondent B states it was good that the speech therapist saw this child had disabilities because this was an indirect indicator that she could be placed in a special day class instead of a regular class.

Now the school district noticed what the mother and the family members see to a certain degree. This school district is considered to be one of the best school districts in Southern California, even though it is not perfect. Because Respondent C's child began attending this school, she now had people who would be advocates for her child such as respondent B and her family. However, what happens to a mother or father who does not know the rules? The issue is that their children suffer, and if they want to go to college, they will suffer or fail (Respondent C interview).

Assessment of the Case Study

Through my research and my own experiences with disability issues, I have come to the conclusion that these special education instructors need more in depth training in order to deal with disabled children's many needs.

I also believe that the term IEP (Individual Education Plan) should be just that--individualized. So many of these children, are lumped together, even though each student's disability is individualized. In other words, not all of these student's disabilities can, nor should they be, generalized. As a result, these children get older and loose out on many important opportunities such as attending college and getting a high paying job.

To say a parent cannot call an IEP meeting when they feel that their child is not getting their needs met, is a violation of the law. In California, Sec. Code 56343(c) allows a parent to make an IEP meeting request at any time in order to question or suggest additional services (Community Alliance for Special Education (CASE) 4-2).

The Perspective of a Special Education Teacher

In analyzing this case study, I try to give another perspective in regards to the pressures of the school district. Respondent F gives his experience based on working for 31 years as a special education teacher. He also gives his opinion on Respondent C's situation as well as other special education issues.

The Issue of Inclusion

In regards to inclusion, Respondent F does believe that Respondent C's child is caught in the system, where sometimes school districts are trying to look good on paper by having disabled students in regular classes. He believes special education teachers are pressured to use inclusion and put mild/moderate disabled students into regular class. Furthermore, he has concerns about the IDEA least restrictive clause, which puts students in a regular classroom setting first. However, if they have disabilities, they are given services on a case by case basis.

On the other hand, to get services there is a lot of red tape according to respondent F. Respondent F also believes some school districts take advantage of this. In other words, they make the process very tedious to the point that the parents of the disabled children often become tired of the system and give up. This in turn saves the school district money. But regardless of the red tape, Respondent F believes the correct approach parents should take is to be advocates for their children as much as possible.

The Issue of Disabled Students with a
Foundation Being Placed in Title I School

For Respondent F there is no surprise what Respondent C's child has gone through. In the school district that he works for, he has seen disabled students in Spanish speaking settings where the disabilities of the student are overlooked. Again, because respondent C's daughter was placed in a Spanish speaking class, her disabilities went unnoticed. As a result, Respondent C had to advocate for her daughter to ensure her daughter received services.

Respondent F believes what Respondent C is doing is good by being an advocate for her child. He believes that by using the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Respondent C is doing a good job by putting pressure on the school district to follow the guidelines. By doing this, it makes the school district accountable. Respondent F does sympathize with students and parents in this kind of a situation because at many Title I schools, the employees don't know the rules of the IDEA (Respondent F Interview, 2009).

Do School Districts Want Special Education Students Going to College?

For Respondent F, even though the IDEA states that disabled individuals have the right to pursue a higher education, the reality is that schools focus more on test scores. According to respondent F, these test scores focus on the schools overall ratings (which dictates if they are within standards in the federal law). For instance, principals receive less pressure where school ratings are high. The principle is solely concerned with keeping his or her school in "good standing", and as a result, ignores the importance and right to academic preparedness for those disabled students who wish to pursue a higher education (Respondent F interview).

Case Study B: A Disabled College Student

This case study is based on Respondent A who is a latino visually impaired student with a possible learning disability. He is currently a student at one of the 23 campuses of the California State University system. I discuss, in a chronologic order, the issues that he has dealt with from elementary school to the present. The objective of this case study was to illustrate that many of

the rules and the regulations were used incorrectly at the school district and higher education levels.

Respondent A's Childhood and the Lack of Using
the Individuals of Disabilities Act

The Individuals with Disabilities Act 1975 states that parents have the right to be informed about the laws and regulations concerning children with disabilities in order to utilize the services available to their children. Respondent A's parents have been very helpful; however, since his childhood up to the present, his parents have had difficulty understanding the English language.

According to Respondent A, the school districts that he attended weren't helpful to him or to his parents. He believes that the school districts, as well as current government programs, take advantage of the fact that his parents speak minimal English. The schools he attended never provided the appropriate information. For instance, the IDEA 1975 states that even if parents don't speak English, they have the right to request a translator and written information in their language.

In this case, Respondent A's parents should have had the IDEA rules and regulations in Spanish. Knowing these

rules would have given the parents of Respondent A the tools to help their son.

In the 1980's, during grade school, one of the teachers at one of the schools that he attended thought he had a learning disability, but no one tested him. He was part of the special education program in a regular class setting with resource help. In other words, he would leave the class room to get the individualized help. He felt he was disadvantage academically. However, the school district never recognized that he had any problems. Instead, the school district and educators believed he was at the same level as the rest of his class. However, according to Respondent A, he believes he should have been placed in a special day class to build a strong academic foundation because this lack of foundation at the k-12 level has affected his ability to perform well at the college level (Respondent A Interview).

Community College

In 1998, he started in community college and was passed in spite of his inability to perform well in his classes by instructors. According to Respondent A, the counselors of the community college took advantage of the fact that he didn't see. For example, Respondent A was not

provided paper work such in Braille to inform him of his progress. When he transferred to the California State University system, the community college told him that he completed all general education classes.

However, at the university, he found out that the community college misinformed him. He discovered he had to take more general education classes. Respondent A believes, since he is visually impaired, that the counselors should be his eyes.

These counselors should have been advocates for respondent A due to his inability to see. Moreover, these counselors should have been familiar with the policies surrounding disabled students and implemented them accordingly.

California State University

In the fall of 2002, Respondent A entered one of the 23 campuses of the California State University System. In the fall quarter, he was forced to change majors from business administration to liberal studies because his learning disabilities were affecting his performance. He started to feel more aware of his learning problems. Business administration was very complex for him, so he chose liberal studies with a non-education track. Even

though Liberal Studies is a much simpler degree to obtain for Respondent A, in the spring quarter of 2003 he had a 0.9 GPA, and his overall GPA was a 1.53 GPA.

The Formation of the Committee

Because of his low academic status in the winter of 2004, an Associate Dean assigned a student to become Respondent A's mentor who would be an advocate and teach him skills that were not taught during from K-12. A Associate Dean of this particular California State University formed a committee in order to help Respondent A improve his GPA. It lasted from 2004-2006. It consisted of Respondent A's Department of Rehabilitation counselor, Student with Disabilities director, and counselors from the university. According to Respondent A, he does not have the knowledge to defend his position or request the proper services. Moreover, he believes that committee took advantage that he couldn't see (Respondent A Interview).

California State University System Assessment

The following findings illustrate how respondent A's needs were not and are not being met.

2003 Assessment

The objective of the assessment was to see if the 23 campuses of the California State University system were

following the rules and regulations at the students with disabilities centers. The office of the Chancellor set the following goals:

- Administration and management of the DSA program provide effective internal control; clear lines of organizational authority; delegations of authority; formation of an Advisory Committee on Services to Students with Disabilities; and documented policies and procedures.
- The adequacy of and satisfaction with the DSA program are consistently monitored and assessed.
- Campus notification and grievance processes ensure appropriate compliance with regulatory requirements and timely and adequate resolution of noted disability-related issues.
- Persons and campus areas providing disabled student services possess the necessary qualifications and are appropriately trained and aware of their roles and responsibilities.
- Reasonable access and accommodations are provided to applicants and employees in compliance with Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and

student disability services comply with state law and California State University (CSU) and campus policies.

- Verification of disability is timely and adequately performed, and appropriate documentation is provided in compliance with CSU and campus policies.
- Disability records and information are properly maintained, safeguarded, and retained in accordance with state and federal regulations and CSU policy.
- Campus programs, services, and activities are readily accessible to all persons, and adaptive aids and other equipment are properly maintained and safeguarded.
- Campus disaster plans include evacuation procedures for disabled persons.
- Budgeting procedures adequately address program funding and ensure effective accounting and management control, and grant funds are administered in compliance with sponsor agreements.
- Charge backs for disability support services are complete, accurate, valued properly, and processed

timely, and credit is received. (2003 Disability Support and Accommodations Report p.1)

The Results of the Assessment

Of the 23 campuses, 10 were audited. According to this committee all of these universities "provide reasonable assurance that CSU was in compliance with applicable federal and state regulations, and for the most part, the DSA program operated effectively" (2003 Disability Support and Accommodations Report p.1).

However, they admit that the campuses that were audited need to improve in the areas such as media services, and to follow the guide lines of the American Disabilities Act in all services provided to the disabled student (2003 Disability Support and Accommodations Report, p.4).

Law Suit

Since the services that were discussed in the Assessment of 2003 were not implemented correctly, in December of 2005, a lawsuit was filed against the university by Respondent A and nine other plaintiffs. The law suit was filed because these students believed that the entitled services were not being provided.

This specific California State University never acknowledged their responsibility. However, they admitted they needed to improve their services. In June of 2007 these 10 students won the lawsuit. It was the court who mandated changes that were adopted and implemented by the university in January of 2008 (Respondent A interview).

Unresolved Issues for Respondent A

Respondent A believes that the law suit has helped him to a certain degree. However, when it comes to learning disability issues there needs to be an improvement in services.

For instance, Respondent A is visually impaired. Many people such as Respondent B(advocate) and D (CSU Dean) believe respondent A has a learning disability. He requested the university to exam him for a learning disability. According to Respondent A, the Students with Disabilities Center, refused to perform diagnostic exams and give an explanation.

However, Respondent A was tested for a learning disability by a private psychologist. The outcome was that the psychologist believes that respondent A has a learning disability; however, he is not aware of a test to diagnose a learning disability for someone who is visually impaired.

The exam that he performed on respondent A was based on personal knowledge, but it does not demonstrate whether or not Respondent A has a learning disability.

Because Respondent A, had to seek testing from an outside source, his situation suggest that there are not enough prepared individuals in special education at the school district nor at the higher education level (Respondent A interview).

Analysis of Respondent D

According to Respondent D, an Associate Dean from a public university, in 23 campuses of the California State University system, only 50-60% of non-disabled individual students take remedial classes in writing and math although not all of these students are considered learning disabled. However, based on these statistics, he recommends that an IEP assessment should focus on specific learning strategies so a learning disabled individual can compete at the college level.

This is why Respondent D believes that there should be a system where IEP assessments don't end at 12th grade because there are so many disabled college students who need these assessments. He argues that students with learning disabilities need a strong foundation in order to

compete at a college level and argues that IEP assessments which address specific learning strategies should be addressed at a national level to improve many problems that occur at both the K-12 and college level (Respondent D Interview, 2009).

I agree with him. According to Bamforth (2009), a writer for the Kansas City Star newspaper, the parents of a student with physical and learning disabilities sued the Olathe school district of Kansas because the student wasn't being adequately prepared for college.

The parents of this 18 year old disabled individual claim that the school district was not performing its obligation by providing an ". . . annual IEP goal of a 'favorable ACT score that would facilitate his transition to a four year college'" (Bamforth, 2009, para. 2).

The ACT is a national entrance exam which tests high school juniors and seniors for college preparedness. This case serves as a perfect example of how school districts are not preparing disabled individuals for college. Moreover, this case illustrates the need for a College IEP assessment, as many disabled individuals who need help can go unnoticed because various school districts refuse to take responsibility.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

I chose to investigate whether or not special education departments of school districts and universities follow the federal law in preparing students with learning disabilities to succeed in college because I'm a graduate student with an advanced learning disability. In addition, I have a back nerve impingement injury. It motivated me to do this research because, despite the rules and regulations, there is a lot of red tape disabled individuals have to go through in order to obtain services. I am amazed that many k-12 school districts and universities fail to take responsibility for disabled individuals. In other words these schools and universities do not take responsibility when they do not provide services or prepare Special Education teachers, all of which result in a poor academic foundation.

I'm one of the rare cases, who has overcome and earned a bachelor degree. Now I'm pursuing a master's degree. However, many disabled people don't complete college degrees work for a living.

The Individual with Disabilities Act (1975) states a student should be placed in a regular class setting first. However, the IDEA also states that each student should be getting services based on their disability. According to respondent B, when someone has a strong foundation in a special day class and makes the transition gradually toward inclusion education, they will develop the tools to succeed at a university level (Respondent B Interview).

I agreed with this position I was part of a special education program. I spent the first 5 years in special education classes and with the exception of the fifth year when I was placed in one regular class. In Sixth grade, I attended four regular classes and two resource classes. In seventh and eight grade, I had resource help at a private catholic school. However, I had a difficult experience in high school. It wasn't good for me, but I had foundations that help me compete at the university level.

I mention my personal experience because I was part of a different method of inclusion. Unlike the inclusion methods in place in today's schools, I was introduced into regular classes at a slow pace. This gradual process provided me with the time necessary to acquire the necessary skills needed to compete at the college level.

The President's Commission of 2002 states that the current system waits for a student to fail rather than intervene at an early age. As a result, children's disabilities are not being diagnosed at an early age, when the child would benefit most. Therefore, I believe that today's method of inclusion is not as efficient as the method that was practiced when I was going to school.

Instead, I was fortunate that I was diagnosed with a learning disability at the young age of five. But what happens to those who have not been as fortunate as I have, because they have not been diagnosed at an early age? One possible consequence is that these individuals may not have an adequate academic foundation, resulting in poor academic performance and even failure. I have known students that have learning disabilities who were not placed correctly and did not graduate. For example, 70% of disables don't work (Presidents Commission, 2002 p.43)

The Issue of Adequate Personnel in Special Education

Another key issue that may contribute to a poor academic performance among disabled individuals is that there are not enough qualified Special education instructors and staff within local schools, colleges and

universities. According to Evans et al.(2005), in California only seven institutions offer special education doctorates where half of all doctorates pursue higher education. From 1994-2000 only 6 people graduated with a doctorate. Doctorates are scarce. Therefore assessments have been made as to the lack of preparation there is in regards to special education instructors. Evans et al.(2005), believes due to the lack of available doctorate programs in special education, there is a lack of innovative research techniques in special education that are necessary in order to discover how to better teach learning disabled students.

One possible reason there is a shortage of special education teachers is because many school employees, such as teachers, are afraid to be advocates for disabled students because they are afraid to lose their jobs. This is a major problem as advocacy is crucial in setting the academic foundation necessary for disabled individuals to succeed at the college level.

An example of such a case is from an adaptive PE specialist, who has a Ph.D. in the field. While working for the Portland school district, she wrote letters to various administrators advocating for academic improvements for

learning disabled individuals. As a result of her being an advocate for these disabled students, she was fired. She filed a lawsuit and won one million dollars(Wright p.1-9). However, according to the respondents A through F, the majority of the employees who work for school districts, and who work for disabled individuals have to be careful, because if they are not, they could be fired.

As mentioned earlier, all of the respondents I interviewed come to the conclusion that there are not enough qualified special education personnel, at any level, to deal with the learning disabled.

Disabled Students Being Placed in Dual Immersion Classes

Respondent B, an advocate for children with disabilities during IEP meetings, has concerns about disabled students being placed in dual immersion classes (classes where there are many students who speak more Spanish, when disabled students are placed in these classes then the disabilities of the individual are over looked). The issue is when students who have learning disabilities may be part of the preschool rocket program (ages 3-5) may be placed in title one schools. Title I schools have the lowest standard in evaluating schools in school districts.

If these students are placed in Title I schools where some school students have limited English skills, then it should be obvious that if the learning disabled students from the rocket program are placed in Kindergarten regular class at title I schools they will be superior.

According to Respondent B, some schools start eliminating services due to the fact that the child is doing well. He also, states this one of the factors that sometimes learning disables are not able to compete at a college level due to the lack of a strong foundation (Respondent B Interview). However, if these students are placed with English speaking students then their disabilities are more noticeable displayed. Respondent B uses this argument over and over at IEP meetings to get learning disabled more services at Title I schools or to be placed in a special day class.

Early Intervention is Key for Learning Disabled

Once a student is diagnosed with a learning disability, their disability will remain with them for their rest of their life. According to Dr Lyon (2003), a frequent consultant for ex President Bush on educational policy, there are ways to improve a learning disability by early intervention programs(p.2). The website Kid Source

states that at a young age and at the high school level planning is key to be competitive for college(p.1).

The Family of Learning Disabled Must be Advocates

In the literature review, I discuss Respondent C's dilemma that despite that there are rules and regulations to ensure the rights of disabled individuals, she spends a lot of time advocating for her daughter. Even if the school district is consider to be good, it is not perfect and to get services, Respondent C has to struggle.

Respondent C is knowledgeable about the services her daughter is entitled to as well as how difficult it can be to get those services. However, many parents of disabled children are unaware of what their children are entitled to in terms of educational services. Moreover, these parents may not know how to get these services for their children. Unfortunately, the consequences of this dilemma are that those disabled children suffer as they are not being provided with the necessary academic foundation in order to compete at a higher level of education. Hence, if these disabled students pursue a college education, they may suffer academically because they lack foundational skills because their parents didn't know how to advocate for their children.

College Level

At the college level, the American Disabilities Act focuses on the basics, but not at preparing learning disabled students to be able to compete in areas such as writing, where college professors don't care whether or not a person is learning disabled. They want results, and that's the bottom line.

The ADA primarily advocates for people with physical disabilities. However, the learning disabled person's they get extra time to take a test, which is beneficial. But at the same time, studying for an exam for a learning disabled person is extremely challenging. It is imperative that universities should provide study strategy classes for students with learning disabilities. A strong foundation at the school district level will help also. In order for this to be resolved the president of the United States must take an active role.

Barack Obama gave a live news conference on C-span, July 24, 2009. During this conference he discussed issues surrounding the ADA and other topics related to disabilities. In this conference and others, the president focused on the issue of disabled individuals being able to work, but he never discussed the problems with getting

people prepared to work. For example, he never mentioned what learning disabled individuals needed to do to get a job--a college education. Also, in this news conference and others, he never mentioned the findings and recommendations of the Presidents Commission of 2002 that still need to be worked on.

If the President is not concerned with fixing the problems that individuals with learning disabilities face, such as receiving the proper training and academic foundation needed to go on to college in order to get a well paying job, then who will be? After all, if these issues are not part of the public and political conversation, then these problems will never be addressed or solved because change begins with communication.

Recommendations

If these recommendations are implemented improvement could happen.

School Districts

- K-12 school should intervene in diagnosing the child's disability. Research shows when intervention occurs at an early age. Disabled students get better services,

and therefore get a strong foundation in order to be able compete at the college level.

- Parents should be given in-depth information in how to defend the child rights. For instance, school districts should always be organized and give with enough anticipation the IEP meeting date which dictates the future of the child. This is key so that the parent could consult with many experts in order to help their child.
- Inclusion should be done when it's appropriate. For instance, when there is a strong academic foundation then this student could compete at a regular class.
- Respondent B believes that for a student to get to inclusion the transition should be done slowly. For instance, a student should be placed in a special day class for 4 classes and two classes in regular class. This way the student is slowly in the process of attending a regular class and having a strong foundation.

College

- Colleges should offer classes exclusively for disabled students that help them with their learning

disabilities so that they may succeed in college. For instance, there should be classes such as English composition that focuses on methods to educate learning disabled students. In other words, these classes much like English classes for basic writers and non-native speakers.

- Base on my research some universities have education centers exclusively for learning disables. However, there should be more centers for learning disables at universities so that students with learning disabilities could succeed at the college level.

Cooperation Between the School Districts and College

- School districts and colleges should work together to find methods for learning disables. For instance, there should be more report such as the President's Commission of 2002 to finds solutions and implement these to improve the areas of the learning disables at the school district and college level.
- In addition, to federal reports in special education investigations should be performed at the local level. For example, college instructors and administrators should work with special education teachers and

administrators from local school districts to address strategies should learning disabled students should be taught in order to compete at the college level.

- The Federal government should create a checks and balances system to investigate whether schools (K-12 and colleges) are providing the proper services to learning disabled students.

APPENDIX A
ACRONYMS USED IN RESEARCH

ADA	American Disabilities Act
CASE	Community Alliance for Special Education
IDEA	Individuals with disabilities Act
IEP	Individualized Education Plan
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
NCLD	National Center For Learning Disabilities
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
NLCD	National Center For Learning Disabilities
PAI	Protection and advocacy, Inc.
SELPA .	California Special Education Local Plan

APPENDIX B
RESPONDENTS

All the respondents allowed me to put their experiences in this report as long as I didn't put their name. As well the interviews were done informally. I have known the majority of these people for years.

Respondents

I used these respondents to examine whether or not public education is preparing learning disabled students to succeed at the College level.

The following is a brief description of the respondents' background and the topics that were discussed:

Respondent A:

He is visually impaired college student, currently working on his Bachelor's degree.

Topics that were discussed?

His experience and obstacles at the school district and College levels.

Respondent B:

He is Program manager for a non-profit organization who defends disabled students at the school district level, college level, and in government programs.

Issues that were discussed?

The American disabilities Act 504: IDEA the evolution of this law

Higher Education

His personal experiences in dealing with people at the school district and higher education level

Respondent C:

She is disabled herself and also has a disabled daughter.

What topics were discussed?

Respondent C's disabled daughter story.

Respondent D:

He is an Associate Dean for a California State University campus.

What topics were discussed?

His experience of over 30 years and issues that were discussed

Respondent E:

The mother of respondent C had a son and daughter in special education in the 1980's and 1990's at the school district k-12, and granddaughter in the last 5 years. She has seen at the school district level from k-12 and at the college level the various obstacles of getting services her family members have gone through. She has advocated for her family members in order to get services.

What Issues were discussed?

Her experience and dealing with the school district level.

Respondent F:

This individual has been a special education teacher for an elementary school for 31 years.

What Issues were discussed?

His experience and his opinions on inclusion and the various aspects of Special Education were discussed.

REFERENCES

- Bamforth, K. (2009, January 31). Family of disabled south senior alleges district hasn't prepared him for college. *Kansas City Star*. Retrieved February 2, 2009 from <http://www.kansascity.com/115/story/1008177.html>
- California Department of Education. (2008, January). *Closing the achievement gap: Report of superintendent Jack O'Connell's California P-16 council*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- California Department of Education. (2009, January 12). *California special education local plan areas (SELPA)*. Retrieved October 18, 2008 from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/as/caselpas.asp>
- California Department of Education. (2007). *Transition to adult living*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- California State University Board of Trustees. (2008, July 3). *Disability support and accommodations systemwide report number 02-33*. Retrieved from http://www.calstate.edu/audit/Audit_Reports/dsa/2002/0233DSASystemwide.pdf

College planning for students with learning disabilities.

Retrieved April 12, 2009 from

<http://www.kidsource.com/kidsource/content3/college.planning.LD.html>

Community Alliance for Special Education (CASE) &

Protection and Advocacy, Inc. (PAI). (2009). *Special education rights and responsibilities* (9th ed.).

Retrieved from

<http://www.disabilityrightsca.org/pubs/504001.pdf>

Evans, S., Eliot M, Hood J., Driggs M., Mori A., & Johnson, T. (2005). Assessing the special education faculty shortage: The crisis in California—a statewide study of the professoriate. *Teacher Quarterly, Fall*, 7-21.

Harchik, A. (2005). Including children with special needs in regular classrooms: Pros and cons. Retrieved March 6, 2009 from

http://www.newsforparents.org/experts_inclusion_pros_cons.html

Lederman, D. (2005). *College and the disabled student.*

Retrieved October 18, 2008 from

<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2005/07/29/disabled>

Lieberman, L. (1996). Preserving special education for those who need it. *Controversial issues confronting*

- special education: Divergent perspectives* (pp. 16-26).
Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Fast facts*. Retrieved October 26, 2009 from
<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=77>
- National Center for Learning Disabilities, Inc. (2006, April). *Overview of IDEA Parent Guide*. Retrieved January 29, 2009 from
<http://www.ncld.org/content/view/902/456086/>
- Patriarca, L. & Travnikar, B. (2003, January). G. Reid Lyon's views on re-thinking learning disabilities: An introduction. *LDA Newsletter*, 1. Retrieved from
<http://www.ldame.org/docs/Rethinking%20LD.pdf>
- Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (Eds.). (1996). *Controversial issues confronting special education: Divergent perspectives*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Swartz, S. (2003, June 3). *Autism: Treatment and inclusion*. San Bernardino, CA: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1995). *Civil rights of students with hidden disabilities under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (2002). *A new era: Revitalizing special education for children and their families: President's Commission on excellence in special education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education Publication Center.

Vaughn, S. & Bos, C. (2008). *Strategies for teaching with learning and behavior problems* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Wisconsin Education Association Council. (2007, March 15). *Special education inclusion*. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from http://www.weac.org/Issues_Advocacy/Resource_Pages_On_Issues_One/Special_Education/special_education_inclusion.aspx

Wright, P. (2004, April 4). Ninth circuit upholds jury award of one million to fired special ed teacher. Retrieved February 25, 2006 from <http://www.wrightslaw.com/info/retaliate.settlegoode.htm>