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Postsecondary Education for Students with Learning Disabilities

RON NELSON
BENJAMIN LIGNUGARIS/KRAFT

ABSTRACT: Increasingly, students with learning disabilities are attending community colleges and traditional 4-year colleges and universities. This article presents the results of a review of the literature on services available or recommended for students with learning disabilities. The results suggest that postsecondary institutions have begun to provide a wide array of services to these students. There is little empirical evidence, however, on the effectiveness of those services. An agenda for future research is also discussed.

Increasing numbers of students with learning disabilities are pursuing postsecondary education in community colleges and traditional 4-year higher education institutions (Adult Committee of the Association of Children with Learning Disabilities, ACLD, 1982; Decker, Polloway, & Decker, 1985; Ostertag, Baker, Howard, & Best, 1982; Ugland & Duane, 1976; White et al., 1982). For example, college officials at 106 California community colleges reported that 7,982 learning disabled students were receiving services through the community college learning disability programs (Ostertag et al., 1982). Moreover, in a survey of adults with learning disabilities, 14% reported they had tried college and dropped out, 32% were currently attending college, and another 9% reported that they had completed their baccalaureate degrees (White et al., 1982).

College officials have developed an increasing number of support programs in response to the influx of learning disabled students on college campuses (Mangrum & Strichart, 1983a). The number of support programs has increased for several reasons. First, the enactment of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was a major impetus for establishing postsecondary programs for learning disabled students. Second, the development of services at the college level is an outgrowth of services provided initially in elementary schools and later in junior and senior high schools (Decker et al., 1985; Gray, 1981a; Mangrum & Strichart, 1983a; Sedita, 1980). Third, the ACLD and other national and local organizations have campaigned actively to persuade college and university personnel to develop programs to assist these students on college campuses. These lobbying efforts, combined with student interest in attending college, have brought pressure on colleges to develop programs to assist students with learning disabilities (Mangrum & Strichart, 1983a). Finally, many colleges face declining student enrollments. Learning disabled students with the potential for college success represent a source of new enrollments for colleges (Mangrum & Strichart, 1983a).

The purpose of this paper is to review the literature on the types of services available to learning disabled students and identify additional services needed in postsecondary institutions. In addition, future research needs are discussed.
LITERATURE REVIEWED

The literature examined was identified through a computer search of the Exceptional Child Education Resources Abstract, Dissertation Abstracts, and Psychological Abstracts. Descriptors included learning disabled, dyslexia, disabilities, academic failure, learning programs, postsecondary education, adult education, higher education, and continuing education. In addition, an ancestral search was conducted from the identified articles. Articles reviewed referred specifically to programs or discussed the need for programs for learning disabled students (or other commonly used classification labels, such as dyslexia) at community colleges or traditional 4-year higher education settings and were published following the enactment of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Articles not included in this review were those that examined specific characteristics (e.g., written language) of college learning disabled students or referred to postsecondary settings other than community colleges or traditional 4-year higher education institutions (e.g., vocational technical schools). A total of 31 articles were identified: 14 articles were surveys of services (8) to support learning disabled students in postsecondary institutions, or descriptive evaluations of specific programs (6), and 17 articles were discussion papers.

The surveys and program descriptions are presented in Table 1. (A complete listing of the discussion papers reviewed is available from the authors on request.) Respondents were identified as directors or coordinators of college learning disabilities programs, college faculty, or students with learning disabilities. In addition, each article was examined for counseling services, instructional accommodations, and administrative accommodations provided to learning disabled students.

The types of counseling services offered were delineated as personal or social, program or academic, and career or vocational counseling. Instructional accommodations included services provided by colleges and instructional adaptations left to the discretion of individual faculty. Finally, administrative accommodations included alternative admission criteria and the addition of special remedial courses to the college curricula.

IDENTIFYING THE COLLEGE STUDENT WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

In general, a clear understanding of learning disabilities is lacking in many college programs (Cordoni, 1982a). There is little consensus on appropriate measures for identifying adults with learning disabilities (Blackburn & Iovacchini, 1982; Cordoni, 1982a; Gray, 1981b; Hoy & Gregg, 1986). Moreover, there is a lack of consistency in admission criteria across programs (Ostertag et al., 1982). In some colleges, services are available on request or following student and parent interviews (Blalock & Dixon, 1982; Hoy & Gregg, 1986), whereas other programs require lengthy psychoneurological testing or psychoeducational testing to determine if there is a significant discrepancy between aptitude and achievement (Cordoni, 1979; Gajar, Murphy, & Hunt, 1982; Miller, McKinley, & Ryan, 1979; Ugland & Duane, 1976).

Some of the programs described in this review served only students who were designated as learning disabled according to the definition of learning disability found in Public Law 94-142, whereas other programs served a broad array of low-achieving students. For example, programs that admitted students based on the definition of learning disabilities found in P.L. 94-142 included Pennsylvania State University, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Rochester Community College, Metropolitan Community College, and Normandale Community College. In contrast, the program for students with learning disabilities at Kingsborough Community College served students with a broad array of learning difficulties and emotional problems (Siegel, 1979), and admission to the Wright State University program was based on a high-average IQ, evaluations from former teachers, a personal interview, and a 100-word statement by applicants indicating why they had applied for the program (Bireley & Manley, 1980).

SERVICES PROVIDED

Most colleges provided similar types of services to students in learning disabled programs.

Counseling Services

Counseling services were often cited as a necessary component of a program for students
# TABLE I
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Provided by College</th>
<th>Provided by Faculty</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Barbaro (1982)     | Adelphi University; 22 students with learning disabilities (LD) entered 5-week diagnostic session. 19 were enrolled in the fall. (IQ range was 90-121 with a mean of 101.) | Diagnostic Assessment:  
- 5-week diagnostic session (formal and informal testing).  
- Student must sign a contract to participate in all services.  
Counseling:  
- Academic  
- Personal (individual and group)  
- Parents (group sessions) | Tutoring by full-time educators | Special Admission Procedures:  
- Untimed SAT scores  
- Submission of WAIS or other evidence documenting a handicapping condition  
- Letter of recommendation from the LD specialist  
- Interview students and parents Funding:  
- $2,000 tuition surcharge  
- Study-skills classes | At the end of the 1st year, 16 (84%) were still enrolled  
GPA of students Number GPA  
1 3.3-3.6  
4 3.0-3.2  
3 2.7-2.9  
4 2.3-2.6  
3 2.0-2.2  
1 1.7-1.9  
2nd year, 15 (78%) remained enrolled |
| Bireley & Manley (1980) | Wright State University program for LD students; 3 LD students (2 male, 1 female) | Diagnostic services not indicated  
Counseling:  
- Program advisement, students are placed in 1 difficult course, 2 courses of moderate difficulty, and 1 course of minimal difficulty.  
- 2 counseling sessions to relieve anxiety and academic pressure. | Tutoring  
- Tape-recorded textbooks | Proctors for exams | 1 participant did not fulfill the terms of the contract established with program coordinator and was dropped; 1 transferred; 1 successfully completed degree |

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan

Continued on next page
TABLE 1 Continued
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Provided by College</th>
<th>Provided by Faculty</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Blalock & Dixon (1982)     | Telephone survey: Program administrators of college LD programs identified in American Council on Education bulletin and other directories | Diagnostic Assessment:  
  - Suggests using formal and informal assessment tools  
  - Counseling programs in interpersonal skills (individual and group) | Remediation of reading, writing, and spelling  
  - Tutoring for academic classes by peers and professional staff  
  - Tape-recorded textbooks  
  - Note takers  
  - Typing service | Allow tape recorders for note taking | Provide classes designed specifically for students with learning disabilities  
  - Study-skills classes  
  - Waive selected program requirements  
  - Allow reductions in course load | Barriers to postsecondary education include entrance requirements; number of courses/semester, and GPA requirements  
  - Recommends development of assessments that reflect adult norms |
| Cordoni (1979; 1982b)     | Project Achieve at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale:  
  In 1981, 46 students were in the program. | Diagnostic Assessment in:  
  - Language functioning  
  - Math: PIAT, WRAT, WAIS  
  - Self-concept: Tennessee Self-Concept Scale  
  - Social skills Counseling:  
  - Use of peer advocates to teach social skills | Tutors  
  - Advocates  
  - Talking books  
  - Tape recorders  
  - Computerized programs to cover course material  
  - Typing lessons  
  - Remedial training in identified weak areas | Oral administration of tests | Special sections of regular courses for students with learning disabilities | Program is in the initial stages of development (no specific data indicated) |
| Gajar, Murphy, & Hunt (1982) | Pennsylvania State University Program for LD students. 12 students: 7 male, 5 female | Diagnostic Assessment:  
  - Formal assessments (WAIS and Woodcock Johnson).  
  - Informal assessments also conducted. | Taped texts  
  - Typing lessons | Extended exam period | Study-skills workshop.  
  - Alternative class provided for foreign language requirement. | 2 students completed degree program  
  - 9 students are receiving passing grades in courses. |

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gajar, Murphy, &amp; Hunt (1982) (Cont.)</td>
<td>Counseling (Academic): IEP specified long- and short-term objectives, strategies for achieving objectives, and evaluation criteria.</td>
<td>Provided by College</td>
<td>Provided by Faculty</td>
<td>Allow student to tape record lectures</td>
<td>Students decrease dependence on services as they progress through school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrum &amp; Strichart (1983a, 1983b) Directors of college LD programs listed in a number of national college directories</td>
<td>Diagnostic Assessment:</td>
<td>Most programs use peer tutors who completed or are currently enrolled in class.</td>
<td>Allow student to tape record lectures</td>
<td>Special Admission Procedures:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Areas assessed included academic skills, language, perceptual processes, study skills, personality, and self-concept.</td>
<td>■ Note takers.</td>
<td>■ Alternative test procedures: untimed tests; take-home tests; test readers, and special projects</td>
<td>■ Open admission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Tests included WAIS, PPVT, Slosson, PIAT, WRAT, Key Math, Woodcock Johnson, DTLA, Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination, and informal tests.</td>
<td>■ Tape-recorded textbooks.</td>
<td>■ Submission of WAIS or other IQ test to judge students' academic potential.</td>
<td>■ Cooperative admission procedure: LD college program staff make admission recommendations to Director of Admissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Diagnostic testing to plan remediation and tutoring services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Untimed ACT or SAT scores.</td>
<td>■ Letters of recommendation from subject area teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan.
### TABLE 1 Continued
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mangrum &amp; Strichart (1983a, 1983b) (Cont.)</td>
<td>Counseling: Academic:</td>
<td>Provided by College</td>
<td>Provided by Faculty</td>
<td>Special course offerings in study skills, learning strategies, time and stress management.</td>
<td>Withdraw from courses without grade penalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Reduced course-loads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Balancing courses in regard to level of difficulty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Enrolling in classes that meet several times a week instead of once a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Cooperation between learning-disabilities staff and faculty (Barat College; College of the Ozarks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal: a. Individual and group counseling to reduce anxiety and promote socialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individuaal Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan.

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Provided by College</th>
<th>Provided by Faculty</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, Anderson, &amp; Skolnick (1987)</td>
<td>100 faculty at a northeastern university; 65% of sample responded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of faculty will allow:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Extended completion deadlines of class assignments (61% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Partial credit (72% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Alternative assignments (61% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Oral presentation of written projects (65% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Proctors (61% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f. Alternative form of exams (58% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g. Extra time to complete tests (79% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h. Oral responses to exams (66% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Take exams in separate rooms (79% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of faculty will allow the student to withdraw from a class after the cutoff date (53% of faculty).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Majority of faculty will not allow substitution of course for a required course (40% of faculty).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop advisory committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inservice for faculty and admission staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan

Continued on next page
TABLE 1 Continued
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, Anderson, &amp; Skolnick (1987) (Cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j. Provide student with a detailed syllabus (87% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td>All three students successfully completed coursework over a 6-month period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k. Tape-record lectures (87% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students required a large number of contacts (30 minutes to 2½-hour meetings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of faculty will not allow:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Extra-credit assignments not available to other students (58% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Copies of instructor’s lecture notes (45% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Poor grammar without penalizing the student (46% of faculty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, McKinley, &amp; Ryan (1979)</td>
<td>Colorado State University; 3 LD students (2 graduate and 1 undergraduate).</td>
<td>Diagnostic Assessment:</td>
<td>Conducted to help students understand their learning problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling:</td>
<td>Academic (individual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal (individual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan
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TABLE 1 Continued
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller, McKinley, &amp; Ryan (1979) (Cont.)</td>
<td>107 faculty at a Northwestern college; 76% of sample responded.</td>
<td>- Tape recorders&lt;br&gt;- Copies of lecture notes&lt;br&gt;- Assignment accommodations include: alternative assignments, extended deadlines&lt;br&gt;- Examination accommodations include: extra time, oral instead of written exams&lt;br&gt;- Proofreaders</td>
<td>- Faculty in Education are more willing to provide support services than faculty in Business or in Arts and Sciences.&lt;br&gt;- Faculty in Business are more willing to provide alternative assignments and extend deadlines on assignments than faculty in Arts and Sciences.&lt;br&gt;- Need to replicate nationwide and evaluate effectiveness of accommodations.</td>
<td>Bob—2 contacts per month for 2 years&lt;br&gt;Marie—40 contacts in 9 months&lt;br&gt;Max—25 contacts in 4 months&lt;br&gt;- Advocacy is an important component in LD programs.&lt;br&gt;- Inservice to faculty is also needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>Instructional Accommodations</td>
<td>Administrative Accommodations</td>
<td>Results and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ostertag, Baker, Howard, & Best (1982) | Surveyed 106 California Community Colleges serving 7,962 LD students; respondents were coordinators of handicapped services, (41% of programs), instructors in LD program (27% of programs) and psychologists, counselors, or other faculty (27% of programs). | Diagnostic assessment (95% of programs):  
- WRAT, PIAT, and PPVT-R used by more than 70% of programs; DTLA, Woodcock-Johnson, Wepman Auditory Discrimination, WAIS-R and Key Math Diagnostic Test by more than 50% of programs.  
- IEPs maintained on more than 98% of students.  
Counseling (as part of LD program):  
- Academic (90.9% of programs)  
- Personal (84.1% of programs)  
- Career (86.4% of programs)  
Counseling (external to LD program):  
- Academic (85.2% of programs)  
- Personal (80.7% of programs)  
- Career (81.8% of programs) | Tutoring by: specialist in LD (67% of programs), peer (62.5% of programs), aide (80.2% of programs), and faculty (28.4% of programs)  
- Reader (80.0% of programs)  
- Note taker (75% of programs)  
- Classroom accommodations (85% of programs) | Registration service (80% of programs)  
- Extended time to complete degree (23.8% of programs)  
- Course substitutions (7.5% of programs)  
- Class load reduced (63.8% of programs)  
- Extend time to complete course (36.3% of programs) | Academic skills found most difficult by students were reading, writing, spelling, math, and oral communication. |

*Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan.*

*Continued on next page*
### TABLE 1 Continued
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parks, Antonoff, Drake, Skiba, & Soberman (1987) | 223 graduate and professional schools (32% of sample respond)  
- 132 graduate schools  
- 46 law schools  
- 28 dental schools  
- 17 medical schools | Diagnostic Assessment:  
- Diagnostic evaluation (52.5% of schools)  
- Report prepared on results of assessment (40.4% of schools)  
Counseling:  
% 46.6% indicated services available  
% Through institution (44.8% of schools)  
- Specific LD counselors (22.4% of schools)  
- Refer to other agencies (39.5% of schools) | Support Services:  
- Tutoring (61% of schools)  
- Audiovisual resources (46.2% of schools)  
- Writing (48.9% of schools)  
- Word processing (34.4% of schools)  
- Note taking (48.3% of schools)  
- Vocabulary development (35.8% of schools)  
- Listening skills (39% of schools)  
- Exam-taking skills (51.1% of schools)  
- Reading (43.5% of schools)  
- Special instructions on use of library (52.5% of schools)  
- Preparation for exams (48.4% of schools)  
- Use of microcomputers (43.5% of schools)  
- Use of calculators (32.3% of schools) | Accommodations:  
- Extra time on exams (65% of schools)  
- Oral vs. written exams (56.1% of schools)  
- Taped test responses (42.2% of schools)  
- Dictated written reports and assignments (49.3% of schools)  
Specific Admission Criteria:  
- Transcripts (18.4% of schools)  
- Special admission tests (11.7% of schools)  
- Untimed scores accepted (14.8% of schools)  
- Other documentation (e.g., letters) (15.2% of schools)  
- LD specialist recommendations (13.0% of schools)  
% On-site interview (4.5% of schools)  
% Parent interview (3.1% of schools)  
- Additional tutorial costs for program (4.5% of schools)  
- Written plan for serving students with LD (4.5% of schools)  
- Extension of program of studies (51.1% of schools) | |

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan
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TABLE 1 Continued
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siegel (1979)</td>
<td>Kingsborough Community College</td>
<td>Diagnostic services not indicated</td>
<td>Tape-recorded texts</td>
<td>Special classes and courses in study skills, social skills</td>
<td>Students reported liking the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugland &amp; Duane</td>
<td>3 Minnesota Community Colleges serving 150 students with learning disabilities:</td>
<td>Diagnostic Assessment:</td>
<td>Tutorial services in basic skills and course content</td>
<td>Copies of lecture notes</td>
<td>Average GPA improvement—0.14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. One-to-one (47% of students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The longer a student was in the LD program the greater the improvement in GPA. Differences between the GPA for a control group were reduced by ½ by the end of the academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Small group (29% of students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost per student = $150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normandale Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taped lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course completion rate in English higher than math at Normandale and Metropolitan. Recommendations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inservice training of faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referred to vocational rehabilita-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop procedures for diagnostic assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tion for talking-book services (23% of students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan
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TABLE 1 Continued
Surveys and Descriptions of Learning-Disabilities Programs in Postsecondary Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ugland &amp; Duane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Develop operating agreements between community agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Evaluate why there are differences among departments in course-completion rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ 90% of faculty aware of program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ 46% could identify specific services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveyed 420 instruc-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ 63% of faculty were optimistic about LD student's success in their course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tors; 24% (101) re-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ 15% of faculty unsure about students' capacity to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sponded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ 19% believed LD students could not succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ 8% suggested that students not be admitted until basic learning problems are remedied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Counseling Services</th>
<th>Instructional Accommodations</th>
<th>Administrative Accommodations</th>
<th>Results and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vogel &amp; Adelman (1981)</td>
<td>8 college LD programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College of the Ozarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kingsborough Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barat College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metropolitan State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Curry College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Southern Illinois University at Carbondale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Westminster College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wright State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagostic Assessment: College personnel indicated that diagnostic testing was beneficial to planning coursework. Counseling: Academic Career Personal</td>
<td>Tutoring Taped texts Readers Proctors for tests Taped lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Admission Procedures:</td>
<td>Programs need to integrate student with LD into the college environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided by College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provided by Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test; WAIS = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; GPA = Grade point average; PIAT = Peabody Individual Achievement Test; WRAT = Wide Range Achievement Test; PPVT = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; ACT = American College Testing; DTLA = Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude; IEP = Individualized Education Plan*
with learning disabilities (Blackburn & Iovacchini, 1982; Decker et al., 1985; Stichart & Mangrum, 1985; Vogel, 1982). In 12 of the 14 surveys or program descriptions, college officials reported that students were provided some type of counseling service.

Counseling services typically included (a) personal or social counseling, (b) academic or program counseling, and (c) career or vocational counseling. For instance, in three Minnesota Community College programs, 81 of 150 students (54%) received social counseling, 45 of 150 students (30%) received program counseling, and 78 of 150 students (52%) received vocational counseling services (Ugland & Duane, 1976). In another survey (Ostertag et al., 1982), college officials of 106 California community colleges reported that 96 of the community colleges (91%) provided students academic counseling, 89 provided students personal counseling (84%), and 91 provided students career counseling services (86%).

**Personal Counseling.** Personal counseling was provided to help students with their social and interpersonal skills and to provide support in coping with the stresses of academia. Personal counseling services differed in how they were delivered (i.e., individual or group) and in who provided the counseling (i.e., specialist or peer). Strichart & Mangrum (1985) suggested that specialists in learning disabilities should provide both individual and group counseling for academic stress. For example, at Kingsborough Community College, a specialist in learning disabilities conducted a social skills training program to teach students how to successfully interact with faculty and friends. In contrast, in the program at Adelphi University, social workers provided personal counseling individually and to groups of students (Barbaro, 1982). Initially a social worker interviewed each student and developed a psychosocial history. Based on the interview, each student received individual counseling. Group counseling sessions, conducted by the social worker, helped students manage their time and improve their communication skills with faculty and peers.

**Academic Counseling.** In 12 of the 14 surveys or program descriptions, college officials reported that students were provided academic counseling. In a majority of programs, academic counseling involved a two-step process. First, diagnostic testing was conducted to determine program eligibility. Second, the test results were used to prescribe an individualized academic plan.

The quantity and quality of diagnostic workups varied widely among college programs. Most programs usually confined their assessment to basic IQ and achievement measures (Cordoni, 1982a; Ostertag et al., 1982). Diagnostic assessment was recommended in a number of academic areas, including receptive and expressive language, reading level, written language, and math reasoning and computation skills (Vogel, 1982). At three Minnesota community colleges, students were diagnostically tested in a number of areas, including oral and written language, academic skills, auditory and visual processes, study skills, and self-concept. Most colleges used standardized measures, such as the Wide Range Achievement Test, the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, the Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude, the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, the Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test, the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale—Revised, and the Key Math Diagnostic Mathematics Test (Ugland & Duane, 1976). Similarly, in Project Achieve at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, students were assessed in academic areas, self-concept, and social skills (Cordoni, 1979).

Prescriptive planning, the second step in academic counseling, involved using the diagnostic assessment information to develop individualized education plans (IEPs) that specify long- and short-term objectives, learning strategies, and evaluation criteria. Ostertag et al. (1982) reported that IEPs were maintained for over 98% of the students in learning disabilities programs in California. The recommended components of an IEP at the college level varied across programs. In programs that emphasized support services, accommodations that directly assisted students in the college classroom were identified in the IEP. Typically, it was recommended that the IEP include compensatory strategies. At Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, students’ IEPs included course content tutoring, talking books, use of tape recorders for lectures, computerized programs to cover course material, and alternative testing.
procedures (Cordoni, 1979). In programs that emphasized remedial services, it was recommended that IEP objectives address basic skill training as well as compensatory strategies.

**Career Counseling.** A variety of career-counseling services are recommended for learning disabled students (Hoy & Gregg, 1986; Salend, Salend, & Yanok, 1985; Siperstein, 1988; Strichart & Mangrum, 1985). Siperstein (1988) suggested that students be provided career-awareness workshops (i.e., self-assessment, job exploration, and job assessment), job-search-strategy workshops (i.e., preparing a resume, writing cover letters, and interviewing techniques), and job-maintenance-skills workshops (i.e., goal setting, responding to employer feedback, interacting with fellow employees, and employee responsibilities). Career counseling, however, was identified as an important program component in only 3 of the 14 surveys or program descriptions (Ostertag et al., 1982; Ugland & Duane, 1976; Vogel & Adelman, 1981). For example, Ugland and Duane (1976) reported that of 150 students, 80 students received vocational counseling. The Kingsborough Community College program provided a comprehensive career or life planning course that included units in career awareness; job interviewing; resume writing; and evaluating one’s own abilities, interests, and values (Vogel & Adelman, 1981).

It is not clear, however, whether career counseling should be delivered in groups or individually, or whether the counseling should be provided by peers or by specialists.

**Instructional Accommodations**

Instructional accommodations include course modifications or support services to help students in college courses. Two types of instructional accommodations were identified. The first type of instructional accommodation is service provided by the college, such as notetakers, tutors, taped textbooks, interpreters and textbook readers, typists, and computers. The second type of accommodation is service provided by individual faculty, such as allowing students to tape-record lectures and providing alternative testing procedures, self-paced instructional modules, extended assignment deadlines, copies of lecture notes, and alternative assignments.

A majority of the college officials reported that learning disabled students were provided some instructional accommodation by the college. Specific instructional accommodations, however, varied across programs. For example, Ostertag et al. (1982) reported that students were provided tutorial support, textbook readers, and notetakers; whereas Ugland and Duane (1976) reported that students were provided only basic-skills and course-content tutoring. At Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, students received a broad array of services, including tutors, talking books, tape recorders, advocates, and computerized printouts that summarized course content (Cordoni, 1979).

Differences in tutoring services provided by colleges were consistent with their program objectives. College officials who advocated a remedial focus provided students basic-skills tutoring and course-content tutoring. In contrast, college officials who advocated a support-service approach provided only course-content tutoring. Remedial services varied in how they were provided (i.e., individual tutoring, group tutoring, or special remediation courses) and in how they were provided (i.e., specialist, peer, or faculty). The College of the Ozarks and Barat College advocated intensive individual tutoring, but at Curry College, two or three students were tutored together (Vogel & Adelman, 1981). Siperstein (1988) suggested that remedial services might be provided through a series of compensatory skill workshops, whereas students in California received tutoring for basic-skills deficits from a peer, from an aide, or from a faculty member (Ostertag et al., 1982). However, the basis for receiving tutoring from peers, aids, or faculty members was not identified.

Instructional accommodations provided by faculty included those classroom adaptations made at the discretion of individual faculty. These accommodations varied across programs. In a survey of directors of college programs, Mangrum & Strichart (1983b) reported that instructional accommodations provided by faculty included additional time to complete coursework and alternative testing procedures. In contrast, Ugland and Duane (1976) reported that the instructional accommodations provided by faculty included allowing students to tape lectures, providing copies of lecture notes, and providing alternative test procedures.
An important consideration was how willing faculty were to provide accommodations in their classes. In only three studies were faculty surveyed concerning their willingness to provide students different accommodations (Matthews, Anderson, & Skolnick, 1987; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, in press; Ugland & Duane, 1976). Matthews et al. surveyed all the faculty at a small northeastern public university. The majority of faculty were willing to provide daily class accommodations, such as tape recording lectures, and assignment and examination accommodations, such as alternative assignments and testing procedures. The majority of faculty were not willing to provide copies of the instructors' lecture notes, nor were they willing to provide disabled students with extra-credit assignments that were not available to other students. In another study, Nelson et al. surveyed all the faculty of a small northwestern university. Nelson et al. reported results similar to those reported by Matthews et al. In addition, Nelson et al. reported there were statistically significant differences among the College of Business, College of Arts and Sciences, and College of Education faculty in their willingness to provide students instructional accommodations. In general, College of Education faculty were more willing to provide course accommodations than were either Business or Arts and Sciences faculty. In addition, faculty in the College of Business were more willing to provide assignment and exam accommodations than were faculty in Arts and Sciences.

The results of these two studies suggest that faculty are willing to provide learning disabled students some accommodation in college classes. The type of assistance, however, is likely to vary based on the college. These conclusions should be viewed cautiously because the small samples in these studies may not be representative of college faculty in general.

Administrative Accommodations

Administrative accommodations include modifications in college admission policies and procedures and program funding mechanisms. Modifications in college admission policies that contribute to identifying students with learning disabilities are advantageous to both the student and the university. Early identification of students requiring services permits the integration of services into a student's program during academic planning rather than in response to academic problems that develop later (Shaywitz & Shaw, 1988). Strichart and Mangrum (1985) suggested that subtest scores on intelligence tests or on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Testing (ACT) college entrance exams should be used to determine college aptitude, and letters of recommendation from learning disabilities specialists should be considered in the admissions process. The admission modifications identified in the colleges reviewed include the acceptance of untimed entrance exams and weighted consideration of letters of recommendation from learning disabilities specialists, high school grades, and interviews with students. For example, Barbaro (1982) reported on 22 students who were admitted to Adelphi University based on untimed SAT scores, a review of a recent IEP, high school grades, and letters of recommendation from the learning disabilities specialist at the students' high schools.

A reduced course load is also a recommended practice (Patton & Polloway, 1987; Vogel, 1982). In three of the surveys, officials reported that students were allowed to take reduced course loads and extend the length of their program of studies. In California, college officials reported that reduced course loads were allowed in 67 of 106 community colleges (63.8%) and extended programs of studies were permitted in 25 of the community colleges (23.8%) (Ostertag et al., 1982). However, the length of time programs might be extended and how much course loads might be reduced were not indicated.

One administrative function that has not been fully addressed is the funding mechanism for special programs or funding for students in special programs. Funding is an important consideration because the amount of money and the source of funds could influence the types of services included within the program. For instance, funding might affect whether a program provides individual counseling or group counseling; uses peer tutors or specialists; and provides remedial services as well as support services. Cordoni (1982b) reported that the cost of programs designed specifically for students with learning disabilities ranged from $3,000 to $10,000 per student per year. In contrast, Ugland and Duane (1976) suggested that a learning-disabilities program at the
community college level might be built on
eexisting services with little additional cost by
using peer tutors and existing community
resources. In some programs, these costs were
met by the institution; in other programs,
students were charged additional fees that
ranged from $150 to $2,000 (Barbaro, 1982;
Mangrum & Strichart, 1983a, Ugland &
Duane, 1976). Parks, Antonoff, Drakes, Skiba,
& Soberman (1987) indicated that in 80% of
the graduate and professional programs they
surveyed, the costs of special services were
met by the institution.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE
RESEARCH NEEDS

It is evident that many learning disabled
students attend community colleges and tradi-
tional 4-year institutions (ACLD, 1982; Decker
et al., 1985; Ostertag et al., 1982; Ugland &
Duane, 1976; White et al., 1982). Three factors
are associated with how services are provided
to these students. First, differences in program
emphasis and service delivery reflect differ-
ces in program objectives. Some college
officials reported that the principle objective
of their program was to provide students
basic-skills remediation. For example, at Kings-
borough Community College, a central pro-
gram component was remediation of basic skills
through peer tutoring and Audio Tutorial Lab
(Siegel, 1979). In contrast, some college
officials indicated that the objective of their
program was to support students in classes
rather than remediate their basic-skills deficits.
For example, at Wright State University,
students were provided course-content tutoring,
exam proctors and readers, access to tape-
recorded textbooks, and assistance from Vocca-
tional Rehabilitation (Bireley& Manley, 1980;
Vogel & Adelman, 1981). Still other programs
emphasized remediation of skill deficits and
support services. For instance, at three Minne-
sota community colleges, students were pro-
vided basic-skills tutoring and remedial courses,
as well as course-content tutoring, taped
lectures, and alternative testing procedures
(Ugland & Duane, 1976).

Provision of remedial services or support
services often reflects differences in the ex-
pected entry-level skills of students with
learning disabilities and differences in how
program administrators view the educational
role of postsecondary institutions (Vogel &
the teacher’s responsibility at the secondary and
junior college level is to teach content and not
remediate learning problems. Proponents of
support services also have argued that most
often a university student does not have the
time or energy to complete a remedial program
in addition to regular coursework (Ingram &
Dettenmaier, 1987). In contrast, basic-skills
remediation has been viewed as a necessary
ingredient for success in college-level course-
work (Sedita, 1980).

Second, the mission of the college appears
to influence the types of services provided
students. Community colleges have provided
opportunities ranging from preparation for the
general equivalency diploma (GED) to noncre-
dit special interest courses and vocational
training courses, whereas traditional 4-year
institutions offer students academic training in
a range of specific fields. Typically, 4-year
institutions have emphasized remedial training
less than have community colleges.

Third, the amount of funding allocated to
the program may be associated with how
services are delivered to students. For example,
the funds available to a program might deter-
mine whether the tutors are specialists in the
field of learning disabilities or peer tutors, and
whether a program provides individual or group
counseling.

There is little research available that college
administrators might use to design a service
program for students with learning disabilities
(Cordoni, 1979, 1982b; Gajar et al., 1982,
Putnam, 1984; Sedita, 1980). First, research is
needed on measures to identify adults with
learning disabilities. This research should lead
to establishing guidelines for determining pro-
gram eligibility (Decker et al., 1985; Gray,
1981b; Hoy & Gregg, 1986).

Second, descriptive research is needed to
identify services provided learning disabled
students. In particular, a national survey that
addresses the course accommodations that
faculty in community colleges and universities
are willing to provide students would be useful
information for career counselors in secondary
schools and academic advisors in universities.
In addition, research that describes the setting
demands of postsecondary educational environ-
ments would be useful in designing learning
plans for learning disabled students. Research
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in setting demands has provided a foundation for developing a number of intervention strategies for high school learning disabled students (Anderson-Inman, Walker, & Purcell, 1984; Schumaker & Deshler, 1984). Similar analyses of setting demand variables in postsecondary settings would provide a foundation for developing an effective and comprehensive service system in postsecondary education.

Third, little research examines the effect of individual program components on student achievement or the most effective and efficient way to structure program components. For example, Deshler and Graham (1980) suggested that material may be taped verbatim or text may be paraphrased and summarized. It is not clear how these approaches affect students’ class performance or if a particular structure of taped material might influence the development of study skills.

Finally, there is a need for longitudinal studies that examine what students do after graduation and that identify the services that students found most useful. This kind of information will provide program administrators with quantitative as well as qualitative data with which to evaluate their learning disabled programs.

Postsecondary careers are composed of transitions that include entering college, adapting to academic and social changes, and exiting college (Siperstein, 1988). It is clear that many postsecondary institutions recognize both the need and the responsibility to provide services that will assist individuals with disabilities to succeed in each transition. It is also clear, however, that we must devote more research resources and expend greater effort in developing programs that are both effective and cost efficient.

REFERENCES


The development of this article was partially supported by Grant #G008780011 from the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. The authors acknowledge Pamela Hudson and Deborah Smith for their helpful suggestions on an earlier draft of this manuscript. Requests for reprints should be sent to Benjamin Lignugaris/Kraft, Department of Special Education, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-6500.

Manuscript received October 1988; revision accepted March, 1989.