

**DISABILITY SUPPORT AND ACCOMMODATIONS**  
**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,**  
**FRESNO**

**Report Number 02-36**  
**November 13, 2002**

---

**Members, Committee on Audit**

Shailesh J. Mehta, Chair  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Vice Chair  
William Hauck    Dee Dee Myers  
Erene S. Thomas    Anthony M. Vitti

---

**Staff**

University Auditor: Larry Mandel  
Audit Manager: Michelle Schlack  
Senior Auditor: John Stegall

---

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

# CONTENTS

---

## INTRODUCTION

Purpose.....	1
Scope and Methodology .....	2
Background.....	2
Opinion .....	4
Executive Summary .....	5

---

## OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

Program Administration.....	6
Policies and Procedures .....	6
Program Management .....	7
Auxiliary Organizations and Off-Campus Facilities.....	8
Program and Physical Accessibility.....	9
Personnel Qualifications and Training.....	10

## **APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A:	Personnel Contacted
APPENDIX B:	Campus Response
APPENDIX C:	Chancellor's Acceptance

---

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

AAES	Academic Affairs Educational Support
AB	Assembly Bill
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
BA	Business Affairs
BP	Business Policy
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Chancellor's Office
CSU	California State University
CSU Fresno	California State University, Fresno
DSA	Disability Support and Accommodations
EO	Executive Order
PCD	President's Committee on Disability
SAM	State Administrative Manual
SSI	Student Satisfaction Inventory
SSD	Services to Students with Disabilities
UC	University of California

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

### PURPOSE

Our overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures related to the administration of the disability support and accommodations (DSA) program and to determine the adequacy of controls over the related processes to ensure compliance with relevant governmental regulations, Trustee policy, Office of the Chancellor directives, and campus procedures.

Within the overall audit, specific goals included making a determination as to whether:

- ▶ Administration and management of the disability support and accommodations 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.
- ▶ Chargebacks for disability support services are complete, accurate, valued properly, and processed timely, and credit is received.

## SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This review emphasized, but was not limited to, compliance with state and federal laws, Board of Trustee policies, and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters, and directives. July 2000 to March 2002 was the primary period of review.

We focused primarily upon internal, administrative, compliance, and operational controls over the management of the DSA program. Specifically, we reviewed and tested policies, procedures, and processes for:

- ▶ Monitoring the quality and effectiveness of campus DSA services.
- ▶ Soliciting and resolving student complaints and grievances relating to programmatic, physical, and other accessibility issues.
- ▶ Hiring DSA program staff and campus-wide training practices.
- ▶ Providing reasonable access and accommodations to applicants and employees.
- ▶ Verifying disabilities and providing (or declining) student disability support services.
- ▶ Maintaining and protecting disability information, including data in automated systems.
- ▶ Providing programs, services, and activities that are readily accessible to disabled individuals.
- ▶ Administering program and grant funds for disability support and other related services.
- ▶ Authorizing and processing expenditures of program funds that include, but are not limited to, grant awards, miscellaneous revenues, and petty cash.
- ▶ Valuing, processing, and collecting chargebacks for DSA services provided to self-supporting operations.
- ▶ Recording, safeguarding, and maintaining inventory for adaptive aids and equipment.

---

## BACKGROUND

As a result of a systemwide risk assessment conducted by the Office of the University Auditor during the last quarter of 1999, the Board of Trustees, at its January 2002 meeting, directed that *Disability Support and Accommodations* be reviewed.

The proposed scope of the audit as presented in Attachment B, Audit Item 2 of the January 29-30, 2002, meeting of the Committee on Audit stated that the review would include all CSU programs for disabled employees, students, and visitors including accessibility of facilities, provision of enabling supportive

services, and use of adaptive technologies. Potential impacts include excessive costs, adverse publicity, inadequate accommodations and services, legal liabilities, and regulatory fines and sanctions. A related audit, *Handicapped Access*, was performed in 1988.

Beginning in the early 1970s, both the federal government and the state of California adopted laws that had far-reaching effects on improving services to students with disabilities and on the availability of these services at the postsecondary level. In 1973, Congress adopted the Federal Rehabilitation Act ensuring equal opportunity for persons with disabilities in the fields of employment and education and prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability by any agency, including educational institutions that receive federal funds. In June 1977, the federal government issued regulations implementing Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. In response to Section 504 regulations, CSU campuses prepared self-evaluations that identified steps needed to ensure that students with disabilities had equal access to educational opportunities. In March 1980 and in response to the 1979 Budget Act, CSU also developed a policy statement that formalized the objectives of the Disabled Students Program to increase the enrollment of students with disabilities in the total student population and to facilitate their access to all educational programs. The *Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities* detailed program goals and objectives, definitions of disabilities, and support services to be offered. The policy became the basis from which campus programs were developed and justified enrollment and funding requests. In 1980, the CSU Systemwide Advisory Committee on Services to Students with Disabilities was also established.

In 1989, the CSU revised the 1980 policy statement and incorporated disability services identified in Assembly Bill (AB) 746 into the new *Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities*. In 1990, the federal government reinforced its commitment to individuals with disabilities by enacting the ADA. The ADA reaffirmed Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 regulations and extended the discrimination prohibition beyond the campus to businesses and organizations that did not receive federal funds. Additionally, the ADA detailed additional criteria in the areas of employment, new construction or renovation, transportation, and telecommunications. ADA also required the appointment of an ADA coordinator and the development of a self-evaluation and transition plan to itemize compliance steps.

In November 1995, the Bureau of State Audits issued a report, *CSU and UC: Campuses Generally Provide Access for Students with Disabilities*, including four CSU campuses and two University of California (UC) campuses. The report noted that overall, the chancellor's office (CO) of the CSU had developed adequate policies requiring respective campuses to comply with provisions of the ADA; all four campuses developed adequate guidelines to meet the needs of, and provide access to, their students with disabilities; and students at all four campuses indicated a high level of satisfaction with services provided by their respective campuses. Based on the audit results, the Bureau of State Audits also recommended that the CO increase campus awareness of ADA requirements by instructing its campuses to provide training classes or seminars for faculty and staff, and address conditions and remove barriers that may deny access to its students. The CO concurred with the findings and most of the recommendations in the report.

Disabled student enrollment at the CSU has grown from 3,760 to 9,699 students (a 158% increase) from fall 1980 to fall 2001. The number of students by disability category (visual limitation, communication disability, deafness, mobility limitation, learning disability, and other functional limitations) changed dramatically reflecting a growth of students with certain disabilities seeking services from the campus disability support services program. Most notably, the number of students with specific learning disabilities totaled 124 in fall 1980 (3.30% of students served) to 4,078 (42% of students served) in fall 2001.

Throughout the report, we will refer to the program as disability support and accommodations (DSA). At California State University, Fresno (CSU Fresno), the services to students with disabilities department, the ADA coordinator, programmatic managers, and other responsible individuals administer the DSA program.

---

## **OPINION**

We visited the CSU Fresno campus from April 22, 2002, through May 23, 2002, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

In our opinion, the administration and management of the DSA program provided reasonable assurance that CSU Fresno was in compliance with applicable regulations, CSU policies, and other directives. Through coordinated efforts, the campus demonstrated commitment to disabled employees, students, and visitors by providing signage, parking, telephones and maps in strategic and accessible locations on the campus; sponsoring an annual disability awareness conference; and establishing a web accessibility policy. However, our review disclosed that certain components of the DSA program needed improvement. Specifically, policies and procedures were not in place for certain aspects of the DSA program; processes and written agreements were not in place to ensure that auxiliary organizations and off-campus facilities complied with the ADA and other related laws and regulations; client surveys or other performance monitoring of student disability services, policies, and practices were not performed; and monitoring controls were not in place to ensure compliance with the campus web accessibility policy. Areas in need of improvement are referenced in the executive summary.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this section is to provide management with an overview of conditions requiring their attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [ ] refer to page numbers in the report.

### **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION [6]**

#### **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES [6]**

Policies and procedures were not in place for certain aspects of the disability support and accommodations (DSA) program. Proper development, documentation, and communication of written policies and procedures improve internal control and ensure that disabled students are properly served.

#### **PROGRAM MANAGEMENT [7]**

The campus had not performed client surveys or other performance monitoring of student disability services, policies, and practices. Performing client surveys reduces the risk of providing substandard disabled student services.

#### **AUXILIARY ORGANIZATIONS AND OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES [8]**

The campus had not established a process to ensure that auxiliary organizations and off-campus facilities comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other related laws and regulations. Sufficient control over auxiliary organizations and off-campus facilities reduces the risk that disabled students will not be properly served and that programs, services, and activities will not meet ADA accessibility requirements which could cause misunderstandings to occur.

### **PROGRAM AND PHYSICAL ACCESSIBILITY [9]**

Campus websites and computer labs were not fully accessible by all persons. Providing access to campus programs, services, activities, and communications reduces the risk of regulatory scrutiny, potential lawsuits, and negative publicity.

### **PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING [10]**

During interviews with ten disabled students, each noted at least one instance where a faculty person demonstrated a lack of awareness or insensitivity to their disability. Providing training to applicable personnel reduces the risk of noncompliance with campus and California State University (CSU) policies and state and federal regulations regarding disabled persons.

---

## **OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES**

### **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION**

#### **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Policies and procedures were not in place for certain aspects of the disability support and accommodations (DSA) program.

We noted that:

- ▶ Students communicated complaints related to physical and programmatic access issues to various distributed departments (e.g., Services to Students with Disabilities (SSD) and the University Courtyard), which had not established internal policies and procedures for accepting, researching, and resolving such complaints.
- ▶ SSD had not documented procedures for declining student disability services and accommodations.

CSU directive Academic Affairs Educational Support (AAES) 89-07/Business Policy (BP) 89-08, *Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities*, dated January 9, 1989, states that disabled student services directors shall establish campus guidelines to implement the provision of services.

State Administrative Manual (SAM) §20050 states that one symptom of a deficient internal control system is policy and procedural or operational manuals that are either not currently maintained or are nonexistent.

The SSD director stated that emphasis is to help the disabled student and that staff generally know how to process complaints. She also stated that documentation supporting all servicing decisions was maintained in the student files.

Failure to develop, document, and communicate written policies and procedures increases the risk that disabled students will not be properly served and misunderstandings will occur.

#### **Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the campus document policies and procedures for departmental functions such as accepting, researching, and resolving student complaints, and declining student disability services.

#### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Policy statements and specific written procedures regarding the processes of accepting, researching, and resolving student complaints, and of declining student disability services have been developed and are under review by the administration of the division of

student affairs. These statements will be incorporated into the existing policy and procedures document of the office of services for students with disabilities in January 2003.

## **PROGRAM MANAGEMENT**

The campus had not performed client surveys or other performance monitoring of student disability services, policies, and practices.

SAM §20050 indicates that there should be established system of practices to be followed in the performance of duties and functions and that it represents a control weakness if procedures are not established to assure that controls in all areas of operation are evaluated on a reasonable and timely basis.

The SSD director stated that while no survey was specifically directed to disabled students, other student satisfaction surveys conducted by the campus included questions that were directed to disabled students.

Not performing client surveys increases the risk of providing substandard disabled student services.

### **Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus implement a performance monitoring process for disabled student services that includes, but is not limited to, periodic student surveys.

### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. The following list outlines the planned performance monitoring process for disabled student services on both an annual and periodic basis.

- a. Campus policy stipulates that each campus program will be comprehensively reviewed every five years. The next scheduled program review will be in 2003-2004.
- b. A Noel-Levitz student satisfaction inventory (SSI) was administered by the campus to a stratified random sample (by class) of 918 students in spring 2002. Of this sample, 34 or 3.69% were students who indicated they had a “physical disability or a diagnosed learning disability.” This percentage is larger than that represented by students with disabilities (446 or 2.33%) within the total student body (20,007) in 2001-2002.

The survey provided baseline information regarding student satisfaction, both disabled and nondisabled, with many aspects of academic and students services provided at Fresno State. The campus plans to administer the SSI again in 2006.

- c. The chancellor’s office will administer questionnaires that seek to measure satisfaction/program effectiveness (approximately 20 items each) to students with disabilities and faculty at all CSU campuses in spring 2003. If the sample size is similar to the one administered in 1992, approximately 200 students with disabilities and 200 faculty members will be surveyed.

- d. Periodic questionnaires with questions that include those on the chancellor's office questionnaire in addition to specific local questions will be included in the fall 2003 SSD registrations mailing to all students with disabilities and every year thereafter.

## **AUXILIARY ORGANIZATIONS AND OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES**

The campus had not established a process to ensure that auxiliary organizations and off-campus facilities comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and other related laws and regulations.

We noted that the California State University (CSU) Fresno Association, Inc. had not documented barrier removal efforts or prepared a self-evaluation of its policies, procedures, and practices to comply with the ADA and other related laws and regulations.

The campus offered academic courses at various community colleges without the benefit of written agreements that included responsibilities for ensuring ADA compliance and ongoing accessibility by students to campus sponsored programs, services, and activities.

Title 5 §42401 and §42402 indicate that the campus president shall require that auxiliary organizations operate in conformity with policy of the Board of Trustees and the campus. One of the objectives of the auxiliary organizations is to provide management systems that allow effective coordination of the auxiliary activities with the campus in accordance with sound business practices. Sound business practice mandates that compliance responsibilities are sufficiently defined and executed, and operating agreements be complete and include applicable regulatory provisions.

Section 4.11 of the CSU *Policy Manual for Contracting and Procurement* indicates that contracts should include terms and conditions necessary to convey a clear understanding of each party's expected role, its obligations, and the parameters in which the activities must be carried out under the contract.

The director of facilities planning, who is responsible for ADA barrier removal and accessibility efforts at the campus, stated that he was not responsible for buildings and facilities operated by auxiliary organizations. The executive director of the CSU Fresno Association, Inc. stated that she had not considered ADA barrier removal and accessibility issues in the auxiliary's facilities. The SSD director stated that consideration of language inclusive of ADA compliance requirements in written agreements between the campus and community colleges began when the student health center negotiated a recent memorandum of understanding with the same entities for health care services. The SSD director further stated that an agreement addressing ADA requirements is presently being negotiated with the local community colleges.

Failure to establish controls and/or to ensure that facilities operated by auxiliary organizations and off-campus facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities increases the risk that disabled students will not be properly served and that programs, services, and activities will not meet ADA accessibility requirements.

### **Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Establish controls to ensure that the CSU Fresno Association, Inc. document barrier removal efforts and prepare a self-evaluation of ADA compliance for all related entities.
- b. Establish written agreements with off-campus facilities that include, but are not limited to, responsibilities for ensuring ADA compliance and ongoing accessibility by students to campus sponsored programs, services, and activities.

### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Corrective action will include the following:

- a. The CSU Fresno Association, Inc. will be directed to document barrier removal efforts and conduct a self-evaluation of ADA compliance. A memorandum documenting these requirements will be sent by January 31, 2003.
- b. Written agreements will be established between the campus and off-campus facilities to ensure that the off-campus facilities understand their responsibility to comply with ADA regulations, and to ensure that Fresno State students are provided with appropriate services for students with disabilities while at the off-campus facility. These agreements will be in place by June 30, 2003.

## **PROGRAM AND PHYSICAL ACCESSIBILITY**

Campus websites and computer labs were not fully accessible by all persons.

We noted that:

- ▶ A survey of 190 employees who attended web-training workshops offered since September 2000 was conducted by the campus. Although 16 of the 22 respondents had taken some action to address web accessibility for the disabled, the other six respondents had taken no action and a process was not in place to monitor these and other responsible individuals involved in web design for compliance with the campus web accessibility policy.
- ▶ A self-instructional lab in housing and residential life was not fully accessible by all persons. In addition, the campus had not developed standards that addressed computer lab accessibility for disabled individuals.

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 28, Part 35, *Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in State and Local Government Service*, §35.149, effective January 26, 1992, states that no qualified individual with a disability shall, because a public entity's facilities are inaccessible to or unusable by individuals with disabilities, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of the

services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any public entity.

CFR Title 28, Part 35, *Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in State and Local Government Service*, §35.160(a) and §35.160(b)(1), state that a public entity shall take appropriate steps to ensure that communications with applicants, participants, and members of the public with disabilities are as effective as communications with others, and furnish appropriate auxiliary aids and services where necessary to afford an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to participate in, and enjoy the benefits of, a service, program, or activity conducted by a public entity, respectively.

The campus *Interim Web Accessibility Plan*, dated June 18, 2001, states that the university's web office will provide ongoing monitoring of the university's website to assess compliance with the standards. A quality control process will be used to assess, on an ongoing basis, the continued accessibility of university web pages covered by this policy.

The web manager stated that funding was not provided during the prior fiscal year to hire staff to monitor campus websites for compliance with the web accessibility policy. She added that many campus areas lack the resources to make their websites and computer labs accessible to persons with disabilities. The director of housing and residential life indicated that she and her staff were not fully aware of the requirements to make the computer lab accessible to disabled residents.

Insufficient access to campus programs, services, activities, and communications increases the risk of regulatory scrutiny, potential lawsuits, and negative publicity.

#### **Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Implement monitoring controls to ensure that web designers comply with campus web accessibility policies.
- b. Develop standards that address computer lab accessibility for disabled individuals.

#### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Specific actions to be taken include:

- a. The campus will implement web accessibility monitoring controls consistent with the Interim Web Accessibility Plan by June 30, 2003.
- b. The campus will develop computer lab accessibility standards for disabled individuals by June 30, 2003.

## **PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING**

During interviews with ten disabled students, each noted at least one instance where a faculty person demonstrated a lack of awareness or insensitivity to their disability.

The President's Committee on Disabilities *2001 Summary of Annual Review of Campus ADA Plan*, dated December 17, 2001, states that students face continued frustration with faculty who are unaware of, and insensitive to, the needs of those with disabilities and that training in this area should be a high priority for the upcoming calendar year.

The Bureau of State Audits report, *CSU and UC: Campuses Generally Provide Access for Students with Disabilities*, dated November 24, 1995, states that to increase campus awareness of ADA requirements, the chancellor's office of the CSU should instruct its campuses to provide training classes or seminars for faculty and staff.

The associate vice president for academic personnel, the associate dean of the college of engineering, and the associate dean for the college of arts and humanities stated that there is no campus requirement for mandatory attendance at faculty meetings that include disability related training, and that the issue is further complicated by part-time faculty who are generally at the campus for short periods of time.

Not providing training to applicable personnel increases the risk of noncompliance with campus and CSU policies and state and federal regulations regarding disabled persons.

### **Recommendation 5**

We recommend that the campus develop specific training for faculty to ensure sufficient understanding of student disability issues and campus-related support and accommodation services.

### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Campus discussions with the associate deans and department chairs have already taken place. In addition, the campus will be sending out an electronic communication in the spring reminding all faculty of their responsibilities in this area. Lastly, the campus will include a student disability issues training component in the New Faculty Orientation provided every semester, beginning with the spring 2003 semester.

---

## APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
John D. Welty	President
Audrey Anderson	Dean, Division of Extended Education
Deborah Astone	Executive Director, California State University, Fresno Association, Inc.
Brad Barker	Security Coordinator, PeopleSoft Implementation
Tina Bedell	Registrar
Barbara Benedict	Director, Advising Services
Pat Blore	Counselor, Services to Students with Disabilities
Beth Case	Counselor, Services to Students with Disabilities
Virginia Chadwick	Chair, President's Committee on Disabilities
Thomas Ebert	Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel
Candace Egan	Web Manager
Vivian Franco	Director, Admissions and Records
Karen Kinney	Associate Director, Library
Walter Loscutoff	Associate Dean, College of Engineering
Maxine McDonald	Executive Director, Academic Enhancement Services
David Moll	Environmental Health and Safety Officer
Robert Paul	Associate Vice President and Director, University Health and Psychological Services
Benjamin Quillian	Vice President for Administration
Jeannine Raymond	Director, Human Resources
J. Chris Robinson	Internal Auditor
Judy Sakkai	Vice President, Student Affairs and Dean of Students
Vida Samiian	Associate Dean, College of Arts and Humanities
Carol Snee	Director, Services to Students with Disabilities
Gary Wilson	Director, Facilities Planning
Mehrzaad Zarrarian	Director, University Student Union




CALIFORNIA  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY,  
FRESNO

December 23, 2002



## Memorandum

To: Larry Mandel  
University Auditor  
The California State University

From: John D. Welty   
President

Subject: **Campus Response to Audit Report Number 02-36,  
*Disability Support and Accommodations at California State University,  
Fresno***

My staff and I have reviewed the findings of the above captioned audit report. Enclosed is the Campus Response addressing specific recommendations contained in the report.

Please feel free to contact me if you should have any questions.

JDW:cr  
Enclosure

C: Dr. Benjamin F. Quillian  
Dr. J. Michael Ortiz  
Dr. Jeannine Raymond  
Dr. Robert Paull  
Ms. Carole Snee  
Mr. Tom Ebert  
Mr. Chris Robinson

Office of  
the President

Thomas Administration  
Building, 103  
5241 North Maple Ave. M/STA48  
Fresno, CA 93740-8027

559.278.2324  
Fax 559.278.4715

## DISABILITY SUPPORT AND ACCOMMODATIONS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,  
FRESNO

REPORT NO. 02-36

### PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

#### POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

##### **Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the campus document policies and procedures for departmental functions such as accepting, researching, and resolving student complaints, and declining student disability services.

##### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Policy statements and specific written procedures regarding the processes of accepting, researching and resolving student complaints and of declining student disability services have been developed and are under review by the administration of the Division of Student Affairs. These statements will be incorporated into the existing Policy and Procedures document of the office of Services for Students with Disabilities in January 2003.

### PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

##### **Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus implement a performance monitoring process for disabled student services that includes, but is not limited to, periodic student surveys.

##### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. The following list outlines the planned performance monitoring process for disabled student services on both an annual and periodic basis.

- a. Campus policy stipulates that each campus program will be comprehensively reviewed every five years. The next scheduled program review will be in 2003-2004.
- b. A Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) was administered by the campus to a stratified random sample (by class) of 918 students in spring 2002. Of this sample, 34 or 3.69% were students who indicated they had a "physical disability or a diagnosed learning disability". This percentage is larger than that represented by students with disabilities (446 or 2.33%) within the total student body (20,007) in 2001-2002.

The survey provided baseline information regarding student satisfaction, both disabled and non-disabled, with many aspects of academic and students services provided at Fresno State. The campus plans to administer the SSI again in 2006.

- c. The Chancellor's Office will administer questionnaires that seek to measure satisfaction/program effectiveness (approximately 20 items each) to students with disabilities and faculty at all CSU campuses in spring 2003. If the sample size is similar to the one administered in 1992, approximately 200 students with disabilities and 200 faculty members will be surveyed.
- d. Periodic questionnaires with questions that include those on the Chancellor's Office questionnaire in addition to specific local questions will be included in the fall 2003 SSD registrations mailing to all students with disabilities and every year thereafter.

## **AUXILIARY ORGANIZATIONS AND OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES**

### **Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Establish controls to ensure that the CSU Fresno Association, Inc. document barrier removal efforts and prepare a self-evaluation of ADA compliance for all related entities.
- b. Establish written agreements with off-campus facilities that include, but are not limited to, responsibilities for ensuring ADA compliance and ongoing accessibility by students to campus sponsored programs, services, and activities.

### **Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Corrective action will include the following:

- a. The Association will be directed to document barrier removal efforts and conduct a self-evaluation of ADA compliance. A memorandum documenting these requirements will be sent by January 31, 2003.
- b. Written agreements will be established between the campus and off-campus facilities to ensure that the off-campus facilities understand their responsibility to comply with ADA regulations, and to ensure that Fresno State students are provided with appropriate services for students with disabilities while at the off-campus facility. These agreements will be in place by June 30, 2003.

## **PROGRAM AND PHYSICAL ACCESSIBILITY**

### **Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Implement monitoring controls to ensure that web designers comply with campus web accessibility policies.
- b. Develop standards that address computer lab accessibility for disabled individuals.

**Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Specific actions to be taken include:

- a. The campus will implement web accessibility monitoring controls consistent with the Interim Web Accessibility Plan by June 30, 2003.
- b. The campus will develop computer lab accessibility standards for disabled individuals by June 30, 2003.

**PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING**

**Recommendation 5**

We recommend that the campus develop specific training for faculty to ensure sufficient understanding of student disability issues and campus-related support and accommodation services.

**Campus Response**

We concur with the recommendation. Campus discussions with the Associate Deans and Department Chairs have already taken place. In addition, the campus will be sending out an electronic communication in the spring reminding all faculty of their responsibilities in this area. Lastly, the campus will include a student disability issues training component in the New Faculty Orientation provided every semester, beginning with the spring 2003 semester.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

BAKERSFIELD

February 6, 2003

CHANNEL ISLANDS

CHICO

**MEMORANDUM**

DOMINGUEZ HILLS

FRESNO

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel  
University Auditor

FULLERTON

HAYWARD

FROM: Charles B. Reed  
Chancellor

HUMBOLDT

LONG BEACH

SUBJECT: Draft Final Report Number 02-36 on *Disability Support and Accommodations*, California State University, Fresno

LOS ANGELES

MARITIME ACADEMY

In response to your memorandum of February 6, 2003, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on *Disability Support and Accommodations*, California State University, Fresno.

MONTEREY BAY

NORTHRIDGE

POMONA

CBR/bh

SACRAMENTO

Enclosure

SAN BERNARDINO

SAN DIEGO

cc: Dr. John D. Welty, President  
J. Chris Robinson, Internal Auditor

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN JOSE

SAN LUIS OBISPO

SAN MARCOS

SONOMA

STANISLAUS