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Summary

Context
Students with a disability form a specific group in education. Some of them require additional facilities, services or support to successfully complete their education. Dutch and international law dictate that discrimination based on handicap or chronic illness is prohibited and that students with a disability or chronic disease are entitled to receive support in the form of accommodations and services that are required to pursue higher education. This legislation places a duty on higher educational institutes to actively promote educational equality for students with a disability. Universities have developed policies on ‘studying with a disability’ to abide by the law and to provide the possibility for students with a disability to access and participate in education. However, the national student questionnaire showed that students are not satisfied with the University of Amsterdam (UvA), VU University Amsterdam (VU) and Amsterdam University of applied sciences (HvA). Additionally, the institutional audit of the Accreditation Organization of the Netherlands and Flanders concluded that improvements for all three universities concerning the policy of ‘studying with a disability’ were necessary.

Problem statement
The national student questionnaire showed that students with a disability are not satisfied with their educational institution. However, the dissatisfaction was only assessed by means of a satisfaction scale. However, in order to bring about policy changes and improve the student’s educational experience, it is essential that we examine where this dissatisfaction comes from. Therefore, this qualitative study explored the needs and desires disabled students have with regard to their educational institute and the barriers they experience that obstruct the access and participation in Amsterdam higher educational institutes.

Research question
This study aimed to provide an answer to the following research question: “What are the needs, desires and barriers to access and participation that disabled students experience in Amsterdam higher educational institutes and what kind of policy, communication and facilities could be advised towards the executive board of the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences?”

Methodology
In order to answer the research question, qualitative semi-structured interviews were held with 21 students with a broad range of disabilities that studied at the UvA, VU and HvA. The interviews contained topics derived from the conceptual model used in this study. Additionally, three study advisors and three policy advisors were approached to discuss current policy and to reflect on the findings of this study. The data were analyzed by means of selective coding based on the concepts of the conceptual model and subsequently a cause analysis was made to identify root problems.

Results
The results showed that the needs and perceived barriers among students with a disability differ. Although some students indicated that they experience no barriers and that their needs are met, the majority was not satisfied and desired improvements that resolve the barriers and meet their needs.
For those students the current facilities, services and support provided by the educational institute were not sufficient. Students’ needs were related better communication, information and responsiveness. These included a more reliable implementation of the promised services, a more proactive approach from academic staff and also a better information distribution. Personal guidance, initiative and attention were desired by students, as well as more commitment and understanding from academic staff. The environmental barriers that students experienced were those that obstruct the accessibility (e.g. swing doors) and participation (e.g. folding chairs in lecture halls) to education. Other barriers were mainly related to participation and communication. They included the absence of information regarding disabilities, the low findability of information on the website, the poor contact with teachers and study advisors and the lack of attention and guidance. Additionally, students indicated that they have to put a lot of effort and time in getting support which makes university life more stressful and inconvenient. Furthermore, students experienced a threshold to seek contact and aid. The distance between student and academic staff, uncertainty of the reaction of the academic staff and shame or inconvenience contributed to this threshold. Some disabilities were not acknowledged and understood by the institute, which led to friction and denying students the support they needed. Moreover, students felt hindered by the inflexibility of the institute and the willingness to provide adjustments in the education. Finally, different academic staff is involved in arranging a facility or service, which was experienced as enervating and uncomfortable. The cause analysis showed that the underlying reasons for the dissatisfaction students’ experience were related to poor information, poor communication and lack of responsibility of the institute.

Discussion
Many unmet needs and experienced barriers find their roots in the expectation that the institute should take responsibility for students with a disability. This raises the discussion how responsibility is divided between the student and the institute. The policies indicate it is the students’ responsibility to inform the institute about their disability and to seek aid. Students on the other hand indicate they expect and desire a more proactive approach from the educational institute. False expectations are thus the cause of many problems and therefore expectation management should be a topic institutes have to address. Entwined with the responsibility, there is discrepancy regarding whose initiative it is to initiate the request for support, the solutions and the communication and information. The study advisors and policy advisors indicate that studying at a higher educational institute demands that responsibility from students and if they require support, they should seek contact by themselves. That is how the institutes are currently organized and their policy on studying with a disability is based on that principle. Additionally, there is an ongoing discussion about the exact point at which the facilitation of aiding tools and adjustments in examination starts to undermine the quality of the study and the qualifications for the degree. Future research into this topic is necessary.

Conclusion
Students with a disability experience a less convenient and effective educational experience then they would like to have. In this study, their needs are often unmet and perceived barriers are not resolved. The main underlying reasons for the dissatisfaction are related to poor information and poor communication and the false expectation that the institute is responsible and shows initiative.
Policy recommendations include: a) provide tailored support instead of using a catch-all category ‘disabled students’, b) develop guidelines specific for each type of disability and c) initiate a process that actively guides and monitors students from application onwards. Communication recommendations include: d) improve the availability and distribution of information, e) discuss *expectancy management* within the educational institute and clearly indicate what students can expect, f) stimulate personal contact and guidance between academic staff and student and g) investigate the search terms students use to find information on the website to improve the findability of information and user-friendliness of the website. Finally, facility recommendations include: h) collaboration between student and institute to identify and solve accessibility barriers and i) provide additional guidance from academic staff and organize trainings for them about ‘studying with a disability’. Policy and practice should take into account the needs and barriers assessment and the recommendations in this study. In addition, the position of students with a disability in universities’ policies should be examined in order to strive towards inclusive education for every student.
**Introduction**

Students with a disability have an equal right to pursue higher education in the Netherlands. This right is described by international and Dutch law (Stapel, 2007). And additionally, human rights find its principle in social equality of all human beings (UDHR, art. 1) (United Nations, 1948). In order to support students with a disability with their education, special facilities and services have been developed and implemented at the universities (Van den Broek, Muskens & Winkels, 2013). The aim of this implementation is to make higher education for students with a disability more accessible and feasible and to stimulate and improve educational success. However, research showed that the University of Amsterdam (UvA), VU University Amsterdam (VU) and the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (HvA) do not score well on the national student satisfaction questionnaire (Steenkamp, 2013). In fact, the UvA, VU and HvA score lowest of all universities and universities of applied sciences in the Netherlands (Steenkamp, 2013). Supporting the low students’ satisfaction score, institutional audits conducted by the Accreditation Organization of the Netherlands and Flanders NVAO (Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatie Organisatie) at the UvA and HvA state that their policy regarding students with a disability is not yet fully developed (NVAO, 2013a; NVAO, 2013b). This raises the question why students are dissatisfied with the UvA, VU and HvA and what is needed to improve the educational circumstances for students with a disability.

This report begins with introducing the reader to the context of studying with a disability in chapter 1. The background information covers several topics: the definition of disability; frequency and severity; international treaties and laws; services and financial support; information; websites; audit and satisfaction reports, policy and eventually the process towards equal education for everyone. The background will end with the research objectives and research question, after which the relevant theoretical concepts and models will be described chapter 2. The context and theory will lead to the sub questions of this study. Subsequently, the methods used in this study will be described in chapter 3. Chapter 4 will entail the results. These results will be discussed in the discussion section in chapter 5. Chapter 6 will conclude with the conclusion and recommendations.
Chapter 1 Background

1.1 Disability and education
International and Dutch law stipulate that having a disability should not result in inequality in daily life. One of these inequalities is the access to education. Article 23 clause 1 and 2 of the Dutch Constitution states that the government is responsible for education and that everyone has the freedom to pursue education. Education is essential for one’s own development, future and freedom of choice (Kohlberg & Mayer, 1972). In many developed countries, like in the Netherlands, the access to education for people with a disability is open (Humanium, 2014). The right and access to pursue education is thus present and regulated by law, but research showed that the accessibility for students with a disability differs a lot among Dutch universities and universities of applied sciences (Steenkamp, 2013; De Zwart, Bakker, Wenneker, Terwel & Kreijen, 2011).

In this study the definition of disability is based on a social perspective of disability and used by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability (United Nations, 2010). This definition is as follows:

“Persons with a disability are those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.” (United Nations, 2010, p.15)

The components of this definition are also found in the definition of functional disability of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap) and of the research institution handicap+studie.

- Physical impairments are those that affect a person’s mobility or dexterity. They include mobility impairments, such as paralysis, stroke, Multiple Sclerosis and spinal cord injury (Gaulin & Dunn, 2005; handicap+studie, 2014).
- Mental impairments are those that affect a person’s mental functioning. They include depression, stress-related conditions, bipolar disorder, autism spectrum disorder, anxiety and schizophrenia (Gaulin & Dunn, 2005; handicap+studie, 2014).
- Intellectual impairments are those that affect a person’s capacity to learn tasks or process information. They can cause difficulties in reading, writing and mathematics but also in communicating. They include Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD), Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), dyscalculia and dyslexia (Gaulin & Dunn, 2005; handicap+studie, 2014).
- Sensory impairments are those that affect a person’s senses. They include visual and hearing impairments (Gaulin & Dunn, 2005; handicap+studie, 2014).

It is thus important to pay attention to all impairments as each can have an effect on the educational access and progress. None of the impairments are the same, so appropriate action and services for each should be taken.

1.2 Frequency and severity
The prevalence of students with disabilities in higher education is estimated in various studies between 8.1% and 30% (De Zwart, et al., 2011; Van den Broek et al., 2013). Based on the Student
Monitor 2012, three out of ten students in higher education in 2012 have a disability (Van den Broek, Muskens, Winkels, 2013). Two out of these three are not hindered during their education. One out of these three, however, does experience hindrance, even though special facilities exist. This means that in 2012, one out of every ten students is hindered in his or her education because of their disability (Van den Broek et al., 2013). This percentage corresponds to a number of about 60,000 students with disabilities studying at higher education.

Based on the National Student Questionnaire 2013 (Nationale Studenten Enquête, NSE), the most frequently reported disabilities and the most hampering disabilities are shown in the table 1 (Steenkamp, 2013). Dyslexia is by far the most common disability, followed by attention problems and fatigue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-10 disabilities and diseases (mentioned)</th>
<th>Top-10 disabilities and diseases (perceived as hinder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of applied sciences</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration problems</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiredness</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological problems</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHD</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic pain</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migraine / headache</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung diseases</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint complaints</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disabilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining 20</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Most frequently reported disabilities and the most hampering disabilities reported at the NSE satisfaction questionnaire. Adapted from Studeren met een handicap, de tiende gebruikerstoets, 2013: De oordelen van studenten met een functiebeperking over hun studie en instelling (p.3), by F. E. M. Steenkamp, 2013, Leiden: Centrum Hoger Onderwijs Informatie. Copyright by Centrum Hoger Onderwijs Informatie.

Student Health Services (Bureau Studentenartsen) of the University of Amsterdam offers an on-line test for students to check their health status (www.studentengezondheidstest.nl alias www.studenthealthcheck.nl). In the on-line test there were also questions regarding disabilities students experience. Analysis of the data of the Student Health Test 2012 (Studentengezondheidstest) (n=3932) showed that 17% of the UvA and HvA students experience a functional disability, 29% experience physical complaints and 14% experience psychological complaints (Van der Heijde, Vonk & Meijman, 2013). The authors indicated there was overlap between the groups and that 58% of the students experienced no disabilities or complaints at all. Analysis also showed that migraine, fatigue and depression have the highest prevalence among UvA and HvA students who filled in the Student Health Test 2012 (n=3932), respectively 2.9, 2.8 and 2.1% (Pesch, 2013).

On one hand it is important to pay special attention to the most occurring disabilities because an improvement will be advancement for many students. On the other hand, less frequently occurring disabilities such as blindness, deafness and severe physical disabilities can have a very large impact.
on the student and are therefore likely dependent of facilities and services on the university. Every disability can lead to hindrance and subsequently a demand for facilities and services and therefore all disabilities are part of this study.

1.3 Regulations, services and support
The next paragraphs will describe the regulations regarding equality and studying with a disability in international and national laws. Additionally the spectrum of facilities and services will be described, followed by the different funds and support relevant for students with a disability. This enumeration will describe the position of students with a disability at the Dutch universities.

International treaties
The rights of people with disabilities are enshrined in international and national legislation in a number of ways. Article 1 of the Dutch Constitution entails that all individuals in the Netherlands shall be treated equally (article 1 BW). Discrimination on grounds of disability or chronic illness is not allowed. This Dutch law corresponds to article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) adopted by the Council of Europe and to article 2.1 and 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) adopted by the United Nations.

Article 14 ECHR states: “The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, color, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.”

The term “other status” has an open-ended meaning and some grounds are not explicitly mentioned but disability can be considered prohibited grounds (Tyrer, 2011). Additionally, the United Nations founded the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, an international human rights treaty, intended to protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities. Two important of their core provisions are the right to education and accessibility to public services and buildings (United Nations, 2010).

Dutch laws
Next to the international treaties, specific Dutch laws are applicable to persons with disabilities.

Firstly, the law equal treatment on the base of handicap or chronic disease (Wet Gelijke Behandeling op grond van handicap of chronische ziekte, WGB h/cz) entails that discrimination based on handicap or chronic illness is prohibited. A student with a disability or chronic illness is entitled to accommodations and services that are required to pursue higher education. In addition, it is stated that these services should be realized by the educational institute, unless it would impose a disproportionate burden. Additionally, a student with a disability may not be discouraged through information or admission to select a specific study.

Secondly, the law on higher education and scientific research (Wet op Hoger onderwijs en Wetenschappelijk onderzoek, WHW) ensures enrolled students of their right to education, making examinations, access to education, the use of existing facilities, mentoring and tutoring a student counselor. It clearly states that every student should be able to make an exam and if not possible in the regular way, an alternative should be searched for (article 7.34). Additionally, every faculty
should have explained in the teaching and examination regulations (Onderwijs- en Examenregeling, OER) how a student can reasonably make an exam (article 7.13 clause 2m). The examination committee is responsible for the organization and coordination of the examinations.

Thirdly, in the law on student grants 2000 (Wet op de Studiefinanciering, WSF 2000) is documented that students who have a delay in their study progress caused by circumstances beyond one’s control based on a handicap, chronic illness or dyslexia have the right on extra financial support from the service executing education (Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs, DUO). Aside from the regular study funds a student receives, students with a disability can receive one extra year of funding (article 5.6 clause 10 of the WSF 2000). In addition, the age limit of 30 years for receiving study funds may be crossed in case of a delay in study progress caused by disability (article 2.3 clauses 3 and 4 of the WSF 2000). Furthermore, students who become at least 80% unfit for work based on the Wajong, receive the entire loan performance provided by DUO as a gift. This is also the case if disability occurs after the first year of education (article 5.15 of the WSF 2000). Moreover, if the student has to quit his or her education because of a new or worsening disability, the entire loan performance becomes a gift as well (article 5.16 clauses 2 and 3 of the WSF 2000).

Fourthly, all universities are obliged by law to have a financial support fund (Proiferingsfonds) (Schmidt & Simons, 2011). This is a fund provided by the university for students who have study delay caused by circumstances beyond one’s own control. Students with a disability can request this fund.

The laws in the Netherlands thus provide regulations for universities to treat every student equally and to adapt to the needs of students with a disability. Additionally, the student can request additional arrangements at the DUO and financial support fund.

Facilities and services
In order to create the possibility for students with a disability to pursue education, special services have been introduced to support them. The government and universities are responsible for these services, which are partly regulated by law (WGB h/cz), but students are responsible for bringing up their disability and need for special services and facilities. There is a broad spectrum of services for students with a disability (Bierwert, 2002; handicap+studie, 2013a). Students should check upon their university for the actual offer, but the list below shows the range of possibilities.

- Special funds exist.
- Facilities at the university can be arranged, such as an elevator.
- Adjustments in existing facilities can be organized, such as an adjusted computer and other IT-resources.
- Special regulations can be arranged for examinations, compulsory activities and study grant (studiefinanciering).
- Transportation to and from the university is possible.
- Universities organize education ‘buddy’ couples, meaning a healthy student supports a student with a disability.
Funds and support

Aside from the laws, students with disabilities can request several funds to aid them in their ability to study. Although there are many funds to support students with a disability, we must pay attention to the process of acquiring these funds. Students with a disability often already experience difficulties at the university and requesting these funds cost a lot of time and energy. Additionally, students need to know that these funds exist. This should be made clear to them, for example during the intake at the university, to help them in orientating the needs and support they can apply for. To what extend students have this knowledge will be investigated in this study.

Firstly, the general law on exceptional medical expenses (Algemene Wet Bijzondere Ziektekosten, AWBZ) sets out which services someone is entitled to in the context of care. The student is qualified for coverage from the AWBZ if he or she is limited in daily activities due to their disability. Services and support can be requested for personal care, such as visiting the toilet or eating at the university, nursing and guidance (even to the university) (RVZ, 2005).

Secondly, the body implementing employee insurance schemes (Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekeringen, UWV) also provides services, resources and financial support to students with a disability. They provide transportation coverage, adjustments and aid at the university, such as a refreshable braille display, an adjusted computer and a language interpreter (UWV, 2013).

Thirdly, educational facilities directly used for education can be requested at the student counsellor. With support of the counselor students may submit a request to the Examination Board to implement services, such as an elevator, separate examination room or an audio induction loop. This is stipulated in the WGB h/cz.

Fourthly, the social support act (Wet Maatschappelijk Ondersteuning, WMO) of the municipal can also be addressed to request support and services, such as a wheel chair, transportation and adjustments at home (Rijksoverheid, 2014).

Fifthly, students can request a Wajong fee (Wet werk en arbeidsondersteuning jonggehandicapten) if the student is declared at least 25% unfit for work. This payment compensates the money the student could make at a regular job, to aid in funding education and daily life practice.

Sixthly, the general Dutch Organization for disabled persons (Algemene Nederlandse Gehandicapten Organisatie, ANGO) is a national pressure group for people with a handicap, chronic illness or those unfit for work. It provides financial aid to all people with a handicap or chronic illness. The ANGO fund reimburses the obtaining of a statement of dyslexia, transport facilities, education, computer equipment etc. (ANGO, 2014).

Lastly, the Netherlands institute for human rights (College voor de Rechten van de Mens, WCRM) is an independent national committee that oversees compliance with its judgments, advises and provides information on equal treatment (https://mensenrechten.nl/). Students can apply here if their request for a certain service has been denied by the Examination Board on the university.

Apart from the rights students with a disability have, as written in the previous paragraphs, they also have duties. Students need to fulfil the OER requirements, which state that students should have qualities in terms of knowledge, understanding and skills when they graduate. Additionally, students
should mention their disability when they register for the education. Furthermore, an accredited medical certificate is required. Students remain the first responsible as their disability concerned, so they are responsible for reporting their disability and applying for the services they require. The above duties are often stated in the regulations of the university.

1.4 Communication & Information
The next paragraphs will describe the communication process between student and university, targeted versus tailored information and the quality and accessibility of university websites for students with disabilities. These paragraphs will thus describe the communication processes and information availability for students with a disability at the Dutch universities.

Communication process between student and university
Additionally, the focus will be on the availability of information on facilities and services for students with a disability. Everything starts de facto with communication. Proper communication is required to make students aware of the offer of facilities and services and subsequently to improve the process of requesting these.

One definition of communication is: “the transmission of information” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2008, p.3). In this simple definition, the information is transmitted, but not necessarily received or understood. In the light of this study the following definition of communication was used instead: “the process of exchanging information through a medium in which the communicated information is understood by both sender and receiver” (Nach, 2008). Communication is only effective when information is accessible and understood. In the year 2014 it mainly takes place on the internet. But brochures and flyers are also important, as well as interpersonal contact – especially for those who cannot make use of the website.

The Revised Shannon-Weaver Communication Model (figure 1) illustrates the current communication process of the Amsterdam Universities (Wagner, 1994).

---

**Figure 1. The Revised Shannon-Weaver Communication Model explaining the process of communication. Reprinted from In support of a functional definition of interaction, by E. D. Wagner, 1994, American Journal of Distance Education. Copyright by American Journal of Distance Education.**
In this study, the university is the source. The transmitter is also known as ‘encoding’ and refers to the way a message is send (set of letters, numbers, and symbols). The channel is the medium; this can be websites, brochures, telephone, email or face to face conversation. Receiver is also known as ‘decoding’ and refers to the way a message is interpreted by the receiver of the message, who is called the destination, in this case, the student with a disability. In addition, noise entails anything that interferes in the communication process between source and destination. This could for instance be semantic noise when words themselves are not mutually understood, but also a disability to read or hear. Furthermore, there is feedback which enables the destination to respond to the source. This could be verification that the destination understood the source’s interpretation of the message. For websites, it could be that the student sends an email or telephones the person responsible for further questions and clarification. Related to this model, it is interesting to understand what students with a disability think of the current offer and content of information, and how they experience the communication method used for this.

Targeted and tailored information
Universities provide information and services for the group of students with a disability. This information is offered on websites, brochures and at information meetings. Targeting is defined by Kreuter and Skinner (2000) as: “the development of a single intervention approach for a defined population subgroup that takes into account characteristics shared by the subgroups’ members”. Thus, the population subgroup is students with a disability and the intervention approach refers to the information the university provides. Targeting differs from tailoring. Tailored information is “adapted to the characteristics, needs and interests of the individual, and hence has more personal relevance and contains less redundant information” (De Nooijer, Lechner & De Vries, 2002). Targeted information entails a population subgroup, while tailored information is more person-specific. As for targeting, students with a disability might find information addressed to them as a group, but that they do not feel part of the group. In addition, every person is unique and everyone has his or her own needs. Students often desire personal attention and advice (Lake Research, 2011). If information on the website or in the brochure is not clear, they will probably telephone or email the contact person for further questions. Students might thus seek tailored information, which they will hopefully receive by phone or email. On one hand, it is worth investigating what students need and desire from the university’s website and other communication channels. On the other hand, it is questionable to what extend it is possible to provide tailored information through websites.

University websites
As mentioned earlier, I will focus on the availability of information on facilities and services for students with a disability. The website has an important role for the availability of information. The question that rises here is how accessible the university’s website is for students with a disability and if the website meets the needs and expectations of these students.

There are different guidelines for an accessible website. The most common guideline is the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 developed by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) (W3C, 2008). W3C is made up of member organizations which maintain full-time staff for the purpose of working together in the development of standards for the World Wide Web. The WCAG 2.0 guidelines cover a wide range of recommendations for making Web content more accessible to
users in general. It specifically also creates more accessible content to a wider range of people with
disabilities, including blindness and low vision, deafness and hearing loss, learning disabilities,
cognitive limitations, limited movement, speech disabilities, photosensitivity and combinations of
these. For example, enlarged writing, contrast and screen reader features for people with low vision.
Another example is a more simplified writing style for people with cognitive limitations.

With the WCAG 2.0 as initial concept, the Dutch foundation Waarmerk drempelvrij.nl and the
Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en
Koninkrijksrelaties) developed Web guidelines 2 (Webrichtlijnen 2) (drempelvrij.nl, 2011). It is the
Dutch quality assurance for accessible websites. The aim is to provide access for everyone to online
information and services of good quality.

Guidelines for quality assurance for university websites exist, such as the project handling university
websites (Project Aanpak Universitaire Websites, PAUW) of the Leiden University (De Kooker, 2006).
They have developed an extensive action plan to improve their websites and systems. This action
plan may be applicable for other universities. However, there is no special attention for students
with a disability.

Additionally, there is the Accessibility Foundation founded by foundation Bartimeus, an organization
who advocates for people with a visual impairment (https://www.accessibility.nl/). Accessibility is
the independent Dutch expertise and research center on ICT accessibility and corporate social
responsibility in the field of Internet, software, and electronic applications. They support companies,
institutes and the government to make internet and internet-based multimedia accessible to
everyone, including people with a disability.

The Accessibility Foundation in the Netherlands conducted a study to assess the web accessibility,
educational information systems and applications for mobile phones of 59 higher educational
institutes (Velleman, Houtepen & Riezebosch, 2010). The websites were investigated by means of an
indicative scan by an expert. The guidelines of Drempelvrij.nl were used as reference. The study
showed that all websites and educational information systems of the 59 universities did not meet
the minimum accessibility requirements of drempelvrij.nl in 2010. The same result was found in
2006 by Dekker (2006). As a result there may be a gap between students with and without
disabilities, because the first group might have more difficulties to use the digital information of
higher education websites and systems.

The Dutch inspectorate of education (Inspectie van Onderwijs) of the Ministry of Education, Culture
and Science (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap) reported that 13 of the 23
institutes scored sufficiently on the findability and content of information on their websites (Inspectie van het
Onderwijs, 2010). Only 32% of the students with a disability were satisfied with the offered services.
The Dutch inspectorate of education recommended improvement in the provision of information to
students.

Research thus showed that the university’s websites do not meet the requirements for a good
qualitative accessible website and that the satisfaction rate is low. This study aims to contribute by
understanding what students with a disability think of their university’s website, in terms of user-
friendliness, findability of information and quality.
1.5 Audit and satisfaction outcomes
Based on the previous paragraphs we can conclude that it is clear that support and facilities for students with a disability exist, and that the university is obliged to provide facilities and services for students with a disability. This study will also focus on the quality and feasibility of facilities and services at the university. This study will use two main reports as reference for the current status of universities regarding studying with a disability. The national student questionnaire (Nationale Studenten Enquête, NSE) will be used for students’ satisfaction and the institutional audit report of the Accreditation Organization of the Netherlands and Flanders NVAO (Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatie Organisatie, NVAO) will be used for the objective evaluation of universities’ policy of studying with a disability (Steenkamp, 2013; NVAO, 2013a; NVAO, 2013b).

The independent research institution handicap+studie aims to improve the accessibility of universities for students with a disability and also to improve the student’s success rate (http://www.handicap-studie.nl/). Commissioned by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap), handicap+studie advises and supports the universities in their policy regarding studying with a disability. In general, handicap+studie makes recommendations on information and education, physical accessibility, guidance, expertise, learning routes, review and examination and to ensure quality and continuity for students with a disability. Annually, handicap+studie publishes a report featuring the students’ satisfaction and quality of facilities and services for students with a disability. These findings are gathered through the NSE, a comprehensive questionnaire among students at universities and universities of applied sciences.

Satisfaction scores
For the students’ satisfaction data, derived from the NSE, the following seven themes have been used: information, intake, aiding tools, adjustments in education, teacher’s compassion, teacher’s knowledge of disabilities and guidance (Steenkamp, 2013). They resemble the themes of the NVAO and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. This research included 18.965 students, of which 13.814 were university of applied sciences students and 5.151 university students. Based on the findings of NSE 2013, respectively 6% and 9.5% of the students have a disability.

Figure 2 shows the satisfaction score per theme for the last four years at the University of Applied Sciences and at the university. Remarkable is that the satisfaction score at the university decreased compared to previous years. The reasons for this decrease are unknown, but Steenkamp (2013) suggests that the introduction of matching (finding out if education fits the student) and the increased pace pressure of education are of influence.
In this study we are interested in the Amsterdam Universities, namely the University of Amsterdam, the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences and the VU University Amsterdam. The reason for these universities is because they score low on the satisfaction scores and thus improvement is most needed. Additionally, the commissioner of this study, Student Health Services, is related to the UvA and HvA. Wageningen University and Breda University of Applied Sciences are also listed in table 2 as reference. They are the universities with the highest satisfaction score and can thus be seen as leading in meeting the needs of students with a disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>Aiding tools</th>
<th>Adjustments in education</th>
<th>Teacher's understanding</th>
<th>Teacher's knowledge</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wageningen University</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VU University Amsterdam</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda University of Applied Sciences</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. NSE satisfaction scores for all seven themes and total score. Adapted from Studeren met een handicap, de tiende gebruikerstoets, 2013: De oordelen van studenten met een functiebeperking over hun studie en instelling (p.8 & 10), by F. E. M. Steenkamp, 2013, Leiden: Centrum Hoger Onderwijs Informatie. Copyright by Centrum Hoger Onderwijs Informatie.
The NSE 2013 showed that the University of Amsterdam received the lowest satisfaction score of their students (Steenkamp, 2013). The UvA scored lowest on all seven themes, giving a total score of 5.69. Moreover, the VU University Amsterdam received the second lowest score out of all Dutch Universities (score 6.03). Wageningen University scored highest with a score of 6.80. For the Universities of Applied Sciences, Breda University of Applied Sciences scored highest with a score of 6.79. The Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences received the second lowest score of 5.88.

Clearly, students with disabilities on the Amsterdam Universities are not satisfied compared to other universities in the Netherlands. However, the NSE only provides satisfaction scores. We thus do not know the reasons why students are unsatisfied. This study is a good initiative to investigate why the Amsterdam Universities obtained a poor grade at the NSE compared with other universities.

Additional satisfaction was measured by the Dutch inspectorate of education of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (Inspectie van het Onderwijs, 2010). The satisfaction, listed in table 3, was measured among 1500 first-year students with a disability. In table 3 we clearly see a very low satisfaction for the information available. While 41% of the 1500 students agreed there was information provided by the university, only 32% of these 41% of the students were satisfied with the provided information. This entails the website, brochures and information at information meetings. The findings of the Dutch inspectorate of education support the findings of the NSE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of reference</th>
<th>Students who agree that the service is provided</th>
<th>Satisfaction percentage of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical accessibility</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments in curriculum and internship</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Percentage of first-year students with a disability who agree there is a service or facility available to them, and percentage of those students that are satisfied with these services and facilities. Adapted from Onbelemmerd studeren: Beleid en voorzieningen voor studenten met een functiebeperking in het hoger onderwijs (p.6), by the Dutch inspectorate of education, 2010, Utrecht: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Copyright by the Dutch inspectorate of education.

Program’s accreditation
The topic ‘studying with a disability’ is admitted in the educational accreditation since January 1, 2011 (Jansen & Van Boxtel, 2011). The accreditation report is a method of quality assurance for individual programs. Recently also the quality and offer of facilities and services for students with a disability provided by universities are evaluated (NVAO, 2011a). NVAO is an independent organization tasked with providing the assessment of the quality of higher education (NVAO, 2007).
The Commission Maatstaf, an advice organ for the government, introduced an amendment to change the law on higher education and scientific research (Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek) to add the topic ‘studying with a disability’ to the accreditation (Commissie Maatstaf, 2010). This amendment was accepted and is now part of the NVAO accreditation. Studying with a disability is now part of Standard 6: the program is feasible. The standard is as follows: “Factors that relate to the program and impair the study progress should be removed as much as possible. Students with disabilities should also receive additional academic counseling on this aspect” (NVAO, 2011b). Additionally, the status of studying with a disability is tested on the basis of the university policy. The policy document includes the current services and facilities for students with disabilities and the plans for improvement. The policy supports the vision of the institute with respect to students with disabilities (NVAO, 2007).

The Dutch inspectorate of education developed a framework to assess the university’s circumstances for students with a disability (Inspectie van het Onderwijs, 2010). The formulated requirements are minimum requirements that fit within the framework of general demands for good higher education and are in accordance with the WHW and the accreditation. The framework is used by the Commission Maatstaf as a reference guide to improve the development of the institutional policies regarding students with disabilities (Commissie Maatstaf, 2010). The seven themes, which are also useful to get a picture of the different possibilities a university can provide to students with a disability, are listed in table 4.
Table 4. Seven themes to assess the current status of university’s effort to provide the best circumstances for students with a disability. Adapted from Meer mogelijk maken: Studeren met een functiebeperking in het hoger onderwijs, by Commissie Maatstaf, 2010, Den Haag: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Copyright by Commissie Maatstaf.

Institutional audit

In the Netherlands, the accreditation takes place at the program level. The accreditation system continues to focus on the quality of individual programs. Next to the accreditation, institutes may request NVAO to conduct an institutional audit, which is a quality assurance assessment for the institute (NVAO, 2011c). In case the institutional audit is certified as good, the quality of the programs is systematically improved. The NVAO will then grant the institute a different confined
accreditation regime for the individual programs. The institutional audit evaluates the university’s policy considering studying with a disability. The institutional audit reports of the NVAO for the UvA (May 2013) and HvA (October 2013) are summarized below. The institutional audit for the VU is still in progress and will unfortunately be published after this study. There is no previous audit to take as reference.

**University of Amsterdam**
The accessibility and feasibility of teaching for students with disabilities at the UvA have limited attention (NVAO, 2013a). The differentiation policy has certain narrowness. The UvA offers more services for outstanding students than for students with a disability. The institute has indicated to offer additional structure and study counseling for students with a disability. It also indicated that they want to create a special policy to increase the development of students with disabilities. The institutional audit report does state that the policy regarding the accessibility and the ability to pursue education for students with a disability is adequate. However, the policy does require more systematic attention. The tangible and intangible facilities are known and available through a website and student counselors. But it remains the question to what extend students do know about these facilities, but also use them. This depends on students’ own initiative, their informal contacts and student counselors. Research showed that the variation on the use of facilities is big. The UvA is aware that their policy regarding students with a disability is insufficiently systematic developed and that there is not any systematic monitoring. The UvA indicated to work on this. The NVAO committee of the audit report concludes that a clearer policy is needed for students with a disability, which should be familiar among the students and involved staff members (teacher, study counselor, supporting services etc.).

**Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences**
The institutional audit report state that the policy regarding the accessibility and the ability to pursue education for students with a disability is adequate (NVAO, 2013b). However, the HvA indicates that studying with a disability has not found its roots in the policy yet. Recently, a policy regarding students with a disability has been introduced, which tightens the regulation of 2007 considering the supervision of students with a disability. This new policy should lead to a more uniform approach to students in the target group and to a policy known among all involved actors. Conversations with students showed that they experience that their disability leads to discussion and that they have to try real hard to get things arranged. The committee of the NVAO has confidence in that this new policy will increase the satisfaction of students with a disability at the HvA. The NVAO committee of the institutional audit concludes that a proper implementation of the new policy ‘Studying with a disability’ is essential. They hope to see an increased satisfaction among students with a disability.

**1.6 Decision-making at the university**
It is clear that improvement of current facilities and services for students with a disability is required. Yet, how do changes in large institutions, like a university, take place? It is important to take a sidewalk to the policy level in order to understand how changes are implemented. Who is responsible for the facilities, and for the information on the website? Who decides what, with whom and when are important questions.
Ideally, universities want to provide the best service as possible for students with a disability. Yet, websites are not in accordance with the guidelines for a qualitative accessible website. The question rises why this is not the case. Decisions and changes in large organizations are often a complex matter. Many departments and people are involved: the board of directors, the policy makers, the staff members, the teachers. In order to change policy it is important to understand the organizational structure of the university.

Mintzberg’s organizational configurations model provides a framework to analyze organizational structures in relation to the ideal types (Mintzberg, 1992). This framework helps us understand how organizations change over time, how powers shift and how all this affects their structure. The framework is illustrated in figure 3.

Six Basic Parts of the Organization

Figure 3. Mintzberg’s organizational configurations framework describing the organizational structure of an organization. Adapted from Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations, by H. Mintzberg, 1992, Prentice Hall. Copyright by Prentice Hall.

The operating core consists of people who perform basic work related directly to the production of products and services. All teachers and student counselors in a university are part of this group. They can be addressed directly to implement changes and to advise them in handling students with a disability.

The support staff consists of people who are concerned with making the organization more self-contained and less dependent on outside services. The cafeteria team, cleaners and mailroom are part of the support staff. The support staff is not relevant for this study because they have no direct influence on studying with a disability.

The techno-structure entails those who establish and maintain the administrative and technological controls, which standardize and specify activities, outputs and skills relevant to the operating core and middle lines. This group includes budget analysis and personnel specialists and those who are responsible for the rosters and digital learning environment and the university website. The latter group of specialists is important because the accessibility of websites is an important element in this study and for changes on the website this group has to be addressed.

The middle line consists of managers with formal authority. This group is small at universities,
because there is a high level of professionalism and independency. The middle line is not relevant for this study because they have no direct influence on studying with a disability.

The strategic apex at the university consists of people who are charged with ensuring that the organization serve its mission in an effective way, such as the board of directors and policy makers. This group is very important in this study because they eventually decide the university’s policy on studying with a disability.

Finally, the ideology of an organization is the halo of beliefs and traditions: norms, values and culture.

To summarize, this study intends to influence the operating core, the techno-structure and the strategic apex to implement changes to create better educational circumstances for students with a disability. In order to implement changes in the organization, there are three options.

1. A bottom-up approach at the operating core; instructing and informing teachers about students with a disability.
2. A bottom-up approach at the techno-structure; instructing and informing those who are responsible for the university’s website in order to implement changes.
3. A top-down approach at the strategic apex; inform the board of directors and the policy makers that changes have to implemented to improve the access to education for students with a disability.

I am curious to understand the policy process of the Amsterdam universities. Who is responsible for the facilities and services for students with a disability? And who runs the websites and is that person allowed to implement changes? Is there a central policy for the whole university or do faculties have their own supervision? These are questions that will help understand what is needed to implement changes at the university to improve education for students with a disability.

1.7 The process of equal access for everyone

To describe the current situation of the Dutch Universities UvA, VU and HvA, I refer to the A3 Model and Transition Approach (figure 4) created by Schwanke, Smith & Edyburn (2001). This theoretical framework aims to illustrate a developmental process associated with efforts to provide access for individuals with disabilities to facilities, programs, and information.

![Figure 4. The ‘A3 Model and Transition Approach’ describing the access to universities for students with a disability. Reprinted from A3 model diagram developed as accessibility and universal design instructional tool, by T. Schwanke, R. Smith & D. Edyburn, 2001, Nevada: RESNA 24th International Conference on Technology and Disability: Research, Design, Practice, & Policy. Copyright by: Schwanke, Smith & Edyburn.](image-url)
The A3 model consists of three phases (Schwanke, Smith & Edyburn, 2001). Applied to the context of this study, the phases are described as follows. In phase I, advocacy efforts raise awareness on inequity and highlight the need for institutional change to respond to the needs of students with a disability. The notion to implement facilities and services for students with a disability is currently present at the Dutch universities. The fact that ‘studying with a disability’ has been added to the accreditation proves this. Additionally, universities already provide support for students with a disability. This study does not take place in this phase.

Phase 2 focuses on the accommodation. This phase describes the accommodations that restrict full participation for people with disabilities in society. Modification of inaccessible environments and alternative solutions to provide access and participation take a central position in this phase. Inaccessible environments entail physical locations and non-physical locations like websites (Edyburn, 2001). In general, universities already exert to assist students with disabilities. Policy changes at universities occur in order to meet the specific needs of the students and to improve their educational participation. Currently, the ‘knowledge gap’ originates here. Research showed that students with a disability are not satisfied with their university, but it is unclear where the dissatisfaction comes from (Steenkamp, 2013). It is therefore important to look for the needs and desires of students with a disability regarding their university to understand the source of the dissatisfaction. All Dutch universities are currently in this phase. Some perhaps more developed than others, but none provide equal access to all students with a disability yet. The problem statement is thus that equal access to higher education for students with a disability is not yet guaranteed and a needs assessment is required to reduce the knowledge gap of what students require from their university. This study thus takes place in phase two of the A3 model.

In phase 3, accessibility describes an environment where access is equally provided to everyone at the same time. Ideally it occurs when change is designed to meet the needs and desires of all students. This would be a goal for the future, enabling every student to participate fully in education, but falls outside the direct feasible objective of this study.

To summarize, this study takes place in phase two of the A3 model. In order to get an understanding of the needs and desires of students with a disability, we should also look at the barriers obstructing their study progress and participation to education. The factors constraining their access to education and their study progress may be associated with the needs and desires.

1.8 Research objective
The long term objective of this study is to improve the facilities and services and the findability of these for students with a disability in higher education. This should in turn result in a better score at the NSE satisfaction questionnaire and a better accreditation for the institution’s policy regarding students with a disability. But more importantly, this should also lead to less study delay and fewer study drop outs for students with a disability. Improved facilities and services, improved accessibility to higher education and improved feasibility of the study lead to better educational circumstances for students with a disability and also to a better appreciation for the universities (Inspectie van het Onderwijs, 2010). Better educational circumstances lead to an increased development of students and on the long run it is better for society and economics.
The research objective is to develop recommendations for the UvA, HvA and VU concerning current facilities and support as well as introducing new services for students with a disability. This will be achieved by exploring ideas, experiences and perspectives regarding the availability and findability of information and facilities for disabled students, including success- and non-success factors.

1.9 Research question

Based on the problem statement and the research objective, the research question is formulated as follows: “What are the needs, desires and barriers to access and participation that disabled students experience in Amsterdam higher educational institutes and what kind of policy, communication and facilities could be advised towards the executive board of the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences?”

The above research question can be answered in two parts. Firstly, the needs, desires and perceived barriers of students with disabilities have to be collected. Secondly, possible solutions for the barriers and changes to fulfill the needs and desires have to be defined.
Chapter 2 Conceptual model

This study is based upon a conceptual model, which is used to help us understand the topic of studying with a disability. The research questions will originate from this model.

2.1 Social model of disability
The social model of disability (figure 5) takes a central position in this study. The social model of disability explains the need of a change in society's values and practices in order to remove the barriers to participation that result in discrimination against disabled students (DDSG, 2003). The social model sees external factors as problematic instead of personal factors of the student with a disability. There is recognition within the social model that there is a great deal that university and society can do to reduce and ideally remove the disabling factors that obstruct participation and access to higher education (University of Leicester, 2014). The social model is thus focusing on how students with a disability can participate in education on an equal footing with non-disabled students. If the current educational circumstances were perfect (no barriers), the student with a disability would not experience any problems and all needs would be met. This is currently not the case and therefore this study will contribute to an improved equality; removing barriers for disabled people benefits everyone (DDSG, 2003). Crow (1996) also described the importance of the social perspective for individuals with a disability: “The Social model has played a central role in promoting disabled people's individual self-worth, collective identity and political organization” (p.56).

Figure 5. The social model of disability. Reprinted from Social Model of Disability, by Democracy, Disability and Society Group, 2003. Copyright by Democracy, Disability and Society group.
The Democracy, Disability and Society group (2003) added the following caption to the model: “You will notice that compared to the medical model, the arrows on the social model are moving outwards. The items around the world are being addressed, and better facilities are slowly being provided for disabled people, but this is not happening fast enough because not enough people are aware of the problems that disabled people face.”

As mentioned, the social model of disability counters the medical model of disability in which only the nature and severity of the impairment is important (DDSG, 2013). This medical perspective concentrates on the physical, sensory or mental functioning, and uses a clinical way of describing an individual’s disability. It defines and categorizes people with a disability by their impairment, and the person is seen as a victim or problem. It is not seen as an issue to concern anyone other than the individual affected (University of Leicester, 2014).

The social barriers are divided into three concepts, namely the environment, the attitudes and the organizations (DDSG, 2003). In the following paragraph they will be applied to the context of this study.

Environment
Firstly, the concept environment entails four components: buildings, services, communication and language.

Buildings refer to the accessibility and user-friendliness of the university campus. It includes the infrastructure of the university as well as the environmental location of the university. For example, students may need public transport to make their way to the university, or they require certain adjustments to be able to enter a building, like a ramp. Another example would be the presence of elevators for physically disabled students.

Services entail the assistance provided by the university to improve educational circumstances. It includes the available support and special regulations provided by the university for students with disabilities can appeal for. Students may for example need a mentor to guide him or him to the lecture, or require permission to use a laptop for examinations.

Communication consists of the exchange of information between university and student. It entails the different communication channels, such as the websites, email, telephone and personal meetings. Educational information systems are also included. Additionally, it encompasses the information on the university website or in brochures. The website takes an essential place in this study because it is in the year 2014 the most easy accessible place to find information regarding studying with a disability (Velleman, Houtepen & Riezebosch, 2010).

Language is not included in this study because I focus on disability and not on the language a student speaks or does not speak. In Dutch higher education, students may experience barriers to educational participation if they do not speak the Dutch or English language, but this is not part of this study. The language a student speaks is independent of their disability. People who are deaf or mute are included in the communication component of the concept environment.

Attitude
Secondly, the concept attitudes originally entails three components: prejudice, stereotyping and
discrimination. In my opinion these three concepts overlap a lot and they are not applicable to the context of this study. However, the attitude of the university staff members towards students with disabilities in itself is meaningful to this study. Therefore, I remove the concept attitude and add the concept persons to the conceptual model. The concept persons refers to the student’s experience and opinion of the university staff members. Persons is subdivided in responsiveness, knowledge and fellow students.

Responsiveness refers to the university staff member’s notion of studying with a disability (Houston, Meyer & Paewai, 2006). The university’s policy ‘studying with a disability’ is an important indicator for the university’s responsiveness. However, the content of the policy does not represent the actual behavior and response of university staff members. It thus primarily entails the willingness to support and to involve teachers, student counsellors and those operative in the realm of studying with a disability.

Knowledge entails the amount of knowledge university staff members have regarding a disability and the facilities and services available for a student with a disability (Carroll, Forlin & Jobling, 2003). Teachers, student counsellors and others involved with students are often primary contacts for students with a disability. Therefore, it is important that those involved are up-to-date of the situation in order to assist the student with a disability.

Fellow students can also influence the participation of education of students with a disability and therefore be a social barrier (Fenollar, Roman & Cuestas, 2007). The experiences of students with a disability regarding the views and manners of other students are thus relevant to understand to broad spectrum of perceived barriers of students with a disability.

Organizations
Thirdly, the concept organizations entails two components: procedures and practices. Additionally, I would like to add a third component: financial support.

Procedures refer to the willingness of the university to adjust regulations to meet the needs of students with disabilities. This includes regulations regarding examination, practicums, allowing laptop use and adjusting the curriculum. Furthermore, it entails the admission procedures to the university for students with disabilities. It describes the flexibility of the university to create exceptions for students with a disability.

Practices address the actual facilities and services that organizations offer for students with a disability. Providing laptops for examinations and screen magnifiers for visually impaired students are examples of this component. Moreover, adjustments in the university ‘environment’ and ‘persons’ are influenced and regulated by organization.

I would like to add a third component to the concept organization, namely financial support.

Dutch research showed that financial security is an important subject for students (Van der Heijde, Meijman & Vonk, 2013). Students may experience financial hardship during their period at the university (Devlin, James & Grigg, 2008). Another study showed that especially disadvantaged gifted learners experience financial concerns during their period on the university (Taylor & House, 2010). Students with a disability might also have other financial expenses, such as hearing devices, a laptop,
a wheelchair or transportation from and to the university. Additionally, lower levels of academic and social integration among low-income students are inextricably linked to finances and financial aid (Engle & Tinto, 2008). Furthermore, Dutch research showed that debts due to study delay also cause uncertainty and stress (Van den Broek, Wartenbergh, Braam, Brink & Poels, 2013). Therefore, financial support is a valuable concept to add to the conceptual model. The presence and importance of financial regulations and funds have been explained in the background of this study.

To summarize, the environment in the social model of disability, including the accessibility and availability of buildings, services and communication is important to take along in the analysis. The concept persons refer to the responsiveness and knowledge of teachers, student counselors and others involved with students with a disability. Additionally, the views and manners of fellow students are included here. The third concept organizations is perhaps the most important concept in this study. It includes procedures, practices and financial support. One can think about adjusted study programs (flexibility) and individual tailored support for students, but it is also the institute that is responsible for the environment and employees.

2.2 Needs assessment
The students’ needs and desires are possibly entwined with the barriers to fully participate in education. Therefore a needs assessment is required to gain full insights in the lives of students with a disability. The concepts of the Social model of disability are also relevant for the needs assessment. Therefore I adapt the model by adding ‘needs assessment’ on the opposite side of ‘social barriers’. The concepts in the Social model of disability will now be assessed through a social barrier and a needs assessment perspective. This is visualized in the adjusted conceptual model at the end of this chapter.

2.3 Outcomes
The main outcome of this study is Policy learning. Policy learning, also known as knowledge acquisition, occurs over a period of time (Ashford, Smith, De Souza, Fikree & Yinger, 2006). Translating technical or scientific facts into political or social facts is vitally important in generating wider understanding of, and potential support for, policy reforms (Porter, 1995). This study contributes by providing the Executive Board and policy makers of the university more insights in the needs and perceived barriers of students with a disability. The Executive Board and policy makers can then take this information along in the future policy on studying with a disability. Aside from policy learning as outcome of the needs and barriers assessment, three other outcomes (and aims) can be defined. Firstly, an increased student satisfaction of the university (seen at the NSE). Secondly, better audit and accreditation scores from the NVAO. Thirdly, less study delay for students with a disability. And finally, fewer study drop outs for students with a disability.
2.4 Adjusted model
I combined the relevant concepts in the models above to develop my own conceptual model applicable to this study. The adjusted Social model of disability (figure 6) is a combination of the Social model of disability, the needs assessment and the outcomes of this study.

The adjusted model, as shown in figure 6, describes the following process.
On the left, the assessment of the social barriers and students’ needs of the environment, persons and organization are used as policy learning to explain and advise the policymakers and others involved about the topic of studying with a disability. Policymakers and others involved are already working on improvement but this study will provide them with in-depth information about the students’ needs, desires and barriers. Policy learning is the main outcome of this study, together with the long-term outcomes: increased satisfaction, better accreditation, less study delay and fewer study drop outs.
2.5 Sub questions
Sub questions were derived from the conceptual model, in order to answer the research question: “What are the needs, desires and barriers to access and participation that disabled students experience in Amsterdam higher educational institutes and what kind of policy, communication and facilities could be advised towards the executive board of the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences?”

1. What barriers that obstruct access and participation to education do students with a disability experience?
   1a) What *environmental* barriers that obstruct access and participation to education do students with a disability experience?
   1b) What *persons* barriers that obstruct access and participation to education do students with a disability experience?
   1c) What *organizations* barriers that obstruct access and participation to education do students with a disability experience?

2. What are the needs and desires of students with a disability regarding their university?
   2a) What are the needs and desires of students with a disability regarding their university’s environment?
   2b) What are the needs and desires of students with a disability regarding their university’s *persons*?
   2c) What are the needs and desires of students with a disability regarding their university’s *organizations*?

3. What are the steps a student with a disability has to go through in order to receive his or her required needs at the university?

4. What are the steps and actions in policy and practice that the institutes have been taken to meet the needs of students with disabilities at the university?

**Comparative**

5. What are the main similarities between the UvA, VU and HvA?

6. What are the main differences between the UvA, VU and HvA?

**Outcomes**

7. How is the responsibility for studying with a disability organized within the university?

8. What kind of policy, communication and facility recommendations can be formulated?
Chapter 3 Methodology

In this chapter the methodology on how to obtain answers for each research (sub) question will be described. The methodology consists of a description of the motivation for qualitative research, the study population, the interview design and type and the data analysis.

3.1 Choice for a qualitative approach

The aim of this study was to understand certain feelings, experiences and thought processes. This thus provides insights in the lives of students with disabilities. To gain these insights, conversations with these students took place about their experiences at the university, their needs and desires regarding facilities and services, the barriers they experience that obstruct their participation in education and finally their thoughts about the communication with the university and the use of the website. Another point of interest was the university’s responsiveness, policy and experiences regarding students with disabilities. Dialogues with university staff members, such as study advisors and those responsible for studying with a disability were needed to get an impression of the university’s point of view.

In general, qualitative research generates extensive, detailed and valid knowledge that contribute to in-depth understanding of studying with a disability at the university (Anderson, 2006). This can only be achieved through conducting interviews with students with disabilities and with academic staff. Additionally, qualitative research in this area was scarce. There was a broad spectrum of quantitative research on the topic of studying with a disability. Many of them were based on questionnaires. The disadvantage was that this mainly provides us with numbers and a general understanding of the situation instead of in-depth insights in the needs, desires and barriers. This qualitative study aimed to tackle this disadvantage to gain an in-depth understanding of studying with a disability. This study generates data that is additional to the existing quantitative data.

3.2 Research design

This study was a prospective empirical research. It was prospective because this study was solely based on existing literature but it also contained interviews with those involved in the topic of studying with a disability. It was empirical because it took place in the real world and different people involved in the research topic were interviewed to gain full understanding of the situation. Furthermore, it was descriptive because the different needs, desires, feelings and experiences of students with disabilities, as well as the responsiveness and experiences of academic staff were described. Moreover, it was reflective because in-depth interviews were conducted meaning that topics were not discussed superficially but motivations and reasons underlying opinions were searched for. In other words, the focus did not lie on ‘what and how-questions’, but on ‘why’ something was said, thought or done.

3.3 Study population

The study population consisted of all students with a disability studying at Dutch universities or universities of applied sciences. The sample population used in this study consisted of students with a disability studying at the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences. Additionally, university staff members of these universities were
included in this study to gain insights in the policy, practice and responsiveness of the mentioned universities.

There were several inclusion and exclusion criteria for interviewees to participate in this study. The inclusion criteria for the student interviewees were that the interviewee follows higher education at one of the three Amsterdam universities. Moreover, the student participants could be male or female, independent of age and field of study. Every disability was taken along, from personally perceived disabilities to medically acknowledged disabilities. Students who did not speak Dutch or English were excluded from this study.

The university staff members included in this study had to work at the UvA, VU or HvA and had to be involved with students with a disability. They had to be familiar with the topic, either because of their expertise or because of their involvement with students with a disability.

The students were approached through email and Facebook but also through study advisors and the database of the Student Health Check, asking if they were interested, willing to participate and subsequently to plan a meeting. The university staff was approached through email, whereupon meetings were planned.

3.4 Interview content
The interviews were aimed at providing an answer to the research questions. The interview questions were derived from the conceptual model, the research objective and the contextual background.

The interview began with requiring background information of the students to understand the student’s perspective and to discover possible links between the student’s experiences and his or her study and/or disability. The interview also began with background information to take off the conversation in a calm and pleasant way. Subsequently, the aim of the interviews was to obtain information about the concepts of the conceptual model in chapter 2. The extensive interview guide can be found in Annex 2. The topics were:

- Education received *(background)*
- Type of disability *(background)*
- Infrastructure and environment (concept: *building*)
- Availability of facilities and services (concept: *services*)
- Information availability (concept: *services*)
- Website (concept: *communication*)
- Communication between university and student (concept: *communication*)
- Communication between academic staff (concept: *communication*)
- Responsiveness academic staff (concept: *responsiveness*)
- Disability related knowledge academic staff (concept: *knowledge*)
- Experience with fellow students (concept: *fellow students*)
- University’s regulations (concept: *procedures*)
- Experiences with facilities (concept: *practices*)
- Experiences with services (concept: *practices*)
- Financial matters (concept: *financial support*)
3.5 Interview type

The list of topics above was created prior to the interviews in order to provide an answer to the research questions. The interviews were semi-structured, because the concepts discussed with the interviewees were known (Bernard, 2006). The aim was thus to steer the dialogue in a certain direction. However, semi-structured also meant that there was room for spontaneous discussions and additional information different than the topics mentioned by the researcher. Open and follow-up questions were used during the interviews to reveal the underlying reasons strengthening the interviewees’ statements. An interview guide was created that contained the topic list mentioned in the previous paragraph, but also the procedures and the main questions were written out to guarantee nothing important would be left out. The confidentiality of the study and interview was explained and a verbal informed consent was agreed on. Finally, students were offered to conduct the interview at a place of their choice to increase the likelihood of participation but also to make it easier and more familiar for the student.

One group interview was held with two dyslexia students of the same study. The students were nephews and requested the group interview themselves. Therefore, the researcher agreed because he was convinced there was a trustful setting and prior to the interview it was known to the researcher and to the two students that one student did report the disability to the university while the other student did not. An advantage of a group interview is that it creates the possibility of interaction between the students, which may lead to supportive or opposing ideas (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2010). Furthermore, one interview was done via mail because the respondent insisted on this due to his mental disability. The extensive interview guide was send as initial questions. Mail traffic took place to clarify and elaborate on subjects. The researcher was aware that potential important insights were missed because interaction was not possible, the intonation how something was being said could not be observed and there was a limited possibility for profoundly questioning.

Furthermore, conversations with study advisors and policy advisors were held after the interviews with the students were analyzed. The aim of these conversations was to gather information on policy and practice. Additionally, the findings of this study were discussed and response on the findings was requested. The recommendations in this study were proposed, which resulted into a discussion involving expectations and responsibilities, approval of the recommendations and its feasibility. The interview guide for study advisors and for policy advisors can be found in annex 3 and 4 respectively.

To improve the quality of the interview and data, the ‘listening, summarizing and reflecting’ tactic was used to understand what the interviewee was telling (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). This tactic also minimized the chance on interpretation mistakes. This tactic was found in the OARS model, which is a skill-based model of interactive techniques, using motivational interviewing principles. The OARS model will be used as the basis of the interviews.

The OARS model includes four basic skills (Center of Health Training, 2010):
- **O** = Open questions: Explore, clarify and gain understanding of the interviewee’s world; learn about the interviewee’s experience, thoughts and feelings; gather information as interviewee does most of the talking.
- **A** = Affirmations: build rapport; demonstrate empathy; confirmation of interviewee’s story.
R = Reflective listening: demonstrate to the interviewee that I am listening and trying to understand him or her; reflect the interviewee’s experiences, thoughts and feelings.
S = Summarizing: Verifying that my interpretation is the same as the interviewee’s; help the interviewee and myself to move through a session to transitions and closure.

The interview procedures can be found in annex 1 and the interview guide for students in annex 2.

3.6 Data analysis
Audio recording was used with permission. The qualitative data obtained from the interviews was processed by transcribing the spoken text into written language. The transcripts can be found in annex 8. After the interviews, the interviewees were sent a summary of the conversation (see annex 7). This was done to check if he or she agreed with what had been transcribed, hence increasing the reliability of the data. All respondents were numbered so anonymity was guaranteed. Additionally, the study advisors and policy advisors were asked for approval and conformation if citations were used.

Qualitative research involves coding, the process in which information is labeled to codes and categories (Baarda, De Goede & Theunissen, 2009). The interview data was analyzed with selective coding as the concepts of the conceptual model were used as starting point. Firstly, the transcript was profoundly read to get a general idea of the information. Secondly, each meaningful fragment in the text was underlined and subsequently labeled. The labeled fragments were gathered in a coding sheet. Finally, the labels and fragments were divided into the concepts of the conceptual model, which served as cluster terms. This process was repeated every interview. In case specific categories within a concept were found, the concerning fragments were divided into umbrella terms to provide additional structure. The codes were visualized by means of tree diagrams (annex 5) in order to provide a clear overview of the data (Boeije, 2005).

To decrease subjectivity and to increase the validity of the coding process, a step has been made towards inter-observer reliability (Baarda, De Goede & Theunissen, 2009). A fellow student, independent of the researcher, read, fragmented and analyzed the first three transcripts. Subsequently, the working method and the labels were compared and discussed until consensus was achieved.

The needs and barriers mentioned in the interviews with students were further analyzed with a cause analysis. This is a method of problem solving that tries to identify the root causes of experienced problems (Rooney & Vanden Heuvel, 2004). The cause analysis was visualized in an argumentation tree. The argumentation tree connects the problems that students experience to the more general perceptions and values underlying these problems (Fischer, 1994). Each consecutive step in the argumentation tree was made by asking why. The consistency was checked as followed: each step downwards in the tree reveals the answers to the ‘why-questions’, while reading the tree from bottom to top reveals subsequent consequences when something is the case. The external validity of the cause analysis was checked by asking feedback from the students on the argumentation trees. Finally, the underlying root causes could contribute in formulating concrete recommendations.
To remain faithful to the principals of qualitative research, saturation of the data should be strived for. Saturation is achieved when the collection of new information does not shed any further light on the needs and barriers that students experience (Mason, 2010). Although saturation is difficult to prove as additional interviews can always provide new insights, the researcher finds it plausible that saturation was achieved when no new labels and categories were formed after a series of interviews.
Chapter 4 Results

The sample population consisted of 21 students, of which seven studied at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, six at the University of Amsterdam and eight at the VU University Amsterdam. The average time of an interview was 70 minutes. Four students followed a master education. Eight students were male and thirteen were female. At time of the study, 20 students followed a different education in the faculties of Economics and Management, Social Work and Law, Earth and Life Sciences, Philosophy, Psychology, Humanities and Sciences. The disability, disability-type and university of the sample population are listed in the table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Amputation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Diabetes type I</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis, back pain</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Chronic headache</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Atychiphobia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Chronic Fatigue Syndrome</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Anxiety disorder</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>PDD-NOS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Asperger syndrome</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Hearing impairment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical, Mental</td>
<td>Stuttering, ADHD, PDD-NOS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical, Mental</td>
<td>Heart disease, information processing disorder</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual, Physical</td>
<td>ADHD, weak fine motor skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Overview of disability, disability-type and university of the sample population.
The results are structured consistent with the sub questions in this study. The first and second sub question entailed the barriers and needs assessment. Both sub questions were divided in three categories: environment, persons and organizations. The findings of this study will be described along the concepts of these categories and there will be distinguished between barriers and needs.

4.1 Environment

4.1.1 Buildings

Barriers

Only some students with mobility problems experienced infrastructural barriers. The absence of electrical sockets in lecture halls was mentioned by students who required the use of a laptop during lectures. A student with chronic fatigue syndrome experienced trouble with placing her stretcher in lecture halls. The same student studying at the VU University also encountered several practical barriers: the swing doors were difficult to open; some elevators were too small to enter with a scooter, the elevator for the handicapped did not work properly and some buildings, like the Transitorium, were barely accessible for students in a wheelchair. A visual impaired student at the VU University mentioned that she cannot read the signs indicating the lecture halls which make them hard to find. A student with rheumatoid arthritis and back pain mentioned she has trouble attending lectures because of her disability:

“The folding chairs and wooden benches in the lecture halls are really painful. You can only sit very closely to each other and you can only sit in one position” (resp. 11, rheumatoid arthritis, back pain)

Needs

One student with chronic fatigue syndrome suggested creating a permanent place for stretchers or wheelchairs in lecture halls. This would offer her a fixed place in the lecture hall, decreasing her insecurity and inconvenience. A deaf student at the HvA explained the importance of a well lit university. She needs light in order to see the sign language of her interpreter and of herself in order to communicate. She was satisfied with the HvA because the university works a lot with visual communication and not merely with verbal communication, which is important for her in order to participate. Four students at the VU expressed the need to have a small distance between the university buildings, and that was their motivation for choosing the VU as university. One student with a hearing impairment at the UvA mentioned an audio induction loop would really help her in understanding the teachers. She noted that the university does have an audio induction loop in some rooms, but that they were never used.

4.1.2 Services

Barriers

In general students were satisfied with the services the university offers them. The most used service is extra time for exams. Though not all students always needed the extra time, it diminished the thought of racing against the clock, which gives them stress and uncertainty.
Some students cannot write as a consequence of their disability and they require a laptop to make exams. In general, the students mentioned that the university wants students to make the exam on a laptop provided by the university.

“The exam committee wants me to make the exam on the university’s laptop, but then I need to buy the reading software again. I will not pay for this” (resp. 9, visual impairment)

One student with chronic fatigue syndrome at the VU experienced a hard time getting to the university. The VU had offered her an access card for special entrances of buildings and a parking pass for the university’s parking lot. Long days at the university were unpleasant for some students because it costs them a lot of effort and they experience pain and tiredness, especially if there were many free hours in between classes. Some indicated that they are exhausted when they come home and thus do not have energy to study or work on papers.

“After a whole day at school, I have no energy to study anymore in the evening, unlike others. I am really exhausted” (resp. 11, rheumatoid arthritis, back pain)

The student with chronic fatigue syndrome was offered access to the relaxing room at the VU, but she explains that you need to reserve the relaxing room in advance while she never knows when she might need it. Another student with rheumatic arthritis and back pain mentioned that the HvA created a relaxing room for her. This room was improvised, but it contained a fat boy, a treatment table and a refrigerator. Additionally, she was given an office chair to make exams on, after she explained to the study advisor that she really experiences pain while sitting on a wooden chair.

Three dyslexia students would like to have more support and comprehension for their writing because they have difficulties with grammar. Additionally, they indicated the need to have at least font size eleven to read the text correctly. To cope with the writing barrier, one student suggested the following idea:

“It would be helpful is there was someone from the university to check your text. A free service of the university for theses, or something like that” (resp. 16, dyslexia)

The blind student and also a visual impaired student at the VU require digital books. The university does provide syllabi and readers in word documents in order to function with the reading software, but study books remain problematic. They are often dependent of external parties that translate written books into spoken text.

Dependent of the university and study, students with extra exam time make their exam in a separate room with other students who have the right on extra exam time. Most students mentioned this as positive, as they are less distracted by other students who are leaving earlier. Not every student was positive though, as made clear by the following quote:

“I do not understand that they put forty students with ADHD or dyslexia in one room for exams. It just does not work” (resp. 8, ADHD, weak fine motor skills)
A student with rheumatic arthritis and back pain was given an office chair to make exams on, after she explained to the study advisor that she really experiences pain while sitting on a wooden chair. She indicated that this is really important for her, but that it took more than a year before this solution was provided.

Needs

Many students indicated the desire for more guidance and support. A student with adhd, pdd-nos and who stutters makes use of the student-psychologist. He has four years of experience with the student-psychologist at the VU and is very pleased with that service.

“On one hand it is very nice to be able to relieve my feelings, but also stuff from my private life, and also if I am worried about a course. She gives me advice and brainstorms with me on solutions. It is really pleasant to have a psychologist” (resp. 5, adhd, stuttering, PDD-NOS)

The three students with dyslexia would appreciate it if the university would take their dyslexia into account at exams. They suggested key words to be underlined or made bold, to avoid difficult words and to avoid putting as many information as possible in one sentence. Additionally, it would be a good idea if a dyslexia student can write ‘dyslexia’ above their exam so the teacher can take into accounts the spelling mistakes or the difficult handwriting.

Two students mentioned verbal exams as a good and helpful alternative to make an exam, but the university did not agree with this because they did not find this service was in line with the qualifications of the university degree.

A deaf student always brings along her interpreter to class. She is pleased that the HvA deals well with the interpreter.

“The interpreter is my key to communication. I cannot visit the university without my interpreter and you cannot just put him or her in a corner” (resp. 10, deaf)

A blind student explained that he cannot visit the university without his guide dog. The guide dog is offered to him by the Royal Dutch Guide Dog Foundation (KNGF). He is pleased that the VU accepts this and that they offered him a locker for towels and food for his dog.

Many students indicated the need to have structure and planning in their lives. Initiatives like an annual study guide and a planning for each course are good and desired, but there is room for improvement.

“The study guide is a good idea, but they do not comply with it. I have read some chapters of the book already and then they say during the first class that we are going to use another book” (resp. 8, ADHD, weak fine motor skills)

Three students with mobility difficulties would like to have video-lectures, so they do not have to visit the university all the time. A deaf student indicated there are video-lectures available, but these
were without subtitles or separate text, which made it complex for her because she still needed to arrange an interpreter.

4.1.3 Communication

Barriers

Some students would like the study advisor to update the teachers about their situation because it is easier and practical. Others, however, see this as an infraction of their privacy. Students mentioned that they find it hard to approach the teacher and they refrain from seeking contact due to their uncertainty concerning the teacher’s reaction.

“I find it difficult to tell teachers, I do not want to have the confrontation” (resp. 12, multiple sclerosis)

“You tell them pretty personal information and actually you do not want to tell them that it is not going good. But you cannot help it either. That is not always appealing” (resp. 7, amputation)

Communication between the study advisor and the teachers was also something students were not always satisfied with. At some studies, the teachers were familiar with the study advisor and they communicate together. Other students experienced no communication between the two.

“The study advisor should ask the student is the student would appreciate it if the study advisor would explain the situation to the teachers. That prevents a lot of stress and emotions for the student himself” (resp. 7, amputation)

One student was not pleased with the way the university dealt with confidential information and how they communicated in general. She was reticent in sharing information with academic staff ever since.

“If I send an email to the study counselor and I write down that I want it to be confidential. It is weird that I receive a reply that is also addressed to the study advisor” (resp. 8, ADHD, weak finer motor skills)

Students were not satisfied with the information provided by the university regarding studying with a disability. They were often not aware of the services and support the university offers and some encountered a threshold to approach a study advisor for information. This limits students in receiving optimal support and a successful educational experience.

When students were asked about their opinion of the university’s website, most students were not pleased. According to students, the websites were not user-friendly and the findability of information was low. Students cannot find what they seek and often end up using Google.

Needs

A topic that reoccurred in many interviews was initiative from the university. Students mentioned that they have to show initiative to get support, facilities and services from the university. If they
restrained from showing initiative, nothing would happen. Those students that were satisfied with the facilities and support they have, also mentioned that this was thanks to their own initiative. Some students agreed with the current state of affairs, namely that the initiative should come from the student.

“I think students should show initiative, they should clearly explain what their problem is and what they expect. Then it will turn out all right” (resp. 3, blind)

One student weighed a lot of weight to the fact that he knows that there are staff members of the university to talk to if needed.

“At least half of the tension is taken away, if you know there is always someone to talk to at the university” (resp. 5, stuttering, ADHD, PDD-NOS)

The majority of the students, however, take the view that the university should show more initiative.

“Look, the stupid part is that you have to find out everything yourself and arrange everything yourself.” (resp. 11, rheumatoid arthritis)

Most students desired the university to approach them at the start of the study. This should already be done in the application procedure and subsequently by an information brochure or email, but also by offering a conversation about the possibilities the university offers. And certainly when the students have indicated that they have a disability, they expected the university to approach them.

“It would be nice if the study advisor would approach me for extra exam time, as soon as I indicated that I have a disability” (resp. 13, diabetes type I)

“Or even an email with a kind of action plan for students with a disability, showing who you need to address if you have a problem and what the different possibilities are” (resp. 7, amputation)

If students have had a conversation with the study advisor, they would like to hear from the study advisor again. Now students indicated that it is a one-time-conversation and after that all contact was over. Some students desire more personal contact and the feeling that someone cares about them. They would appreciate it if the study advisor would ask them a few months later how they were doing, if the study went well and if they had any problems.

“If the study advisor would ask me once in every three months how I am doing and if I need anything; that would be nice. Then you know that someone if thinking of you” (resp. 11, rheumatoid arthritis, back pain)

Some students would also appreciate it if there were more attention and interest from the teachers. Currently, most students mentioned that they have no personal contact with the teacher.

“They all had the email about my situation; they could at least talk to me sometimes” (resp. 11, rheumatoid arthritis)
“If the teachers would ask me two weeks after the start of a course if everything goes all right, that would be nice. Then I can also tell him if I have problems or whatsoever” (resp. 9, visual impairment)

Summary
To summarize, needs and barriers regarding the category environment were varied. Students with mobility difficulties require equal access to their university and participation to their study. They need a university that is more adjusted to their disability, e.g. a fixed place for a stretcher. Barriers that obstruct the accessibility, such as swing doors and a malfunctioning elevator for the handicapped should be removed or solutions should be offered. Barriers to the participation of education, such as the folding chairs and wooden benches in lecture halls, should also be fixed.

Students in general were satisfied with the services provided by the university. Most barriers were overcome thanks to the provided services, e.g. laptop use, digital books and an office chair instead of a wooden chair. However, some needs are yet to be met. Improvement is possible for the study guide and course planning. Video-lectures remain an unmet need as well. The other needs were provided by the student himself, such as the interpreter and the guide dog.

Communication is a broad subject. Students feel like they have to arrange everything by themselves and this costs them a lot of effort and time. Some also found it hard to start the conversation and to approach teachers. Additionally, students were not satisfied with the available information regarding studying with a disability and the website did not make it easier for them. Students desired the following solutions to bypass these communicational barriers: improved communication between the study advisor and teachers, a more proactive approach from academic staff, a better offer of information and clarity of services and support and finally more attention and interest from teachers and the study advisor.

4.2 Persons

4.2.1 Responsiveness

Barriers
The study advisor was mostly the first contact person at the university. In general, students’ opinions about the study advisor were favorable regarding their friendliness and understanding. However, the responsiveness of the study advisor was an aspect that has to be improved according to the many students. Students expected more initiative and actions from the student counselor. Currently, students mentioned that they have to initiate every action and idea. This costs them a lot of effort and time and sometimes a restrain from seeking further aid. They would like to have a study advisor who is creative and who comes up with solutions.

“The study advisor was friendly, but she is passive. There is good will, I am sure. But no action” (resp. 9, visual impairment)

“I told her before that I find it difficult and painful to follow classes like this but she did not do anything with it” (resp. 11, rheumatoid arthritis, back pain)
Another student wanted to have a conversation with the study advisor but when she explained her disease (Multiple Sclerosis) by email, she received a non-inviting answer which only contained “okay come to my office”. The student did not feel any empathy and felt uncomfortable approaching her. She was disappointed in the reply she received but also in the study advisor herself. The way a study advisor responds to student seems to be an important factor to overcome the threshold to seek contact. The following citation clarifies this.

“She was very friendly through mail […] She is very good in what she does and that is the reason why I asked for a conversation with her” (resp. 15, epilepsy)

Contact with teachers varied among the students. Some state that teachers showed understanding and that they were helpful, while others disagreed.

“I told one teacher I had Atychiphobia because I had to do a presentation. The teacher was very friendly and said that someone else could do the presentation. It was not for a grade though. He was very cool” (resp. 2, Atychiphobia)

“I once asked if the teacher could fully explain the equation, instead of writing only parts of it on the black board and explaining the other part verbally. But his reply was “that is too much work” (resp. 20, PDD-NOS)

Students find it hard to address the teacher to explain their disability, mostly because they do not know what the reaction will be. Others do not tell the teacher because they think or know that it will not change anything. And some students were afraid of being labeled and unequal treatment. Restraining from seeking contact could result in a decreased educational experience and study results.

“But I never told a workgroup teacher about my concentration disorder, because I feel ashamed. […] But I do require more explanation about certain topics” (resp. 20, PDD-NOS)

Needs

Students desired a more proactive attitude from the study advisor and they would appreciate it if they would be approached by the study advisor themselves. Additionally, students would like the study advisor to show more involvement and attention. Students often stated that they would appreciate it if the study advisor would ask them how they were doing and how their study progress was going and if they needed anything. The citations below clarify this desire.

“It would be pleasant if the study advisor would have contacted me sometime again” (resp. 1, chronic headache)

“She could have actually asked me sometime how I was doing” (resp. 8, adhd, weak fine motor skills)

Students desired attention and support from teachers, and they would appreciate it if the teacher would approach them to discuss the disability. They also desired more personal contact and aid with
specific study material. However, the teacher has to know about the student’s situation in order to discuss it. Some students would like the study advisor to inform the teachers, but not all students agreed.

“It would be nice if the teachers would know about it, but I do not want to tell them every time. But if the study advisor would mail the teachers with my photo, that is not a pleasant thought either” (resp. 1, chronic headache)

Currently, students get a **tutor** for the first year at the university. One student at the VU would like to have had a tutor during her whole study, instead of only in her first year. Other students also mentioned the desire to have more guidance from the university. When asked if the tutor fulfills this role, some said no.

“In the first year we had a tutor, but he was suddenly gone after the first year. In the third year I really needed him” (resp. 13, diabetes type I)

### 4.2.2 Knowledge

**Barriers**

Some students restrained from contacting the **study advisor** because they had the feeling that the study advisor would not take him or her serious. Others mentioned that they felt that the study advisor had no knowledge regarding their disability. And others had the idea that the study advisor cannot do anything for them.

“It restraints me to start a conversation because I am afraid she will not take me serious. They will not do anything with it anyways. I find it uncomfortable if she will ask questions about my Atychiphobia” (resp. 2, Atychiphobia)

A student with anxiety disorder at the UvA experienced a hard time at the university because the study advisor did not acknowledge anxiety disorder as a disability. As a result she did not get the understanding, support and services she would like to have had.

“They told me they do not acknowledge my disability. If you have dyslexia, you can have a declaration on paper, but not with anxiety disorder. I even handed over my entire medical file so they would see the facts, but still they did not want to acknowledge it” (resp. 19, anxiety disorder)

A student with PDD-NOS at the UvA experienced trouble with study exercises and required additional aid from the **teacher**. He had the feeling teachers did not understand him. The teacher’s lack of knowledge regarding his autism sometimes led to wrong and unclear explanations and decreased his understanding of the study material.

**Needs**

Students understood that the study advisor and teachers could not be familiar and have experiences with all disabilities. Nevertheless, students would at least like to receive understanding and response from academic staff that they will aid in searching for a solution. They expected the study advisor to
inform them about the different services and support the university offers. Teachers were less familiar with the spectrum of services available for students.

“Sometimes I ask teachers if they know if there are digital books available. Most of them do not know, but some do help with searching” (resp. 9, visual impairment)

Another idea students brought forward was to offer trainings for study advisors and teachers that focus on studying with a disability. These trainings should aim to expand the knowledge regarding disabilities and to train academic staff in handling students with a disability. These trainings should contribute to the increased knowledge and understanding students would like to have from the study advisor and teachers.

4.2.3 Fellow students

Barriers

In general, students were satisfied with their fellow students. Sometimes students missed class due to their disability and in rare cases, such as a student with multiple sclerosis, consecutive days or even weeks were missed. Most students experienced support and understanding from fellow students.

“My project group was very friendly and they respected me, they took over my part of the project” (resp. 12, multiple sclerosis)

However, five students had less positive experiences with fellow students. They often felt misunderstood, which resulted in less social contact and a feeling of loneliness. Related to this was that some, mainly autistic students, did not tell their fellow students what disability they had to avoid stigma or because they felt ashamed.

“On a certain moment I stopped wearing bandages, because others thought I was exaggerating” (resp. 7, amputation)

“If I tell my disability to fellow students, the reaction is like ‘oh again someone with back pain’ or ‘yeah my mother also has been in her back some times” (resp. 11, rheumatoid arthritis)

Needs

Three students would like to have contact with other students who have the same disability. They would be interested in their experiences and how they solve certain problems. Contact can be through meetings for students with the same disability, or through email.

Summary

To summarize, the needs are barriers associated with the category persons were mostly related to understanding, support and a proactive attitude of academic staff. Students expected more initiative from the study advisor and they felt like they had to initiate everything. They desired a study advisor who would seek contact with them after a few months to show they were not being forgotten. Personal attention and interest was thus clearly an aspect students desired. As for teachers, some
students experienced a threshold to address the teacher, which restrained them in receiving support and understanding.

Students did not always have the feeling they were being understood by academic staff. A sense of not being taken serious or not being acknowledged by academic staff mad it for some students hard to seek and receive support. Students suggested trainings for academic staff to increase the knowledge and manner towards student with a disability.

Contact with fellow students was often experienced as good and in general they received support and they felt understanding. Some students, however, had less positive experiences with fellow students because they felt ashamed or misunderstood, which resulted in less social contact. Some students indicated they would like to have contact with other students with the same disability to share thoughts and experiences.

4.3 Organizations

4.3.1 Procedures

Barriers

In some cases, students indicated that the university was willing to think along with solutions and were willing to make adjustments in regulations, such as curriculum and exam related adaptations. Other students did not experience this willingness and felt they were being opposed by the regulations.

“You have to be well prepared and self-confident, if you want them to carry out a solution. Most of the times they just say that they cannot make an exception for me alone” (resp. 8, ADHD, weak fine motor skills)

Three students also expressed criticism towards the structure within the university. Often already struggling with seeking help and talking about their disability, students indicated that there is a broad spectrum of academic staff involved in requesting services or support. This costs the students a lot of time, effort and a lot of waiting.

“Something happens, you tell your coach, who says you have to go your study advisor, who says you actually have to go to the study counselor and then the study counselor has to arrange it with the examination committee. Then you already involved four persons” (resp. 8, adhd, weak fine motor skills).

One student had a very specific encounter with the regulations and policy at the VU, as described in the citation below.

“I had a one-year break. The only thing we had not tried yet is to stop studying for a while. So after my second year I took a break for one year. That was well arranged with the VU. [...] I was told I could register to the university at a later moment in the year, so I would not need to pay useless college fee. However, they suddenly changed the rules. When I was already having my break, they told me that I had to pay the full college fee. [...] I think it is good the university does not become an
entrance for every student hopping in and out, but they knew about my situation and we agreed that I could register at a later moment in the year.” (resp. 1, chronic headache)

Needs

A distinction between the UvA / VU and the HvA is that on the HvA students arrange their extra exam time only once with the study advisor. For every exam a separate room is arranged and students only have to take their declaration with them. On the UvA and VU, students have to get permission from the study advisor, and then approach the teacher every course to arrange it. Students of the VU and UvA would see it as a great improvement if their extra exam time could be arranged in once for all their courses, meaning they do not have to seek contact and put effort in getting it arranged on time.

Furthermore, students indicated it would be easier and more pleasant if the process of requesting aiding tools or services would be quicker and clearer. The dependence of the examination committee as decision authority sometimes resulted in stress and a lot of patience, as these decisions take six to eight weeks.

4.3.2 Practices

Barriers

The fact that universities provide certain facilities and services for students with a disability does not per se mean that they are also well implemented and positively experienced by students.

Two students for example mentioned that they were allowed to make their exam on a laptop, but that their exam got lost afterwards (multiple times in one case). These students were blamed and it cost them a lot of effort to get permission for a re-exam. Additionally, two dyslexia students and one with ADHD at the HvA were told they could make exams on A3 size paper, but the A3 size papers were barely provided at time of the exam.

A majority of the students mentioned that arranging facilities and services takes them a lot of effort and time. A clarifying example is the experience of a student with a visual impairment at the VU.

“At the start of the year I send an email to all teachers with a description of my situation. At the beginning of every course I send another email to the specific teacher. During the first lecture I visit the teacher and I introduce myself and I explain him that the needs to arrange a separate exam room for me with a supervisor and an exam of USB flash drive. Then the teacher says ‘okay I will get it done’. In week two I visit him again and he says ‘oh should we do that? Is not that the task of the study advisor?’ I answer with ‘no’. So the teacher says ‘okay I will arrange it’. In week three I visit him again and he tells me ‘yes I still have to do that’. Well in week four my exam is on Friday. So, on Monday I send an email asking if it is arranged. ‘We are still working on it’. On Wednesday I send another email. And finally on Thursday night or on Friday, two hours before the exam, I get to hear that it is arranged and that I can make my exam. It gives me stress, I get tired of it and the first times it is very scary.” (resp. 9, visual impairment)
Needs

Additional guidance is a service that universities provide for students with an autism spectrum disorder. However, some students with disabilities other than autism also indicated the desire to have additional guidance. The contact with the study advisor was often not enough. A student who underwent amputation surgery would have appreciated more guidance and support in times of pain and uncertainty regarding her diagnose. She elaborated that she would like to have had someone who is close to her, who is there to talk to and to give advice and who is also acknowledged by the university. It should be someone who is familiar with the regulations and laws and who can function as an intermediary between student and university.

“Someone who would try his best to aid me in all possible ways, that is something I really missed [...] The study progress and my student experiences would have been so much better if I was given support” (resp. 7, amputation)

Several students took the view that the universities pretend to be a better institute for students with a disability than they actually are. Facilities, services, support and adjustments were presented on the website but in practice some students were disappointed in the actual offer. Students would be pleased to see the university realizing their policy regarding ‘studying with a disability’.

4.3.3 Financial support

Barriers

Study delay and related financial uncertainty were important aspects for students. Students often worried about future study delay and they were afraid of financial problems. Financial uncertainty also contributed to stress and increases the pressure to succeed, which sometimes created friction with students’ health.

“Fortunately it did not become a choice between health and money” (resp. 1, chronic headache)

Seven students already had a study delay of one year or more. For four of these students financial support, as in an extra year of study grant, was essential in continuing the study without having financial problems. One student who had study delay as a result of pain, sleeping medication and surgery requested financial support from the VU itself, the so-called financial support students request (FOS-aanvraag). Her request was denied twice by the examination committee.

“I requested the FOS two times, one got denied because I was so called ‘too late’ and once because I had too many credits. [...] As if I can predict when I become sick [...] so basically I got punished because I tried my best to follow my courses” (resp. 7, amputation)

Needs
Some students mentioned that they were not aware of the possibility to receive extra year(s) of study grant. They would like to have more information on this aspect, especially from the study advisor at their first meeting.

Students who require external aiding tools to study, such as the students who are blind, deaf or visually impaired, were very pleased with the financial contribution of the UWV. These students explained that they really need this contribution and that they are dependent of it.

“If I work in the future, I only receive 15% coverage of my working hours for my interpreter from the UWV. On the university the coverage is still 100%, so I can follow all courses. I really have to take that into account for the future” (resp. 10, deaf)

Summary
To summarize, the needs and barriers related to the category organizations referred mainly to false expectations regarding guidance, financial support and the willingness to make exceptions for students with a disability. Students felt hindered by the university’s inflexible regulations and it was sometimes perceived as enervating and uncomfortable that so many personnel was involved in arranging a facility or service. Furthermore, students desired a smoother process of requesting services.

Students were pleased that the university provides facilities and services, although it sometimes led to complications and frustrations. In some cases, students had to do a lot effort to get a service arranged which generates a lot of stress and uncertainty. Some students desired more guidance from the university that is supplementary to the study advisor.

Some students were dependent of financial support from the university and government. This included financial compensation for study delay and financial coverage for aiding tools like reading software. Financial uncertainty led to stress, inconvenience and sometimes caused friction with the student’s health. Finally, students would like to have received more information on financial support.
4.4 Other findings

In addition to the interviews with students, conversations were held with academic staff (table 6). Topics related to policy, practice and the findings of this study were discussed with three study advisors and three staff members involved with the policy on ‘studying with a disability’. Five conversations were held face-to-face and one through telephone. The average time of a conversation was 60 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iris Hettelingh</td>
<td>Study advisor</td>
<td>Faculty of Science</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Harbers</td>
<td>Study advisor</td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozemarijn Wegert</td>
<td>Study advisor</td>
<td>Faculty of Law</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Flüggen</td>
<td>Student counselor, project leader ‘studying with a disability’ and policy advisor*</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>UvA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjolein Touwen</td>
<td>Project leader ‘studying with a disability’, Career counselor</td>
<td>The Course and Career Information Centre and SCHIB</td>
<td>VU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona Bonnema</td>
<td>Project leader ‘studying with a disability’</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>HvA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Overview of academic staff and their function, department and university. * regarding the policy on studying with a disability.

4.4.1 Route towards support

The third sub question was as follows: “What are the steps a student with a disability has to go through in order to receive his or her required needs at the university?” The answer to this sub question is based on students’ experiences and conversations with study advisors and policy advisors on ‘studying with a disability’.

Every university offers a tutor for the first year of the study. At some faculties, the tutor is a fellow student from year two or three and at other faculties the tutor is a teacher. The tutor’s function is to introduce the university environment to the student and to be an easy accessible contact person for advice and problems. On the UvA and VU the tutor is available during the first year, while on the HvA he or she is present during the whole study. If students with a disability address the tutor with needs or problems that go beyond ‘a listening ear’, the student is redirected to the study advisor. Teachers are also instructed to redirect the student to the study advisor in case of needs or problems. The study advisor is the first contact person for facilities, services and additional guidance. For study results and matters that are related to study progress, such as adjustments in curriculum, the study advisor will take care of it. At the UvA, the study advisor will forward the student to the study counselor, if students request facilities and services and also for financial matters related to the disability. The study counselor discusses the possibilities with the student and finally has to request the appeal at the examination committee. At the VU, study advisors only forward the student to the study counselor for financial matters. Facilities and services can be arranged through
the study advisor and subsequently the examination committee. At the HvA, the study advisor has the same function as the study counselor and thus only consists of one person, which is called the study counselor at the HvA.

4.4.2 University’s response

The answer on the fourth sub question: “What are the steps and actions in policy and practice the institutes have been taken to meet the needs of students with disabilities at the university?” is based upon conversations with study advisors and policy advisors.

Policy

The HvA and VU have recently updated their policy regarding studying with a disability. The policies include protocols and guidelines on six themes: information, accessibility, guidance, expertise, adjustments in curriculum and examination. Quality control and monitoring are also included. The policies also indicate the rights and duties of students and that there is a shared responsibility for studying with a disability. It is the students’ responsibility to inform the university about their disability and subsequently the university is responsible to support the student and to aid him or her with her study.

A new policy on studying with a disability is currently being developed at the UvA. Claudia Flüggen, student counselor and policy advisor at the UvA, mentioned the importance of creating a written policy in order to have more guidelines ‘on paper’, which provides more structure and clarity. She also mentioned it would be a good idea to have a specific policy for every disability, although this also has its disadvantage. She explained that the UvA does not advocate policies for specific groups, such as those with dyslexia or those with autism. Positive discrimination and stigma is something to take into account when developing policy.

Ilona Bonnema, project leader ‘studying with a disability’ at the HvA, explained that more and more attention is given towards the group of students with a disability. The addition of the topic ‘studying with a disability’ into their institutional accreditation in 2013 was considered as a boost for the board of directors of the HvA to emphasize the group of students with a disability. Their recently developed policy ‘studying with a disability’ was the first initiative to create extensive guidelines. Ilona Bonnema further mentioned that study advisors are actively involved in the implementation of the policy and that constant feedback is requested.

Marjolein Touwen, active at the Course and Career Information Centre at the VU and at the SCHIB as contact person and project leader, mentioned that the new policy is a great step in the right direction to create an optimal learning environment for students with a disability. She did mention that the university staff dedicated to the policy and practice related to studying with a disability has decreased significantly in the last years because of austerity: less money is available, which lead to less appointed personnel. Additionally, she mentioned that there are still improvements to be made in information and communicational aspects.
Practices

The SCHIB (Studenten Contact Hulp en Informatie bij Beperkingen) is a small department within Student Services at the VU that is focused on students with a disability. They are monitoring the implementation of the policy ‘studying with a disability’ at the VU. They also organize meetings, send out newsletters to students with a disability and they can be contacted by students to discuss additional possibilities to cope with their disability. They also provide guidance for autism students and dyslexia students.

All universities provide trainings and information meetings for teachers, study advisors and other academic staff about the topic of studying with a disability. However, these meetings are optional and there is no supervision. Rozemarijn Wegert, study advisor at the VU, assumes that study advisors visit these meetings because she expects them to be interested in the topic as they are involved with this group of students. Ilona Bonnema indicated that teachers are hard to reach and to inform and that she does not know if teachers feel commitment towards the group of students with a disability.

A lot of information regarding studying with a disability is provided on the website of the universities. Information about the policy, possibilities and contact persons is listed here. Thus information supply is mostly through digital communication through the website, although information emails and brochures are also used. Study advisor Marianne Harbers at the UvA acknowledged that students might desire more personal non-digital information. Therefore at their faculty the study advisors also give presentations and personal contact with teachers and study advisors is stimulated.

The universities provide a broad spectrum of facilities and services. One of these is the student-psychologists for students with autism who require additional guidance. Aside from the psychologists, the universities also provide peer-coaches: fellow students who provide support and advice related to the study and disability.

Study advisor Iris Hettelingh at the UvA explained that it is always a matter of figuring out what a student really needs and if this need is in line with the study. She elaborated that she always tries to aid students and find a way that suits the student best. However, this should not conflict with the quality of the education and the qualifications of the university degree. She concluded that the faculty is open for adjustments and solutions, but only up to a certain degree.

4.4.3 Similarities and differences

Sub question five and six encompassed the similarities and differences between the three universities.

All three universities have a policy on ‘studying with a disability’ and continuous improvements are being thought of. Based on the conversations with students, all universities need to improve their information and communication and students desire a more proactive approach from academic staff.
There are two main differences between the universities. Firstly, the HvA offers a tutor for all students during the whole study, instead of only during the first year, as is the case on the VU and UvA. Students experience this as pleasant and helpful. Secondly, students at the HvA only have to request extra time for exams once. If the student has been given permission by the study advisor, this is implemented for all courses and a separate room and exam are already arranged. On the UvA/VU however, students first have to ask for permission at the study advisor and subsequently they have to arrange the exam with every teacher at a new course. This requires students to continuously seek contact with the teacher, which some state to be emotional and time-consuming.

Another major difference is seen at the size of the study. Students studying at a study with a small department, including most master studies, were in general more satisfied than those at studies with a bigger amount of students. The distinction between small and large studies is difficult to make, but it involves the study advisor being able to know all the students and also the likelihood that students have personal contact with teachers and that teachers feel involved with individual students. Students at small studies often experienced better support, personal contact and guidance from their teachers and study advisor. Three reasons were mentioned by the students that support this. Firstly, students mentioned that the department is smaller and therefore people tend to know each other and communicate more. Secondly, there are fewer teachers and teachers often give multiple courses, stimulating personal contact and also the threshold to address a teacher is experienced as lower. Thirdly, students experienced more dedication from teachers and teachers were more open for guidance and support.

“In my master it all went fine. I got all the help I needed and we searched for solutions together. They were very broad-minded and they had faith in me” (resp. 4, chronic fatigue syndrome)

Marianne Harbers and Iris Hettelingh, both study advisors at a small study at the UvA, understand that it is likely that students at a small study are more satisfied than students at large studies. They indicate that they know every student and that they are well monitored. They also mention that at large studies this is often not possible because of the many students. Rozemarijn Wegerts, study advisor at a large study at the VU, agrees with this point of view. She mentions that personal contact and guidance for every student is impossible due to a lack of time and manpower. There is no easy solution for this, but she is certain that peer-educators and tutors contribute to the needs of students regarding attention and guidance and play an important role in referring the student to the advisors if necessary.

4.4.4 Responsibility

The seventh sub question “How is the responsibility for studying with a disability organized within the university?” can be answered based on the conversations with the study advisors and policy advisors.

The executive board and its policy makers are responsible for the policy ‘studying with a disability’. Policy advisors, such as the student counselor Claudia Flüggen and SCHIB staff member Marjolein Touwen, advise the policy makers and often also work together on creating policy. Policy advisors have occasional meetings with study advisors, study counselors and students to assemble problems,
improvements and experiences of daily practice (M. Touwen, personal communication, 24 June 2014). Tutors and also teachers have the responsibility to redirect students with a disability or other problems to the study advisor. The study advisor is responsible for seeking for solutions together with the student in order to make the education possible and to meet the needs of students as much as possible. Their function is also to discuss and monitor study progress and results. The study counselor is responsible for financial matters and the actual offer of facilities and services, such as laptop use for exams. Finally, the examination committee takes the student’s request into account and decides if it request is accepted.

All three universities are clear about the division of responsibilities regarding students. As written in their policies, it is the responsibility of the student to inform the university about the disability and what support they require. Subsequently, the university is responsible for delivering tailored services and support, as long as it is in line with the study and qualifications of a graduate. Marjolein Touwen and Claudia Flüggen did mention that the university is responsible to provide information and to minimize the threshold for students to seek contact. Based on the interviews with students, it seems that there sometimes occurs a gap between policy and practice regarding the topic of responsibility.

“Teachers direct you to the study advisor and vice versa [...] The SCHIB say I should go to the study advisor while the study advisor says I should go to the SCHIB” (resp. 9, visual impairment)

4.5 Cause analysis

The needs and barriers described in the results section were further analyzed with a cause analysis. The cause analysis is visualized in an argumentation tree. The argumentation tree connects the problems that students experience to the more general perceptions and values underlying these problems. Each consecutive step downwards in the argumentation tree reveals the answers to the ‘why-questions’. The underlying root causes could contribute in formulating concrete recommendations.

![Argumentation Tree](image)

Figure 7. Overview of the argumentation trees explaining why students were dissatisfied with their educational institute.
Figure 8. Argumentation tree for ‘unfamiliar with possibilities’.

Figure 9. Argumentation tree for ‘threshold to seek aid’.
Figure 10. Argumentation tree for ‘unmet needs’.

Figure 11. Argumentation tree for ‘lack of attention’.
Figure 12. Argumentation tree for ‘one-way initiative’.
Chapter 5 Discussion

The aim of this study was to explore the needs, desires and barriers to access and participation that disabled students experience in Amsterdam higher educational institutes. Subsequently, recommendations on policy, communication and facilities would be provided towards the executive board of the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences.

5.1 Important findings and comparison with literature

Disabled students experience difficulties with mobility, socializing, tiredness, misreading, seeing and hearing. Other difficulties entail tasks such as concentration, examination, structuring and time planning. The experiences of students with a disability are varied. Some encounter significant barriers, while others do not. And some find the support they receive sufficient; while most state that it does not meet their needs.

All concepts of the conceptual model in Chapter 2 were discussed and recognized by the students. The concepts of communication between student and university, and responsiveness of the teachers and study advisors were recurring topics and students weighted great value to these concepts. The cause analysis also showed that root problems were related to information, communication and responsibility. No new important themes emerged from the findings that were not included in the conceptual model. A reason for this may be that the interview questions were based upon the conceptual model and that the concepts were broad, meaning that a wide range of data could be assigned to a concept. The only addition entails the discrepancy between needs assessment and desire. Needs should be met in order to successfully and enjoyably have access and participation to education. Desires on the other hand led to an improved university experience but were not per se essential for following education. Thus, some students mentioned that certain services, like attention from teachers, are not a need but rather a desire; they would appreciate it if was available.

The study by Vickerman & Blundell (2010) explored the experiences and perspectives of 504 English students with a disability through a questionnaire. Their findings indicated five key issues that should be addressed in order to enable access and participation to higher education. These are pre-course induction support, commitment by higher educational institutes to facilitating barrier free curricula, consultation with disabled students, institutional commitment to develop support services and embedding of personal development planning. Four of the five key issues were also identified in the current study. Only pre-course induction support was not mentioned. The embedding of personal development planning could be compared to the student’s need of active guidance indicated by students in the current study.

A topic students found important but insufficient, is the application procedure at the university. Most students expected and desired a more proactive attitude from the university when they applied and mentioned they had a disability. A quantitative British study by Cooke et al. (2006) among 4.699 first-year students aimed to map the well-being of students before and during their first year at the university. The findings showed that student life is generally anxious, especially in first-year students. This emphasizes the importance of a proactive, open approach from the
university. Wei, Russell & Zakalik (2005) conducted a longitudinal psychology study among 308 American students regarding their psychological status. They found that anxiety can be reduced if students feel comfortable and welcome. Additionally, Lowe & Cook (2003) conducted a study that aimed to elicit the expectations of pre-enrolment first-year students regarding social and academic aspects of university life and to compare these with their experiences after their first two months at the university. Their qualitative study among 691 Irish first-year students in general showed that they are not bridging the gap between school and university quickly and effectively. Approximately 25% of all the students experience academic and personal problems and coming to the university has been a negative experience, leading to drop-outs, under-performance and lack of fulfillment (Lowe & Cook, 2003). The problematic transition between high school and university was also mentioned by three students in this study. The recent introduction of the ‘matching’ initiative at all Dutch higher educational institutes is a tool for the student to see if he or she matches the study. The data will be saved at the faculty and used as background information for possible study counseling. However, according to Ilona Bonnema (personal communication, 26 June 2014) ‘matching’ is not used by study advisors to actively seek contact with students who indicate they have a disability.

A key finding of this study is that students with a disability expect and desire more initiative from the university regarding their disability. Students would appreciate it if the university approaches them to discuss their disability and the facilities and services that the university offers. Almost all students are dissatisfied with the university’s website, which could function as an important source of information if it would be user-friendly and well-organized. Currently, students indicate that all communication and action has to come from their side. The findings of the current study are consistent with those of Cooke et al. (2006) who indicated the need for institutes to be more proactive in determining what kind of support, formal or informal, students in the vulnerable group need. Storrie, Ahern & Tuckett (2010) conducted a systematic review of 572 articles that addressed emotional and mental health problems of university students worldwide. The authors recommend increasing students’ awareness of existing support services within and external to the university.

Another key finding of this study is that students with a disability desire more attention and interest from teachers and the study advisor. Duquette (2000) investigated the experiences of post secondary students with disabilities in a qualitative study among 17 Canadian students with disabilities. The findings showed that support from teachers and tutors are related to study success of students. Support and understanding is important, especially because neglecting these may even have deteriorate consequences. Duquette (2000) explains this as follows: “The professors may be flexible and act as facilitators or they may have a negative attitude, thus presenting another barrier to this group of students” (p.138).

In the discussion whose responsibility it is to initiate the disability and to arrange facilities and services, students in the current study indicate that they desire initiative from the university because it costs them a lot of effort, time and stress. This finding corroborates the ideas of Goode (2007) who conducted a qualitative study among 20 British students and aimed to offer insight into students’ experiences of the aids and obstacles to an inclusive learning environment at the university. Goode (2007) mentioned: “Already facing physical and psychological hurdles, students often didn’t have the
energy to ‘do battle’. ‘Battling the system’ was a very common phrase and several interviewees had come close to dropping out” (p.44).

Storrie, Ahern & Tuckett (2010) correctly mention that “it is unrealistic to expect all academic staff to have the expertise required to deal with students with emotional problems” (p.5). Therefore, personnel with expertise in mental health but also in other disabilities should be available and easy accessible for students. On the other hand, trainings for teachers and study counselors focused on giving information about disabilities, improving communication with students who have a disability and providing suggestions for making appropriate accommodations should, according to some students in this study, be provided. According to Duquette (2000) well trained academic staff will contribute to make students with a disability feel more secure, confident and satisfied about their educational experience.

The question rises to what extent students with a disability have different needs, barriers and desires compared to non-disabled students. The barriers students in this study mention are mostly specific for their disability. More general issues are many free hours between lectures and poor course planning. Salinitri (2005) evaluated a formal mentoring program by examining the retention rate and program satisfaction of first-year Canadian university students, in which 128 students participated. Salinitri’s evaluation study (2005) showed that students without disabilities also appreciate more guidance and personal attention from the university. This is often related to dissatisfaction with study progress. Every student should be offered personal guidance, but students with a disability may require more specific guidance, focused on their disability.

5.2 Strengths and limitations

A strength of this study is the variety of disabilities included: the 23 respondents had 20 different disabilities together. Students with physical, mental, intellectual and sensory impairments were included in the sample population. Aside that it was very interesting to talk with a broad range of unique students, it also created many point of views, rich information and experiences from many disability perspectives.

In the light of audi alteram partem, hearing the other side too, meetings with study advisors and policy advisors on studying with a disability were arranged as well. The aim of these meetings was to gather information on policy and practice. Additionally, the findings of this study were discussed and response on the findings was requested. The recommendations in this study were proposed, which resulted into a discussion involving expectations and responsibilities, approval of the recommendations and its feasibility.

Due to the personal nature of this study, the aim was to minimize the social desirability bias as much as possible to ensure validity of the data. A primary feature of qualitative research with so-called vulnerable groups is the quality of the relationship between researcher and participants (Nind, 2008). Rapport-building was successful and guaranteeing anonymity through verbal informed consent also decreased the chance of social desirability bias. Additionally, students acknowledged they were pleased to finally share their experiences with someone who is independent of their study.
Another positive aspect of the data validation is related to a second important feature of qualitative research, namely the ethical principle of checking back with participants in a process of participant validation (Nind, 2008). A summary of every conversation was sent to the respondent for validation of the information. The response rate was 15 of the 21 students. The external validation of the cause analysis cannot be fully guaranteed as the cause analysis was only discussed with four participants.

One could wonder if the sample of 21 participants in this study is a representation of the population of students with a disability in general. Due to the small sample size, this could not be statistically tested. More importantly is if the needs and barriers found in this study match those of the total population of students with a disability. Future research can compare the needs and barriers in this study with other studies regarding disabled students’ experiences at educational institutes to validate the findings.

A limitation of this study is related to the findings regarding the university’s website. The analysis showed that students are not satisfied with the university’s website. The website is experienced as not user-friendly, inconvenient and the findability of information is low. However, students could not describe what the exact obstacles were and why they found the website inconvenient. The think-aloud method with the website in front of the student could have indicated the user-friendliness of the website and the obstacles that came across (Van den Haak, De Jong & Schellens, 2006). Future research should include the think-aloud method in order to formulate concrete recommendations on website improvement.

5.3 Recommendations

The second part of the main research question entailed the recommendations on policy, communication and facilities that could be advised towards the executive board of the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences.

5.3.1 Policy

My first recommendation to the universities is to adjust their policy concerning studying with a disability in a more proactive approach. Every student is unique and encounters disability related barriers and problems. Therefore, as Healey, Fuller, Bradley & Hall (2006) recommend as well, we should avoid using a catch-all category ‘disabled students’ because it is problematic and generic policies to support their teaching, learning and assessment may not always meet the specific needs of these students, as shown by this study.

My second recommendation regarding the policy is to develop guidelines specific for each type of disability. Currently, the policy and integrated guidelines are generalized for all students with a disability. Additionally, faculties at the same university do not provide the same facilities and services for students with a disability (R. Wegert, personal communication, 25 June 2014). For example, at some faculties dyslexia students get extra exam time and at others they do not. This is not in line with equal treatment. Therefore, guidelines for each disability should be made to offer study advisors criteria to fall back on, but also to show the student what they can expect of the university. However, as Claudia Flüggen (personal communication, 23 June 2014) also emphasized, the guidelines should be indicative and should not have a binding force because every student is
unique and appropriate action should be specified to the student. The guidelines should also be developed for the examination committee because these are currently not available (I. Bonnema, personal communication, 26 June 2014).

My third and major recommendation involves the supervision and monitoring of students with a disability and setting up a process that is initiated as soon as the student with a disability registers at the university. This recommendation includes several steps, as is shown in table 7. If these steps are followed as proposed here, it would resolve many problems students experience, as described in the results section. Thanks to these six steps, students with a disability a) will feel more welcome by the university, b) are better informed about the possibilities and what to expect, c) have personal contact with the study advisor and d) can easily and quickly get the services and support they need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Application form</th>
<th>Students should be able to indicate that they have a disability at the application form.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Forwarding information</td>
<td>In case a disability is mentioned, the form should be forwarded to the concerning study advisor of the study. Currently, this is not the case (R. Wegert, personal communication, 25 June 2014). Students have to indicate their disability at the start of their study in the application form, but also again at their faculty. It should be made easier for students to communicate their disability and information regarding disabilities mentioned in the application form should be redirected to the specific faculty and study advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Invitation for intake</td>
<td>Prior to college year, the study advisor sends information about ‘studying with a disability’ through email or post to the student and invites the student for an intake interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Intake and plan</td>
<td>In case the student accepts the invitation, a meeting should be planned wherein the needs of the student are discussed. The outcome of this meeting is a concrete plan of facilities, services and support that has been agreed on by the study advisor and the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: Feedback</td>
<td>In the first weeks of the college year, the student gives feedback to the study advisor if everything is arranged according to the plan and if there are still any problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6: Monitoring</td>
<td>The study advisor offers to have contact twice a year to check up with the student and to see how the study progresses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Suggested process for first-year students with a disability.
5.3.2 Communication

Not all students, however, indicate they have a disability at the application form. Therefore, my recommendation is that the university should try even more to communicate with the student from the moment of application onwards. All students should be offered information about studying with a disability through brochures and emails but also by presentations in their first week of college. This latter is important because it decreases the threshold for some students to seek contact as they now have seen the face of the study advisor. The information should include an action plan describing the facilities, services and support the university provides and contact information of those involved, such as the study advisor and study counselor. Subsequently, my recommendation for study advisor is to send a personal email to the concerning student with information and an invitation for a conversation to discuss the needs and expectations of the students and the available support from the university (as also described in step 3 and 4 above). We should be aware of positive discrimination concerning students with a disability and therefore the conversation should be optional as not all students desire contact.

According to Claudia Flüggen (personal communication, 23 June 2014) expectancy management is very important. This is related to one of my recommendations on communication. As described in the previous paragraph, information on studying with a disability should be available and distributed through many channels. This makes it possible for students to seek and request aid. On the other hand, it also indicates what students can expect from the university. If expectations of the student are not coherent with those of the university, false expectations and miscommunication occur. Therefore, I advice universities to put emphasizes on what they expect from the student and to clearly indicate how the responsibility is divided between student and university.

My recommendation for teachers and other academic staff is to show more interest in the student with a disability and to express a welcoming attitude. At the first lecture of a course, the teacher is advised to stay in the lecture hall after the lecture for a few minutes giving the students the possibility to approach the teacher. If the student sends an email to the teacher about his or her situation prior to the course, I advise the teacher to reply and to invite the student to come by after the first lecture.

My last recommendation on communication involves the website of the university. Currently, students indicate that the website is not user-friendly and that they cannot find whatever they are looking for. This includes information about disabilities but also other university related information. Students mention they mostly use Google to find information about their university. To increase the user-friendliness and findability of information on the website, I advice website editors to talk with students to find discuss students’ experiences of the website and the search terms they use. The search terms that are used by students should match the keywords, headings and introduction texts on the university websites. The varied search terms students use do not make it easier for website editors to discover the search terms, but think-aloud method might help in this search(Van den Haak, De Jong & Schellens, 2006). Additionally, information on the website requires constant updating and this should be monitored and executed by someone who is regarded responsible. Currently, the responsibility is shared among different departments. Finally, universities should improve their websites according to the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines developed by the
World Wide Web Consortium (W3C, 2008) and according to the guidelines of drempelvrij, the Dutch quality assurance for accessible websites, as described in the introduction of this report (drempelvrij.nl, 2011). Currently, the UvA and VU websites do not meet the criteria. According to the policy on studying with a disability the HvA has improved their website in 2014 and now meet the criteria.

5.3.3 Facilities

My recommendation regarding the accessibility of the university is to organize meetings with students with specific mobility difficulties. Discuss their experiences and barriers that obstruct the access to the university. After the meeting, have a walk in the university so the student can illustrate the barriers that he or she experiences. Immediate solutions should be discussed with the student, but the barriers should also be forwarded to Student Services and others involved in 'studying with a disability' in order to remove the barriers and to increase accessibility. Furthermore, as Claudia Flüggen (personal communication, 23 June 2014) also suggested, a central contact point should be created that students can call or mail about problems they experience, such as a broken elevator for the handicapped or a door handle that is placed too high for a student in a wheelchair.

Additionally, especially at large studies, personal contact and guidance between the student and the teacher and/or the study advisor is limited. According to Rozemarijn Wegert (personal communication, 25 June 2014) this is just not possible because of the number of students following the same study. Keeping this in mind, my recommendation is to offer extra guidance from tutors during the whole study (as is the case at the HvA), from teachers for course related activities such as the writing of a thesis, and from student-psychologists for students who desire this. Currently student-psychologists are only available for students with a mental disability (Iris Hettelingh, personal communication, 20 June 2014). Academic staff should be offered trainings to increase their knowledge regarding disabilities and to learn how to deal with students with a disability. Currently, only a limited amount of trainings are offered and they are optional (Iris Hettelingh, personal communication, 20 June 2014). Incentives should be used to have more teachers and study advisors attend these trainings and meetings. Furthermore, information for each specific disability should be distributed among tutors, teachers, study advisors and study counselors.

Realization of the recommendations

A dedicated person should be given the assignment to develop, implement and manage the recommendations. The yearly costs are approximately 60,000 euro to employ a person who will first develop and implement the recommendations and subsequently manage, evaluate and report the changes. Within a study year it will be feasible to have the proactive approach in place.

5.4 Implication

Although Dutch and international law dictate equal treatment and access for everyone, students with a disability still experience difficulties and unmet needs at the university. In the past, the policy on ‘studying with a disability’ of the VU, UvA and HvA were not extensive and guidelines were missing. The universities acknowledge they are constantly trying to improve the policy and practice. The addition of the topic ‘studying with a disability’ into the institutional accreditation in 2013 was a
boost for the HvA to emphasize the need of a clear and concrete policy and more attention for this group of students (I. Bonnema, personal communication, 26 June 2014). The VU and HvA have made work of this and an extensive policy has been created. The UvA is still working on an improved policy. Although guaranteeing the quality and continuity of the policy is integrated in the policies, the future will show us if the policies are well implemented. The recommendations proposed in this study should be taken into account by policy makers and by academic staff. The recommendations will contribute to an improved university experience of the student. This may subsequently lead to less study delay and fewer drop outs. On the long run this will improve students’ satisfaction and an improved accreditation score.

The findings and recommendations of this study can also be translated to other universities and universities of applied sciences in the Netherlands. Although based on interviews with students at the Amsterdam higher educational institutes, the needs and barriers that students experience can also be applicable to other Dutch educational institutes. The institutes can take the findings of this study into account and compare them with their current policy. Additionally, the recommendations of this study are also valid for other educational institutes because the recommendations include general ideas to improve policy, communication and facilities.

5.5 Future research

Future research should focus on differences between the group of disabled students and those without a disability. What characterizes the group of disabled students compared to those without a disability and do students with a disability have other needs and desires regarding the university are questions that should be addressed. In the conversations with students, study advisors and policy advisors the topic of ‘studying with a disability’ was often associated with the discussion about the exact point at which the facilitation of aiding tools and adjustments in examination starts to undermine the quality of the study and the qualifications for the degree. Currently, no protocols are available. Future research in this topic is necessary. The project ‘examination: not less but different’ of the research institution handicap+studie is a good initiative and example (handicap+studie, 2013b). Furthermore, the position of students with a disability in universities’ policies should be examined in order to strive towards inclusive education for every student. Finally, I join up with the view of Healey, Fuller, Bradley & Hall (2006) that “there is a vital need to continue to seek out, listen to, and act upon the views of disabled students in our attempts to make higher education thoroughly inclusive” (p.41).
Chapter 6 Conclusion

The law equal treatment on the base of handicap or chronic disease (Wet Gelijke Behandeling op grond van handicap of chronische ziekte, WGB h/cz) entails that discrimination based on handicap or chronic illness is prohibited and that students with a disability or chronic disease are entitled to receive support in the form of accommodations and services that are required to pursue higher education. These services should be realized by the educational institute, unless it would impose a disproportionate burden. Additionally, the national student questionnaire (NSE) showed that the UvA, VU and HvA did not score well on the national student satisfaction questionnaire and the institutional audit concluded that improvements on the policy on ‘studying with a disability’ are necessary. With the above information given and the law as foundation, this qualitative study explored the needs, desires and barriers to access and participation that disabled students experience in Amsterdam higher educational institutes. A concrete answer to each sub question will now be provided, resulting in the main research question.

First sub question: “What barriers that obstruct access and participation to education do students with a disability experience?”

Some students with a disability encounter significant barriers, while others do not. Mainly students with mobility difficulties experience accessibility (buildings) barriers. Examples are inaccessible or defect elevators, swing doors and the absence of a fixed place for stretchers in lecture halls. Students also experience barriers that obstruct the participation of education, such as the folding chairs and wooden benches in lecture halls. Barriers related to services include poor study guides and planning and the absence of video-lectures. Communication barriers include the absence of information regarding disabilities, the low findability of information on the website, the poor contact with teachers and study advisors and the lack of attention and guidance. Students have to put a lot of effort and time in getting support which makes university life more stressful and inconvenient.

Barriers related to responsiveness of academic staff include the threshold to seek contact: students experience a distance between them and teachers and they are uncertain of the response of academic staff. Additionally, students feel like every solution and action has to come from their side, as study advisors react passively. Knowledge barriers involve misunderstanding from study advisors and teachers about disabilities. Disabilities that are not acknowledged and understood (e.g. anxiety disorder) also cause friction between the student and university. Fellow students can also create barriers as soon as understanding and respect is not showed by fellow students. This leads to less social contact and shame.

Barriers experienced in the category organizations are as follows. With respect to the regulations students felt hindered by the inflexibility of the university and the willingness to provide adjustments in the study. Furthermore, the many staff members involved in arranging a facility or service was experienced as enervating and uncomfortable. Barriers related to practices are the poor implementation of facilities and services. Students have to do a lot effort to get a service arranged which generates a lot of stress and uncertainty and subsequently services are not always available, such as extra exam time. Not all students were aware of financial support by the university and DUO, but they expected information on this topic from the university.
Second sub question: “What are the needs and desires of students with a disability regarding their university?”

Students distinguished needs and desires. Needs should be met in order to successfully and enjoyably have access and participation in education. Desires on the other hand led to an improved university experience but were not per se essential for following education. Students need free and easy access to the university and entrances and lecture halls should be adapted to students with mobility difficulties. Most students are pleased with the provided services because they acknowledge that they need them for their study. Some students need tailored services, such as a soft office chair and a relaxing room. Students desire a more proactive approach from academic staff and also a better information distribution regarding studying with a disability.

With regard to the responsiveness, students desire more action and attention from study advisors. They also desire more personal contact with teachers, as they sometimes need aid or understanding. Students desire academic staff to have more knowledge about their disability and about potential support related to the disability. Some students desire to have contact with fellow students with the same disability to share experiences.

As for regulations, students indicated the need for an easier and quicker process of requesting services with fewer staff members involved. With respect to practices, students need a more reliable implementation of the provided services and they desire more guidance from the university. Finally, students desire to be better informed about the different possibilities of financial support.

Third sub question: “What are the steps a student with a disability has to go through in order to receive his or her required needs at the university?”

Students with a disability indicate that in general it requires a lot of effort and time to receive the required needs at the university. The different university staff involved creates a threshold for students to seek aid and to get facilities arranged. Students have to deal with tutors, teachers, study advisors, study counselors and the examination committee. Some students find it hard to address academic staff and to explain their situation because of inconvenience or uncertainty of the response received. Different academic staff involved requires them no repeatedly explain their situation and needs. Finally, poor communication and responsibility between academic staff sometimes results in inadequate implementation of promised services, which disadvantages the student.

Fourth sub question: “What are the steps and actions in policy and practice the institutes have been taken to meet the needs of students with disabilities at the university?”

The VU and HvA recently created an extensive policy on studying with a disability. UvA’s policy is still in an early stage of development. The policies include guidelines and regulations, but it also indicates what the university offers to students with a disability’. Over the past few years, more and more attention has been given towards the group of students with a disability. Trainings and information meetings are provided for academic staff, although they are optional. The universities aim to provide much information regarding studying with a disability on their websites. Finally, the universities
claim to be willing to aid students to make their study more pleasant and feasible, but the quality of the study and the qualifications of the university degree should not be desecrated.

**Fifth sub question: “What are the main similarities between the UvA, VU and HvA?”**

The main similarity is the universities are committed to students with a disability, especially since new policies have been developed. All three universities are committed and they emphasize the need for improvement regarding ‘studying with a disability’. According to students, all three universities should improve their communication and information and they should adopt a more proactive approach.

**Sixth sub question: “What are the main differences between the UvA, VU and HvA?”**

There are two main differences between the universities. Firstly, the HvA offers a tutor during the whole study instead of only during the first year. The tutor guides students in their study progress and introduces them to the educational environment. Students are pleased with having a tutor and personal contact is experienced as pleasant. A second major difference is seen at the size of the study. Students studying at a study with a small department, including most master studies, are in general more satisfied than those at studies with a bigger amount of students. Students at ‘small’ studies often experience better support, personal contact and guidance from their teachers and study advisor. Reasons are: better and more personal communication between student and academic staff, fewer different teachers as teachers give multiple courses and teachers tend to be more dedicated to their field and to the student.

**Seventh sub question: “How is the responsibility for studying with a disability organized within the university?”**

The executive board and its policy makers are responsible for the policy ‘studying with a disability’. Academic staff involved in the topic is involved in the development and implementation of the policy. Policy advisors have occasional meetings with study advisors, study counselors and students to assemble problems, improvements and experiences of daily practice. Tutors, teachers, study advisors, study counselors and the examination committee each have their own function and responsibilities. All three universities are clear about the division of responsibilities regarding students. As written in their policies, it is the responsibility of the student to inform the university about the disability and what support they require. Subsequently, the university is responsible for delivering tailored services and support, as long as it is in line with the study and qualifications of a graduate.

**Eighth sub question: “What kind of policy, communication and facility recommendations can be formulated?”**

Policy recommendations include: a) provide tailored support instead of using a catch-all category ‘disabled students’, b) develop guidelines specific for each type of disability and c) initiate a process that actively guides and monitors students from application onwards. Communication recommendations include: d) improve the availability and distribution of information, e) discuss *expectancy management* within the educational institute and clearly indicate what students can
expect, f) stimulate personal contact and guidance between academic staff and student and g) investigate the search terms students use to find information on the website to improve the findability of information and user-friendliness of the website. Finally, facility recommendations include: h) collaboration between student and institute to identify and solve accessibility barriers and i) provide additional guidance from academic staff and organize trainings for them about ‘studying with a disability’.

**Main research question:** “What are the needs, desires and barriers to access and participation that disabled students experience in Amsterdam higher educational institutes and what kind of policy, communication and facilities could be advised towards the executive board of the University of Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences?”

In the introduction of this paper the question was raised why students were dissatisfied with their educational institute. This study can now provide an answer to this question by answering the main research question. The current facilities, services and support do not meet the demands of all students and therefore improvement is required to improve students’ educational experience. Students indicate the need to be able to have access and participate in education. Some students indicate the need to have tailored support instead of the general services that are provided. Additionally, students need a more reliable implementation of the promised services. Students desire a more proactive approach from academic staff and also a better information distribution. The proactive approach contains more action and attention from study advisors and more personal contact with teachers. Additionally, students desire more personal guidance for the university and they would like to be better informed about the different possibilities of financial support.

The main barriers students experience are those that obstruct the accessibility (e.g. swing doors) and participation (e.g. folding chairs in lecture halls) to education. Most students require structure and planning, while the absence of well pursued study guides and planning form a barrier. Communicational barriers include a significant part in this study. They include the absence of information regarding disabilities, the low findability of information on the website, the poor contact with teachers and study advisors and the lack of attention and guidance. Additionally, students have to put a lot of effort and time in getting support which makes university life more stressful and inconvenient. Furthermore, students experience a threshold to seek contact and aid. The distance between student and academic staff, uncertainty of the reaction and shame or inconvenience contribute to this threshold. Additionally, students feel like every solution and action has to come from their side, as study advisors react passively. Some disabilities are not acknowledged and understood by the university, which leads to friction and support that is rejected. Moreover, students felt hindered by the inflexibility of the university and the willingness to provide adjustments in the study. Finally, different academic staff is involved in arranging a facility or service, which is experienced as enervating and uncomfortable, but students also mention that this takes a lot of time and effort and in some cases results in a poor implementation of promised services.

Additionally, the cause analysis visualized in the argumentation tree showed that the underlying reasons for the dissatisfaction students’ experience are related to poor information and poor communication and the false expectation that the university feels responsible and shows initiative.
To conclude, universities try hard to improve their policy for studying with a disability, but this is not yet recognized and experienced in practice. An improved policy on studying with a disability is essential to optimize the university experience of the 10% of the total student population. The findings and recommendations in this study should be taken into account by policy makers and by academic staff. The recommendations will contribute to an improved university experience of the student. This may subsequently lead to less study delay and fewer drop outs. On the long run this will improve students’ satisfaction and an improved accreditation score.
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Annex 1. Interview procedure for students

The interviews I conducted were one-to-one conversations. Permission for audio recording was asked, and interviews were subsequently audio-recorded.

**Recruitment:** I aim to recruit students with different disabilities from different Amsterdam universities to participate in my research. I will recruit them through Facebook and email. In the recruitment message I introduced myself and explained my study. Additionally, I described the purpose of this interview and what will be done with the information derived from the interview. Subsequently, I asked if he or she was interested in participating in the study and to talk about their experiences of studying at the university as a student with a disability. If he or she agreed, I arranged a location, date and time to conduct the interview.

**Objective:** To gain insight in the needs, desires and social barriers students with a disability experience regarding the university in order to provide knowledge and to advise the Executive Board and policymakers of the university to change or improve educational circumstances for students with a disability.

**Purpose of interview:** The aim of this interview is to gain insights in the lives of students with disabilities and their experiences regarding the university. Based on the information derived from the interviews, I will develop recommendations that eventually lead to an improved situation for students with a disability at higher education.

**Method:** I will use semi-structured interviews. There is a fixed list of topics that I would like to have information on. However, I want to keep the option open to ask further questions. I will use a combination of open-ended and follow-up questions to find out the *why* and not only the *what* and *how*.

**Structure:** The interview will start with an introduction of myself and my study, followed by a question which leads to the interviewee introducing him or herself. Then the main part of the interview will begin. Each topic will be attended. The interview will be closed by asking the interviewee if he or she would like to add something or if he or she has any remaining questions. Last but not least, I will ask if the interviewee would like to receive a summary for verification and finally I will thank him or her for his or her time.

The aim is to conduct interviews with 20 students, equally distributed between the UvA, HvA and VU. Additionally, interviews with ten university staff members at the UvA, HvA and VU is desired.
Annex 2. Interview guide for students

The interview guide is specifically made for students with a disability. It distinguishes four parts: the introduction, introducing questions, main topics and the closing of the interview.

Introductie

Hallo,

Ten eerste, wil ik je bedanken voor deelname aan mijn onderzoek. Ik zal beginnen om mijzelf even voor te stellen en de inhoud van mijn onderzoek uit te leggen. Daarna wil ik vragen of jij iets over jezelf wil vertellen en dan kunnen we het interview beginnen.

Alle informatie die je tijdens ons gesprek geeft blijft vertrouwelijk en de gegevens zullen anoniem blijven. Ik zou graag ons gesprek willen opnemen zodat ik het gesprek na afloop goed kan analyseren. Vind je dat goed?

Mijn naam is Pascal Collard en ik ben master student aan de Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam. Ik werk momenteel bij Bureau Studentenartsen, een onderzoeksinstiutueut dat samenwerkt met een huisartsenpraktijk in Amsterdam. Mijn master is Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences. Dit gaat kortweg over management, beleidsvorming en communicatie binnen de gezondheidszorg. Voor mijn masterstage doe ik nu onderzoek naar studeren met een beperking. Ik heb je een e-mail gestuurd met daarin informatie over het onderzoek.

- Zou je mij kunnen vertellen wat je denkt waar we het over gaan hebben vandaag?

Ik ben benieuwd naar hoe studenten met een beperking hun studie op de universiteit ervaren. Mijn doel is om te begrijpen hoe de beperking het onderwijs beïnvloed. Daarnaast wil ik graag weten welke behoeften en verwachtingen studenten van de universiteit hebben. Bovendien wil ik weten welke barrières studenten ervaren die de toegang en participatie tot onderwijs belemmeren. Ik richt me op een paar hoofdzaken: het gebouw van de universiteit, de aangeboden voorzieningen, communicatie en de website, begeleiding en ondersteuning, en aangepaste regels. De gegevens van ons gesprek blijven binnen Bureau Studentenartsen en zullen niet voor andere doeleinden gebruikt worden. Met behulp van de informatie uit de interviews zullen aanbevelingen gemaakt worden naar de Raad van Bestuur en de beleidsmakers van de universiteit om zodoende de onderwijsomstandigheden van studenten met een beperking te verbeteren.

- Heb je nog vragen over hetgeen ik zojuist verteld heb?

- Is er iets dat je nu al kwijt wilt met betrekking tot studeren met een beperking?

Introductievragen

Om te beginnen zou ik je graag wat algemene vragen willen stellen over je studie en je beperking.

- Welke studie volg je aan welke universiteit?
- Wanneer ben je met je studie begonnen en wat vind je van je studie?
Hoe lang ben je al met je studie bezig en ben je tevreden met je voortgang?
Waarom heb je deze studie gekozen en kan je uitleggen wat jouw reden was om te gaan studeren?

Kan je me iets meer over je beperking vertellen?
Wat voor beperking heb je?
Is dit medisch vastgesteld?
Hoe lang heb je de beperking al?
Hoe ervaar je het om een beperking te hebben?
Zie je jezelf als een beperkt persoon?
Wat voor invloed heeft je beperking op jouw level?
Wat zijn voor jou de gevolgen voor je leven en specifiek voor je studie?
Vind je, in het algemeen, dat jij verantwoordelijk bent voor je beperking of dat de verantwoordelijkheid ook bij de maatschappij c.q. de onderwijsinstelling ligt?
  o Kan je dit uitleggen?

Hoofdzaken
Ik zou je nu graag wat willen vragen over je keuze voor de universiteit
  • Je wilde gaan studeren, kan je vertellen hoe je dit hebt aangepakt?
  • Wat waren je overwegingen om te kiezen voor deze universiteit?
    o Wat kwam hier bij kijken?
  • Heb je gezocht naar informatie over jouw type beperking en de mogelijkheden tot studeren in het algemeen?
    o Zo ja, hoe en waar?
  • Heb je tijdens het kiezen van een studie en universiteit geïnformeerd naar ‘studeren met een beperking’?
    o Zo ja, waar heb je dit geïnformeerd? Wat voor informatie heb je gezocht? Kon je vinden wat je zocht? Heeft dit je keuze beïnvloed?
    o Zo nee, waarom niet?
  • Heb je aangegeven dat je een beperking hebt bij de aanmelding aan de universiteit?
    o Zo ja, heeft dit gevolgen gehad c.q. kreeg je reactie van de universiteit?
    o Zo nee, waarom niet?
  • Heb je persoonlijk contact gehad met een medewerker van de universiteit om jouw beperking te bespreken en eventueel zaken te regelen?
    o Zo ja, met wie, hoe en wat vond je hiervan?
  • Hoe zou voor jou de optimale aanmeldprocedure met betrekking tot je beperking eruit zien?
  • Verwacht je initiatief van de universiteit om jou te ondersteunen met je beperking na de aanmelding of vind je dat het van jou moet komen?

Ik wil je nu een aantal vragen stellen over je huidige situatie op de universiteit
  • Maak je momenteel gebruik van bepaalde faciliteiten, regelingen of ondersteuning van de universiteit?
Indien antwoord ‘nee’ is, dan suggesties: extra tentamentijd, aangepast curriculum, ruimte, aangepaste computer (afhankelijk van beperking).
- Ben je op de hoogte van de voorzieningen die de universiteit aanbiedt (faciliteiten, regelingen, ondersteuning)?
  - Zo ja, kan je voorzieningen opnoemen die beschikbaar voor jouw beperking zijn?
  - Hoe ben je aan deze informatie gekomen?
  - Zo nee, heb je enig idee waar je deze informatie zou kunnen vinden?

De volgende vragen gaan over jouw behoefte aan voorzieningen van de universiteit
- Heb je behoefte aan bepaalde aanpassingen in het gebouw of de omgeving van de universiteit?
  - Zo ja, leg uit waarom welke aanpassing.
  - Zo nee, voorbeelden geven zoals aangepaste collegezalen, liften, grotere dia’s etc.
- Heb je behoefte aan bepaalde diensten of ondersteuning van de universiteit?
  - Zo ja, leg uit waarom welke dienst of ondersteuning.
  - Zo nee, voorbeelden geven zoals extra tentamentijd, laptopgebruik, aangepast scherm, hulp bij schrijven, extra tentamentijd etc.
- Hoe ervaar je de communicatie tussen jou en de universiteit?
- In hoeverre zou je de communicatie tussen jou en de universiteit anders willen hebben?
  Meer persoonsgericht?

Dan wil ik je wat vragen over de website van de universiteit
- Maak je wel eens gebruik van de website van de universiteit?
  - Hoe is jouw ervaring met de website van de universiteit?
    - In hoeverre is de website goed te hanteren voor jou?
    - Kan je de informatie vinden die je zoekt? In alle gevallen? Wanneer niet?
  - Heb je wel eens naar informatie over ‘studeren met beperking’ of jouw specifieke beperking gezocht op de website?
    - Zo ja, heb je de informatie kunnen vinden?
    - Zo nee, heb je ergens anders informatie gezocht?
- Als je informatie wil hebben over speciale voorzieningen voor studenten met een beperking of jouw specifieke beperking, waar zou je dat gaan zoeken?

De volgende vragen gaan over jouw ervaringen met docenten, studieadviseurs en decanen.
- Hoe vind je dat docenten, studieadviseurs of decanen reageren op jouw beperking?
  - Kan je voorbeelden van situaties noemen?
- Heb je het gevoel dat je anders behandeld wordt door docenten (positief en negatief)?
  - Zo ja, kan je een voorbeeld noemen?
- Heb je wel eens contact gehad met de studieadviseur m.b.t. jouw beperking?
  - Zo ja, waarom had je contact? Hoe verliep dit? Was je tevreden?
- Heb je wel eens contact gehad met de studentendecaan m.b.t. jouw beperking?
  - Zo ja, waarom had je contact? Hoe verliep dit? Was je tevreden?
- Heb je wel eens persoonlijk contact gehad met een docent m.b.t. jouw beperking?
  - Zo ja, waarom had je contact? Hoe verliep dit? Was je tevreden?
• Heb je wel eens contact gehad met iemand anders van de universiteit m.b.t. jouw beperking?
  o Zo ja, waarom had je contact? Hoe verliep dit? Was je tevreden?
• Zou je achteraf graag met iemand contact hebben gehad over jouw beperking?
  o Zo ja, wat heeft je weerhouden om contact te zoeken? Waarover wilde je contact?
• Speelt schaamte of ongemak een rol bij het benaderen van docenten, studieadviseurs of decanen?
  o Zo ja, kan je dit uitleggen?
• Wat vind je van het begrip dat docenten, studieadviseurs en decanen tonen?
  o Vind je ze behulpzaam? Begripvol? Waar blijkt dit uit?
  o Zo nee, wat kan er beter?
• In hoeverre vind je dat docenten, studieadviseurs en decanen op de hoogte zijn over jouw beperking?
• In hoeverre vind je dat docenten, studieadviseurs en decanen op de hoogte zijn over mogelijke voorzieningen voor jouw beperking?

Dan wil ik graag nog iets weten over je ervaringen met medestudenten.
• Hoe ervaar je de houding van medestudenten tegenover jou?
  o Kan je positieve ervaringen vertellen?
• Heb je ook wel eens iets minder positiefs meegemaakt?
  o Zo ja, kan je een voorbeeld noemen?
• Heb je het gevoel dat je anders behandeld wordt door medestudenten (positief en negatief)?
  o Zo ja, kan je een voorbeeld noemen?

De volgende vragen gaan over de regelingen van de universiteit.
• Wat vind je van de huidige regelingen die worden aangeboden?
  o Waarom maak je er wel of geen gebruik van?
  o Heb je ook daadwerkelijk gekregen waar je naar vroeg?
• Heb je wel eens een voorziening aangevraagd voor je beperking?
  o Zo ja, hoe verliep dit proces? Hoe heb je dit aangevraagd? Wat vond je ervan?
• Heb je behoefte aan nieuwe, andere regelingen die jouw studievoortgang kunnen verbeteren?
  o Zo ja, waaraan bijvoorbeeld?
• Heb je studievertraging opgelopen en hoe reageerde de universiteit hierop?
  o Wordt er rekening gehouden met je beperking?

De volgende vragen zijn gericht op financiële ondersteuning.
• Heb je wel eens beroep gedaan op financiële ondersteuning vanuit de universiteit?
  o Zo ja, voor wat? Ben je hier tevreden mee?
• Heb je wel eens beroep gedaan op financiële ondersteuning vanuit de overheid (bijv. AWBZ)?
  o Zo ja, voor wat? Ben je hier tevreden mee?
• Ben je ook op de hoogte van de regelingen buiten de universiteit om voor studenten met een beperking (bijvoorbeeld aangepaste regels omtrent studiefinanciering)?
  o Zo ja, welke? Maak je daar gebruik van? Waarom wel of niet?

Dan ben ik benieuwd naar het initiatief van de universiteit.
• Ben je ooit benaderd vanuit de universiteit over ondersteuning of informatie omtrent jouw beperking?
  o Zo ja, hoe? En wat voor ondersteuning/informatie? Wat heb je hiermee gedaan?
• Ben je ooit uitgenodigd voor een gesprek om over de mogelijkheden van jouw beperking te praten?
  o Zo ja, door en met wie? Wat vond je hiervan?
• Zou je het prettig vinden als er initiatief vanuit de universiteit wordt getoond om te praten over jouw beperking?
  o Zo ja, van wie, hoe en wat?

De volgende vragen gaan over jouw verwachtingen van de universiteit.
• In welke opzichten had je verwachtingen van de universiteit met betrekking tot jouw beperking vóórdat je met je studie begon?
• Welke verwachtingen heb je nog steeds die (nog) niet zijn uitgekomen?
• Zijn er dingen die je van de universiteit verlangt die jou echt zouden helpen met je studie?
  o Zo ja, wat? Hoe zie je dit voor je?
• Vind je dat de universiteit over het algemeen genoeg aandacht besteed aan studenten met een beperking?
  o Zo ja, wat?
  o Zo nee, leg uit.
• Wat zou er moeten gebeuren als een vriend of vriendin van je met dezelfde beperking wilt studeren op de universiteit?
  o Wat zou de universiteit moeten doen?
  o Wat zou de student moeten doen?

Het laatste onderwerp dat ik wil bespreken gaat over barrières tot onderwijs.
• Zijn er dingen waar je tegen aanloopt tijdens je studie?
  o Zo ja, kan je voorbeelden noemen?
• Ervaren je barrières tot de toegang van het onderwijs?
  o Zo ja, leg uit.
• Eervaren je barrières tot de alledaagse deelname van het onderwijs?
  o Zo ja, leg uit.
• Eervaren je barrières tot het bekostigen van voorzieningen die je nodig hebt voor je beperking?
  o Zo ja, leg uit.
• In welke mate heeft jouw beperking invloed op je studievoortgang?
• In hoeverre denk je dat jouw beperking invloed heeft op je banenperspectief?

Tot slot, heb ik nog twee vragen.
• Heb je contact met medestudenten die dezelfde beperking hebben?
  o Zo ja, wat bespreken jullie en helpen jullie elkaar ook?
  o Zo nee, zou je er voor openstaan of behoefte aan hebben?
• Ben je lid van een belangenvereniging die opkomt voor jouw beperking?
  o Zo ja, kan je daar iets over vertellen en hoe helpen zij jou?

Afsluiting van het interview

• Wil je nog iets toevoegen aan dit interview?
• Heb je nog vragen?
• Ik wil je een samenvatting van ons gesprek sturen zodat je de inhoud kan verifiëren. Is dat goed?
• Heel erg bedankt voor het gesprek en je tijd.
Annex 3. Interview guide for study advisors

1. Kennis rondom huidig beleid met betrekking tot studenten met een beperking.

2. Is het beleid faculteitsafhankelijk of hetzelfde voor de hele universiteit?

3. Heeft u iets gemerkt van veranderingen rondom het beleid rondom studeren met een beperking?

4. Zijn er standaardregels en protocollen voor studenten met een beperking (bijv. Dyslexie -> tijdsverlenging)?

5. Laag scoren op NSE voor studeren met een beperking. Oorzaak?

6. Zijn er dingen waarvan u denkt dat het beter of anders kan?

7. Eigen specifieke ervaring met betrekking tot studenten met een beperking

8. Aanmeldprocedure: actief informeren naar beperkingen?

9. Bij wie ligt de verantwoordelijkheid: student / universiteit, en binnen de universiteit zelf?

10. Krijgen studieadviseurs een handleiding hoe om te gaan met beperkingen?

11. Krijgen studieadviseurs trainingen of informatie over studeren met een beperking?

12. Is er contact tussen studieadviseurs en docenten en studieadviseurs en decanen over de student?

13. Is er een persoonlijk contactpersoon / begeleider mogelijk?

14. Wie is er verantwoordelijkheid voor de website en de informative daarop?

15. Wordt er tevredenheidsonderzoek gedaan door de universiteit zelf? Enquêtes?

16. Worden er bijeenkomsten gegeven, of brochure of emails met informatie rondom studeren met een beperking?

De belangrijkste bevindingen van het onderzoek bespreken:

1. Studenten verwachten meer initiatief vanuit de universiteit m.b.t. hun beperking.

2. Studenten moeten altijd alles zelf regelen en achteraan zitten.

3. Studenten verwachten meer persoonlijke aandacht van de studieadviseur:
   Om de paar maanden vragen hoe het gaat, hoe de voortgang gaat en of ze nog hulp bij iets nodig hebben.


5. Bevindingen specifiek voor de universiteit waar de studieadviseur werkzaam is.
Annex 4. Interview guide for policy advisors

1. Wat is uw functie binnen de universiteit/hogeschool?
2. Beleidsplan Studeren met een functiebeperking
3. Hoe is dit beleid tot stand gekomen? Wie zijn er betrokken?
4. Zijn er richtlijnen / protocollen per beperking?
5. Hoe wordt het beleidspan gecontroleerd en geëvalueerd?
6. De universiteit scoort laag op de NSE. Heeft u enig idee waarom?
7. Huidig beleid ten opzichte van studenten met een beperking. faculteitsafhankelijk of hetzelfde voor de hele universiteit/hogeschool?
8. Heeft u iets gemerkt van veranderingen rondom het beleid?
9. Aanmeldprocedure: actief informeren naar beperkingen?
10. Bij wie ligt de verantwoordelijkheid: student / universiteit, en binnen de universiteit zelf?
11. Krijgen studieadviseurs een handleiding hoe om te gaan met beperkingen?
12. Krijgen studieadviseurs en docenten trainingen of informatiebijeenkomsten?
13. Is er een persoonlijk contactpersoon / begeleider mogelijk?
14. Wie is er verantwoordelijkheid voor de website en de informatiedaarop?
15. Wordt er tevredenheidsonderzoek gedaan door de universiteit/hogeschool zelf? Enquêtes?
16. Worden er bijeenkomsten gegeven, of brochure of emails met informatie rondom studeren met een beperking?

De belangrijkste bevindingen van het onderzoek bespreken:

1. Studenten verwachten meer initiatief vanuit de universiteit m.b.t. hun beperking.
2. Studenten moeten altijd alles zelf regelen en achteraan zitten.
3. Studenten verwachten meer persoonlijke aandacht van de studieadviseur: Om de paar maanden vragen hoe het gaat, hoe de voortgang gaat en of ze nog hulp bij iets nodig hebben.
5. Te veel verschillende medewerkers zijn betrokken bij het regelen van voorzieningen.
6. Bevindingen specifiek voor de universiteit waar de beleidsadviseur werkzaam is.
Annex 5. Tree diagrams