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Abstract
In an attempt to improve the graduation rate of students with disabilities who attend colleges and universities, a response strategy consisting of four components is advocated:

• self-determination and self-advocacy curriculum developed to build life skills,
• faculty committed to increasing cultural capital for all students and sustaining environments where positive postsecondary experiences flourish;
• a range of related services; and,
• a coordinated system of supports that is student-centered and delivered in the classroom.

In Support of Modified Timelines—Based on Change in Theoretical Understanding
The timelines of Study One have been modified because the assumptions surrounding the conceptual framework became suspect. Additional inquiry into the literature became the priority and the development of self-determination curriculum was delayed to Spring 2000, and the class to Fall 2001. A white paper and article for the Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation were produced during the Winter of 2001 and completed February 1 and April 1 respectively.

The original proposal of this study identified existing self-determination curriculum to be used in post-secondary settings because over 60 self-determination curricula have been developed through OSER projects in secondary education (Test, Karvonen, Wood, Browder, Algozzine, 2000). Self-determination curricula are developed as one way to improve post-school outcomes for students with disabilities but their effects are suspect given the fact that students with disabilities continue to have poor outcomes. An average of 22% of all students with disabilities drop out of school compared to only 12% of their peers without disabilities (Benz & Halpern, 1987). The rates for students with disabilities in postsecondary education, while improving, are still 50 percent lower than that of the general population (Stodden and Dowrick, 2000; OSEP, 1992). Students with disabilities—in spite of self-determination efforts and the number of supports available in secondary education—are still not adequately
represented in post-school education and employment settings. Researchers began to question the assumption that curricula created for secondary education could be readily used on college campuses. Researchers returned to the literature to better understand three issues: adapting secondary education curricula to postsecondary settings and a set of students with entirely different needs and opportunities; understanding campus dynamics to better support program and outcome success; and framing self-determination within a context of cultural capital.

Another side to the problem appears to be in the way services “wrap” (surround and support) students. At the secondary level students have fewer opportunities but are support and entitlement rich; at the postsecondary level students have greater opportunities but fewer supports (Rumrill, 2001). Compounding the challenge to serve, postsecondary students are not identified by an IEP and can remain invisible within a postsecondary environment. Looking into the future, the college student of the 21st century will most likely be non-traditional. These students tend to delay college attendance and are older when they first enroll in a postsecondary education. Non-traditional students usually live at home, commute to school, may work part-time or full-time off-campus, and have family obligations (Bean and Metzner, 1985). Research (Rendon, 1994) suggests that these non-traditional students expect institutions to take the initiative in assisting them. They look to external mechanisms such as programs and supports, to reach out to them. These external mechanisms exist on college campuses, although with varying degrees of success. With the growth of the non-traditional student and a truly diverse college campus, the problem continues to be integrating students within the campus culture, making them more resilient and conferring degrees.

Secondary and postsecondary campuses reflect two different campus environments. In secondary education, students have fewer opportunities (variety, latitude and frequency of behavior options) and more services and supports to “wrap” them. In postsecondary education the opposite is true, students have more opportunities but fewer services and supports to “wrap” them. The effort of this research/teaching project becomes finding ways to teach, support and integrate students within the campus community. Curriculum is the vehicle to teach students self-determination skills to enhance the process of self-discovery through self-awareness, develop an historical context of disability, and provide an understanding of legal rights. Curriculum and faculty are also responsible for engaging students outside their classroom and linking them with resources and people in communities. Students must learn how to put skills to use to find supports, fulfill goals and work toward dreams. As students with disabilities become involved in their world they become more visible. When they and others begin to see themselves reflected in the community at-large, they have greater opportunity to define and effect change. The integration of skills and opportunities are critical for successful journeys toward self-determination and cultural empowerment.

**In Support of Modified Method—Changes Based on Campus Climate**

**The Original Research Plan.** The study provided an opportunity to develop and refine teaching and curriculum strategies for individuals with disabilities. The goal was to teach subject matter, confirm theory, and develop skills building
strategies. The curriculum was developed to support freshmen and sophomores attending the University of Hawai`i, Manoa. The course was conceptualized as a for-credit experimental course so we could compensate students with credit for their participation. Objectives of this study included: challenging other educators to push the envelope of teaching; empowering students to change the way they look at their world; develop a learning environment containing high personal expectations; create action plans to meet challenges, and reinforce to the opportunity to succeed outside the classroom.

Campus Climate. Though the objectives remain the same, the campus environment at the University of Hawaii, Manoa has made it difficult to list a for-credit experimental course. This challenge has been exacerbated because the Center on Disability Studies—within the College of Education—does not have its own set of course numbers for undergraduate level courses and must borrow from other departments. Several departments were unwilling to allow their course numbers to be used for this course because it is experimental and the curriculum did not fit within various department. Departments like the College of Education did not have the 100 and 200 level course numbers. The Outreach College was willing to assist if the class was offered non-credit but researchers still faced the challenge of finding a course number and creating student incentives to participate. Outreach College did not know “where to put our course” or how to match this course with a program or department and in the end was unable to help. The bottom line is that the apparent inflexibility of departments to think and act as interdisciplinary units has impeded attempts to collaborate, create and experiment in the classroom.

The challenge of implementing a for-credit self-determination course on the University campus was expected. Research has found that systemic impediments have reduced the effectiveness of self-determination efforts in other settings. Systemic challenges have been blamed for the ineffectiveness of self-determination curriculum in secondary education. It was determined that the ineffectiveness of secondary education supports and curricula for students with disabilities did not appear to lie in substance or content but in the failure to integrate efforts within the larger campus environment. Ineffectiveness also appeared to be related to the lack of commitment and support from the campus at large (Berliner & Biddle, 1996; Edgar, 1997; Hatch, 1998; USDOE, 1995, 1996; Waldron & McLeskey, 1998), and reinforced by the lack of resources (Jorgensen, 1997; Oakes & Wells, 1998; Vaughn, Schumm, & Brick, 1998).

While there are pockets of excellence supporting students with disabilities at the University of Hawaii, Manoa, these efforts do not appear to be coordinated across the campus nor do they reflect a proactive campus-wide initiative that supports people with disabilities. Take for example the actions of University of Hawaii President Evan S. Dobelle and his message to the community. During his first semester on-the-job, he relocated an access ramp fronting the President’s home to the back of the house.

Research Questions.

• What types of skills and life experiences do students with disabilities need in order to successfully transition to postsecondary education
• What types of skills and life experiences do students with disabilities need in order to successfully advocate for their own educational supports and subsequent workforce settings?

• What are the essential skill-building blocks necessary to enhance self-advocacy, self-determination and locus of control?

• How do internal and external “loci of control” relate to the self-perceived successes of postsecondary students who have disabilities?

• What is the impact of a curriculum aimed at enhancing locus of control and cultural capital on the development of self-determination and self-advocacy skills in students with disabilities?

• How does capital culture relate to the outcomes of postsecondary students who have disabilities?

• How do we adapt course(s) with self-determination and self-advocacy curriculum to a variety of disabilities, teachers, and disciplines?

Method Proposed to Address the Research Questions

The proposed intervention study will provide learning and research opportunities for students within the classroom, and increase understanding of students with disabilities. The intervention will be implemented as an eight-week, non-credit course for students with disabilities and participants will include secondary students (this group will be used for comparative purposes in this study), post-high school adults, and postsecondary students (community colleges and 4-year institutions). A quantitative and qualitative study will determine the education needs and the range of information required to adequately support students; and identify, develop and implement effective practices to assure that students with disabilities have the knowledge and skills necessary to advocate for their own educational successes.

Concern was express by members of the collaborative community research team Participatory Action Team because the experimental course will be self-contained. Team members felt a mainstreamed effort would provide better supports—a more well-rounded education—for individuals with disabilities. Participatory Action Team members used a philosophy course on disability, taught at University of Hawaii, Hilo by P. Amundson, as an example. This class is successfully using an inclusive setting. Though this course is developed to accommodate diverse type of students who may be disenfranchised for purposes of this research, it will be self-contained for
students with disabilities, but as a way to engage students in real-world activities, mentoring and community-based shadowing will be implemented.

**Quantitative Method.** An “internal locus of control assessment,” will be developed and administered at the beginning and end of each course (two administrations). The instrument will measure the effects of the curriculum on self-awareness, self, esteem, self-determination, self-advocacy, and personal development among participating students. The instrument will measure pre-post-interval changes in four areas:

- Attitudes, knowledge and understanding, and actions concerning one’s own abilities and disabilities;
- Self-awareness and self-esteem;
- Knowledge of educational supports as they relate to accommodation needs; and,
- The development of a sense of control over one’s environment

**Qualitative Method.**

Qualitative inquiry will also be used to develop case studies based on each student’s “Life Course Chart” and personal interviews. Data will be gathered and presented to provide “details of everyday life” and a picture of “rites, habits, practices, beliefs, and, generally, ways of life” (Van Maanen, 1988, p. 48) for students with disabilities. Qualitative inquiry is the method of choice because it allows researchers to look at “settings and people holistically; people, settings or groups are not reduced to variables but are viewed as a whole” (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984, p. 6). The goal of data collect is to gather “thick description” (Geertz, 1983) of events and experiences, which “embodies an interpretive characteristic of description, rather than detail per se, that makes it thick” (Schwandt, 1997, p. 161). Individual student perceptions about various events will be gathered using life course charts, journals, observations and class participation. Personal interviews will be used to compare and contrast personal interpretations and gain insight into how individuals perceive their lives, how they define levels of satisfaction, and what helps them to be resilient and empowered. We also hope to better understand the effect of a self-determination curriculum on student development and empowerment.

**Recruitment of Students.** There will be several defined groups of students within the sample. Within each group research will identify the shared information held by its participants. The information gathered may provide insight into the social system and its boundaries created by individuals with disabilities. According to Werner and Schoepfle (1987, Volume 1) “[Shared information] is very likely shared by all within the social system. In other words, whenever we find discontinuities in shared knowledge, changes are we have crossed a social boundary” (p. 185).

Participants will be recruited at two different “pre-four-year college” entry points. Hawaii Center for Independent Living (HCIL) and Kapiolani Community College will be used as entry points into the four-year University.
Several sample groups, consisting of six to eight individuals, will be organized to compare the self-determination curriculum across a variety of disabilities, ages and abilities. Groups will include secondary students (this group will be used for comparative purposes in this study), post-high school adults, and postsecondary students (community colleges and 4-year institutions). The course will be offered non-credit for eight weeks. In this way we can develop group comparisons within the disability culture to test curriculum, begin to adapt teaching materials to different stages in life and abilities; and engage twice as many students than we would in a single 15-week course. Groups of students will be recruited from two sources:

- HCIL who is awarding money to high school students to attend college. HCIL will provide access to students to support and enhance the development of self-determination, self-advocacy and cultural capital for post-school students, those at secondary, pre-postsecondary and postsecondary levels. (Three groups containing six to eight students.)

- Kapiʻolani Community Colleges Gallaudet Program within the University of Hawaii system to aid in the articulation of students with disabilities from two-year to four-year institutions. (One group containing six to eight students.)

To validate the practical understanding and concerns of service providers more PAT feedback is being addressed by this study. When we shared the curriculum with the Gallaudet Program Coordinator at Kapiʻolani Community College she expressed the need for mentors who are able to walk students through specific activities on campus (i.e., registration, checking out a library book, doing research, etc.). She believed that in-class teaching was not enough and believes what is needed is hands-on mentoring on typical activities that occur outside the classroom. Because of these insights the curriculum is offering a mentor/shadowing component to provide one-to-one assistance, feedback and training on specific community-wide interactions and activities.

**Case Study.** Each student will be treated as a case study, which will be grounded on the perceptions, feelings, attitudes, and values expressed by each student. Life Course Charting will provide the structure for students to describe student experiences, supports, challenges and successes in life and school settings. Autobiographical life narrative writings and alternative forms of expression will support the self-assessment process and provide insights into a student’s perception of the past, present and future; and the factors shaping expectations and creating successes.

The case study is relevant because it provides “empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 1994, p. 13). A case study will be used because the research questions are explanatory in nature and are conceptualized as “how” and “why” questions (Yin, 1994, p. 6). Research questions are being asked about a contemporary set of events—the relationship between self-determination, self-advocacy, locus of control to the empowerment of...
students with disabilities—over which the [researcher] has little or no control (Yin, 1994, p. 9). A case study also can illustrate certain topics within an evaluation in a descriptive mode. The choice of a case study does have drawbacks. The case study inquiry manages environments where there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and it is effective in explaining causal links in “real-life interventions” (such as disability support services, self-determination curriculum) that may be too complex to be measured by survey or experiment. There may be a perceived lack of rigor because the researcher, who is also the instrument of research, and may allow “equivocal evidence or biased views to influence the direction of findings and conclusions” (Yin, 1994, p. 9). This threat to reliability will be countered by using interviews and presenting other points of view of events and experiences.

**Interviews.** In any research method there are threats to validity and reliability. For this reason it is critical to add another layer of data collection to the method. Collecting data from each student’s network of informants (i.e., information sources, significant others) will help triangulate data and provide added reliability and validity. Students will develop a Communication Contexts Matrix (Werner and Schoepfle, 1987 Volume 1, p. 181) that plots and categorizes student communication by the people they interact with and the roles/responsibilities they assume in each interaction.

In-depth interviewing will be used in this study to produce discussions about what participants feel about their lives. Questions are open-ended and will not presuppose which feelings, analysis, or thoughts are important to the interviewee. The wording of interview questions will reflect the frame of reference of the participants and questions can be phrased using: “What is your opinion?” “How to you feel?” “What do you think?” “Should have” and “Ought to have happened.” “Are you satisfied?” “What do you like?” “Define problems,” will be avoided. The purpose of interviewing is to find out “what is in and on someone else’s mind” (Patton, p. 161). As a method of inquiry, interviewing is yet another way to help people make meaning through language. While interviewing benefits the researcher, it also benefits the interviewee. It is a powerful way to gain insight into educational issues by understanding the experience of the individuals whose lives constitute education’ (Seidman, 1991, p. 7).

Interviewing consists of an interchange between the interviewee and interviewer. “Questioning is not just unidirectional or monological; it is dialogical and reflective” (Schwandt, 1997, p. xvi). To collect good data, it is important to develop interviewer-interviewee rapport and a neutral environment—one that is comfortable, informal, and accessible—where open interaction can occur. Interviews will be designed to enable people to share openly, honestly and accurately. Interviews will last 30 minutes. Ten questions, developed by students, will be asked during interviews with significant others.

A goal of this study was to achieve “theoretical saturation,” the point at which new cases no longer yield new information (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The sample was defined so “redundancy with respect to information is reached [informational isomorph]” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, pp. 233-234). Interviews enable a “high level of involvement” with the topic as required by this study. Participants will be selected because they are “experts;” they have insight
into this complex topic, and can provide “detailed stories and personal accounts” (Morgan and Scannell, 1998, p. 73). The interview was designed to address clear-cut goals, produce answers to specific research questions, and “deliver a maximum amount of well-targeted information” (Morgan, 1998, p. 46). Morgan (1998) cautions the use of a structured interview is not “useful for exploratory purposes” (p. 47) and “narrowly focused set of predetermined issues” (p. 51). A structured interview supports the analysis process because it enables the researcher to make systematic comparisons across people.

**Data Collection.** To maintain consistency and trustworthiness, the researcher will review data collected on a daily basis. There will be several cases studied simultaneously and it is important to maintain case integrity by maintaining current and accurate data collection techniques. The teacher/researcher will carry the following items into each class:

- Video camera
- Cassette tape recorder with external microphone
- Back-up cassette tape recorder with external microphone
- Extra batteries for cassette tape recorders
- Blank micro-cassette tapes
- Pens
- Writing tablet with clipboard
- Lecture notes/daily activity materials and instructions

Some classes will be audio taped or videotaped and then transcribed. If participants request, they will not appear on the video-tape or audio tape though they will participate in the session. The researcher may take notes during the class to strengthen the collection process. Note taking and audio recording can enhance the fidelity of data collection by enabling the researcher to reproduce exactly the data as it becomes evident (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 240). Transcripts will be inputted into a computer and reviewed by the researcher who will confirm the accuracy of the transcripts. The researcher will note personal comments and impressions as data are reconfirmed.

**Data Analysis**

The essential raw data of interviews are quotations and first-hand observations. Data analysis examines the content of interviews to determine what topics surface most frequently for most of the participants; what topics generate the most interest; and the importance of topics for each participant (Morgan, 1998, p. 56). Quotations and key words will be grouped and catalogued according to the topics that emerge from interaction. Each category will be written as a complete picture of an event that “addresses the intellectual and emotional connections between the participants’ small, but very densely textured facts, to support broad assertions about the role of culture in the construction of collective life by engaging them exactly with complex specifics” (Geertz, 1973, p. 28). Large conclusions will be drawn from small, but very densely textured facts, to support broad assertions about the role of culture in the construction of collective lives [of those with disabilities] by engaging them exactly with complex specifics (Geertz, 1973, p. 28). The data analysis procedure of this study included the following steps:
• Create a database to log in student demographics [the database will not contain student identifiers and data will not be attached to specific individuals].
• Check transcripts against notes, and taped sessions.
• Isolate main ideas of each response. Create general categories.
• Assemble by interview question.
• Extract relevant quotations that reflect categories. Sort responses by research question.
• Sort responses by source of income category. Further tighten selection and length of quotations. Where necessary, refer to original audio/video tapes to transcripts to reconfirm meaning and intent of quotes.
• Refine categories to provide broad perspectives and representational stories of individuals within categories.

Qualitative inquiry requires researchers to protect the “goodness” of data throughout the study. For this reason, analysis is designed as an ongoing process conducted as data is collected to ground findings within the framework of research goals and questions. The researcher will also maintain a reflective journal. Constant and consistent monitoring of the data collected and the perceptions of the researcher will assist in the ability to address and adapt to unanticipated changes in people, settings, and activities. Additionally, the researcher will be better prepared to analyze the amount of data generated and gain theoretical sensitivity through data and introspection (Glaser, 1978). At some point, data should become redundant and new data/cases will no longer yield new information (Morgan and Scannell, 1998, p. 78). When data analysis and collection occur simultaneously, the researcher can be more sensitive to the point of saturation. (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985); New information will become progressively scarcer, because inquiry as a whole is achieving a sharper and sharper focus, thus rendering a good deal of information initially believed to be important, relatively irrelevant (p. 234).

**Timeline: January 2001 to October 2002.**

- Develop Curriculum—February 1, 2001 to April 30, 2001
- Pilot Curriculum and Test Drive Activities—August 2001
- Quantitative and Qualitative Instruments—January 1, 2001 to May 31, 2001 [Pre-test-August 2001; Test 1-October 2001; Test 2-November 2001; Post-Test-December 2001]
- Data Analysis and Write-up—August 2001 to May 2002 (Ongoing from Start of Course)
- Products and Reports—January 1, 2001 to End of Project

White Paper 2/1/2001: **Cultural Empowerment of Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education.** JoAnn Yuen, Ed.D and Brian Shaughnessy, J.D.

JVR Article 5/1/2001: **Cultural Empowerment: Tools to Engage and Retain Postsecondary Students with Disabilities.** Brian Shaughnessy, J.D. and JoAnn Yuen, Ed.D.
• Conference Presentations—2001:

**Timeline: January 2002 to August 2002**

• Implement/ Pilot Curriculum and Test Drive Activities—February 1, 2002 to April 30, 2002
• Quantitative and Qualitative Instruments—January 1, 2002 to May 31, 2002
  [Pre-test: Week 1; Test 1-Week 4; Post-Test: Week 8]

• Data Analysis and Write-up—March 2002 to August 2002 (Ongoing from Start of Course)

• Synthesis, Products and Reports—January 1, 2001 to End of Project
  
  Self-determination Curriculum—June 2002:
  JoAnn W.L. Yuen, Ed.D and Brian Shaughnessy, J.D.

  Locus of Control Measure—June 2002:
  JoAnn W.L. Yuen, Ed.D and Brian Shaughnessy, J.D.

• Conference Presentations—2002:
  
  PACRIM 2001, Hawaii—March 4-9
  (Honolulu, Hawaii)
  14th International Conference on the First-Year Experience—July 9-13
  *(Application submitted)*

  Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences—June 11-15
  (Honolulu, Hawaii)
  *(Application submitted)*

AHEAD Conference 2002: Reframing Disability—July 8-12, 2002 (Washington, DC)
*(Application submitted)*
Appendix 1.

Statement of Informed Consent

I, _________________________________, agree to participate in this research project on students who are part of the University of Hawaii and Community College System, conducted by JoAnn W.L. Yuen, Ed.D. and Brian Shaughnessy, JD.

**The course.** I understand that the purpose of this research is to develop a curriculum and strategies to better prepare students with disabilities to be successful college students, graduates, and employees. As a participant I will share my ideas about what it means to me to be a student with a disability and what I need to succeed in this postsecondary education and employment setting.

I understand that about 10 students will be involved in this study and eight-week course. The class is offered non-credit, will meet 1.5 hours or less twice a week, and is provided at no cost to me.

**Your right to be videotaped and audiotaped.** I understand that specific classes may be audiotaped and/or videotaped. I will be informed in advance, if and when a class will be taped and my consent will be required before I participate in each taped session. If I withhold my consent and attend the class my voice and/or image will not be included in the taped session. My participation and/or non-participation in audiotaped and videotaped sessions will not effect on my standing in this class. Audio and video tapes will be transcribed and data will be used in reports to the federal government and related articles. After transcription all tapes will be destroyed.

**Your right to privacy.** I understand that I have an obligation to respect and protect the privacy of the other members of this class by not disclosing my own or anyone else’s personal information that may be shared during our discussions.

I understand that because of the nature of this study there may be potential for violations to my privacy. To prevent violations of my own and others’ privacy, I have been asked not to talk about any of my own or others’ personal experiences outside the class that I would consider too personal or revealing.

**Your right to confidentiality.** I understand that all the information I give will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law and that the names of all the people in the study will be kept confidential. In order to further protect an individual’s confidentiality the observation of public behavior possess the following two conditions:

(i) In the researcher’s private data (including field notes) as well as in any published material, observations are recorded in such a manner that individual human subjects cannot be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; or
(ii) The observations, even if disclosed outside the research, could not reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subject's financial standing, employability, or reputation.

**Your participation** I understand that the benefits I receive from this class may range from the intangible to profound but I agree to participate in the hope that it will help others and enroll and participate solely for purpose of the earning three credits and/or the accompanying stipend. I understand that I may terminate my participation for any or no reason and that the only consequences being the withdrawal or dropping from the class, and/or I may also be required to repay the stipend or portion thereof.

**For more information about this study and your rights.** The members of the research team have offered to answer any questions I may have about the study and what I am expected to do. If I have questions about research and this study I can call:

Center on Disability Studies—College of Education (HUAP)
JoAnn Yuen, Ed.D. [Fopawz@aol.com]
Brian Shaughnessy, JD. [Shaughnehb001@hawaii.rr.com]
1776 University Avenue, UA 4-6
Honolulu, HI 96822
808 956-2641 (PH)
808 956-2643 (FAX)

If you have any questions or comments regarding your treatment and rights as a research participant, you may contact the:

Committee on Human Studies
University of Hawaii
2540 Maile Way
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96822
Phone: 808 956-5007.

I have read and understand this information and I agree to take part in the study.

Signature ________________________________

Print Name ______________________________

Date of Signature _________________________
Appendix 2.

Self-determination and HCIL Proposal

Goal: Serve 6-8 people per course  
Timeline: One course every 2 months (Jan/Feb; Mar/Apr; May/Jun; Jul/Aug)

Course: Week 1-6, 2 hours each class  
Week 7, Individual Projects (up to 4 hours individual support)

Seat time: 12 hours (6 modules)

Community time: 8 hours (defined by student and shadowed by teacher)

HCIL Support: HCIL provides students and classroom. Groups set up by cognitive ability and type of special need. *Proposed Groups:*

- Secondary Education—Young Adults  
  (identifying mentors, social building, leadership)

- Postsecondary Education and Adults  
  (identifying mentors, social building, leadership)

- Providers Serving Individuals with Disabilities and their Families  
  (service providers, college practicum placements/interns)

CDS Support: CDS provides teacher(s) and curriculum.  
Teach curriculum and develop specific teaching strategies to support curriculum for specific disabilities. Understanding and identifying the essence of self-advocacy and self-determination to create the building blocks of self-determination and self-advocacy. Determine what students need to create positive outcomes.

Products: Curriculum for three populations: Secondary education students, postsecondary education students and adults; people who serve individuals with disabilities  
Develop a Self-help Pamphlet for individuals with disabilities.
Proposed SD Modules

Self-awareness
who I am (the self)
who I am relative to my disability (my life)
clarifying the image (how I see the world, how I think the world looks at me)
creating dreams and goals
assessing locus of control

Awareness of others
sharing dreams and goals
creating consistent images (how the world sees me, how I see the world—is there consistency)
what is means to be other-centered
developing empathy

Communication
receiving messages
sending messages
processing messages (creating words and symbols)
sending feedback
understanding (the struggle: different meaning, same message)

Team work, assertiveness, and conflict resolution
working together with others
creating equal partnerships
creating equitable power relationships
understanding and expression

The law, your rights and responsibilities
human rights
legal rights
your responsibilities

Advocacy and mentoring
honoring your rights and needs
honoring rights and needs of others

Shadowing—4 hours

Field training and support. Teachers shadow students in day-to-day activities of the students choosing. One-on-one observations, assessments, and teaching to improve the quality of day-to-day human interaction for each student.
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