مجلة جامعة الملك عبدالعزيز: العلوم التربوية والنفسية، م٢ع٢ ص ص: ٢١٥- ٢٢٦ (٢٠٢٣م)
DOI:10.4197/Edu.2-2.7

The application of high-impact educational practices to support university students with disabilities in Saudi Arabia: faculty perspectives.

Dr. Abdulaziz bin Shawq Al-Solami
Associate Professor of Special Education
King Abdulaziz University - Jeddah - Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
asalsolmi@kau.edu.sa

Dr. Turki bin Mahdi Al-Qarni
Associate Professor of Special Education
Najran University
tmalqarni@nu.edu.sa

Abstract. the current study has investigated the faculty perspectives related to the application of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. 250 faculty members from King Abdul-Aziz university participated in filling an online survey which is consisted of ten domains of high impact educational practices (HIPs). Descriptive and inferential analysis were used to investigate about the average and demographic variables related to the applications of HIPs for postsecondary students with disabilities. The faculty responses revealed that HIPs can be applicable for postsecondary students with disabilities. However, there was no significant differences for both male and female faculty regarding the application of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. Also, faculty with more experiences intend to apply HIPs with postsecondary students with disabilities compared to faculty with low experiences. recommendations and future studies were discussed to support the engagement of postsecondary students with disabilities in higher education.
Keywords: College students with disabilities, High impact educational practices (HIPs),University

Introduction

The development of higher education has been critical to include the best educational practices for the worldwide universities. High-impact educational practices are the most interesting practices in many popular universities. The root of high-impact educational practices comes from the falling out of Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) to fulfill the desired outcomes for university students in higher education (Sandeen, 2012). Those outcomes are "global knowledge, self-direction, writing, critical thinking, adaptability, self-knowledge, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, social responsibility, intercultural skills ethical judgment, and teamwork" (Schneider, 2008, p. 5).
Kuha (2008) proposed ten high-impact educational practices to support the students during their potential goals in higher education. These practices have been measured by many institutions and have been greatly useful from many university students with different backgrounds. These practices are consisted of various forms and rely more on student characteristics and higher education contexts. In other words, many universities are increasingly assessing the learner involvement of active learning practices which showed helped to assess the practices contributing to students' success. However, the use of active learning practices is disorganized (Kuh, 2008).

The primary goal of high-impact educational practices is to increase the students retention and engagement in higher education (Sandeen, 2012), however, they are important to improve the students critical thinking, cognition, intercultural effectiveness and overall students success (Kilgo et al., 2014). As advocates of disability higher education are always seeking practices promoting and the success of university students in higher education, this study will investigate the applications of high-impact educational practices to support the university students with disabilities in Saudi universities.

The problem of the study

Although the rate of dropout of students with disabilities has been progressively increasing for the past ten years, the proportion of those students graduating from high school with a diploma still remains little compared to students with learning disabilities (Banerjee & Brinckerhoff, 2010). However, many studies revealed the effectiveness of HIPs for the overall engagement of university students (Gatson-Gayles & Hu, 2009; Umbach, Palmer, Kuh, & Hannah, 2006). They also believed that the applications of HIPs were helpful to create a positive impact on college outcomes and reducing dropouts for all students exhibited to these practices.

Research questions

1. What are the faculty perspectives towards the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities?
2. Are there statistically significant differences in the faculty perspectives of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities due to the gender variable?
3. Are there statistically significant differences in the faculty perspectives of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities due to the variable of teaching experiences?

The objectives of the research

The current study represents the following objectives. First, it shows perspectives towards the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. Also, it examine the differences in the faculty perspectives of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities due to the gender and teaching experiences' variable.

Literature Review

The experience of teaching students with disability at higher education revolves around the need to establish an inclusive environment where interactions can occur easily to enable learners to engage fully in the curriculum (Godovnikova et al., 2019). In their article on the experience of teaching students with disability, Swart and Greyling (2011) contend that educators have to provide support for disabled students to promote their self-efficacy and determination in their ability to participate in learning. Godovnikova et al. (2019) argue that the inclusion of disabled students in higher learning institutions' learning environment majorly grounds on the educators focus on emotional attachment and its role in enabling students to develop their communication and social skills. In this regard, research points to the link between educating students with disabilities and self-sacrifice to ensure that all their needs are met. Students with disabilities find it challenging to focus on academic performance, as their life needs cannot be met efficiently considering they are mostly not independent and self-efficient (Pinion, 2022). Lang (2015) posits that the higher learning experience is incapacitated by the lack of self-identity linked to individual uniqueness. Therefore, university students with disabilities need to focus on three aspects including personal and psychological aspects and culture of teachers to develop their university integration (García et al., 2022).

The lack of self-identity linked to dependence on others for assistance demonstrates unequal access to education and other opportunities for students with disabilities (Pinion, 2022). Mosia and Phasha (2020) contend that students with disabilities in Lesotho find it hard to access education, as the system and educators fail to address the lack of support systems and access to educational resources. Eguavoen and Eniola (2016) reaffirm this point by pointing to the inaccessibility of some classroom settings, as well as the underlying attitudes that educators and independent students may have towards those with disabilities. Access to learning materials and the likelihood of being left behind in scenarios where disabled students lack support systems indicate that better policies should be adopted to guide the inclusivity of higher education institutions. On this note, students with disabilities also struggle with self-identity and self-esteem, as they are required to rely on other parties to dress, sit on a chair, or even write a sentence (Wormald et al., 2015).

From an educator's perspective, students with disabilities may seem like a burden, especially when support resources or systems are limited. From a learner's standpoint, being perceived as a burden comes with a psychological liability, which exposes students with disabilities to abuses and hostility (Zungu et al., 2013). The lack of enough staff members and the poor allocation of resources exposes disabled learners to a lack of clarity that comes with anxiety, disadvantaging individual experiences (Eccles et al., 2018). While some students may find it inconvenient to disclose their disabilities, it is worth acknowledging that the education system inhabits access to resources by failure to define what aspects constitute disability (Kutsche, 2012). According to Özhanci et al. (2018), the challenges that students with disabilities face in education extend to the outside world, as access to employment and participation in society hinder their experiences while shaping their future.

Literature on the challenges faced by students with disabilities highlights common aspects such as negative attitudes by society, majorly fellow students and educators (Özhanci et al., 2018). As per Muñoz et al. (2019), most educators are likely to overlook the importance of introducing career skills such as entrepreneurship, which undermines their participation in learning and economic activities. This point is emphasized in Salome et al.'s (2013) research; they conclude that female students with disabilities are marginalized further because of their gender, as society perceives them as less capable. In so doing, they are left behind in class work and growth opportunities, exposing them to gender-based violence and maltreatment. Mistreatment by educators is not a far-fetched idea among students with disabilities. Maric (2018) points to the lack of inclusivity in classrooms, which contributes to the social and educational factors barring special needs learners from realizing their potential.

Higher education is already challenging for students irrespective of their ability or disability. In this regard, students with disabilities require additional support to enable the attainment of improved learning outcomes. Medola et al. (2018) argue that the lack of support systems such as rehabilitation teams, assistive technology, and the inability to actively engage in some educational and community work affects the experience of students with disabilities. Kutsch (2012) supports this point by arguing that international students with disabilities benefit from studying in countries where special education needs are considered in legislation and infrastructure development. Although aspects of discrimination and bullying may be present in diverse learning environments, Kutsch (2012) maintains that access to special education infrastructure helps to eliminate underlying difficulties. Dangoisse et al.'s (2020) argument that special needs students have to overcome the lack of social network and support, as well as dealing with heightened educational demands indicates the complex nature of special needs learning in higher education.

According to Moisey and Moore (2002), special needs students with access to the necessary resources and materials do not have to deal with the challenge of needing special content assistance, as such resources enhance independence. Resources such as assistive technology help to boost the inclusivity of higher education learning environments, helping to eliminate challenges associated with unequal access to education. Du Toit (2018) contends that students with disabilities find it challenging to deal with affairs such as accessible housing for those living out of campus, and international culture experience for those studying abroad. In the article, "Everyone Is Normal, and Everyone Has a Disability": Narratives of University Students with Visual Impairment, Almog (2018) points to underlying aspects such as adjusting to campus life/environment and a lack of opportunities for social expression result in the increased risk of social oppression. Thus, higher education experiences of students with disabilities are defined by the elements of inclusion, self-identity, and access to opportunities offered by available support systems (Almog, 2018).

Method

Design

A quantitative research design was employed in the present study, which is beneficial to gain numerical data and find a correct response by examining hypotheses and using scientific techniques (Davies & Fisher, 2018). Particularly, quantitative survey research was used to collect data, which can reveal perspectives, attitudes or opinions of participants (Hansen and Tsheko, 2021). Thus, the authors were seeking to represent the perspectives of special education faculty members towards the application of HIE practices for students with developmental disabilities in Saudi universities.

Participants

250 faculty members from King Abdul-Aziz university engaged in a survey with different demographic characteristics. King Abdul-Aziz university is one of Saudi higher education were ranked on the QS World University Rankings (Sohail and Hasan, 2021). Also, King Abdul-Aziz university includes 1067 students studying in various specializations. However, nine of these universities are fully established with adequate facilities of disability services. The rest of universities are missing reasonable inclusive services provided to students with disabilities in higher education.

Questionnaire

A survey was adapted from high-impact educational practices presented by (Kuh, 2008) who mentioned that these practices are beneficial to increase the college students' engagement. High-impact educational practices included First-Year Seminars and Experiences, Common Intellectual Experiences, Learning Communities, Writing-Intensive Courses, Collaborative Assignments and Projects, Undergraduate Research, Diversity/Global Learning, Service Learning, Community-Based Learning, Internships and Capstone Courses and Projects.

Furthermore, we divided these practices into 10 practices; each one containing some applicable statements for students with developmental disabilities in university education. The first practice is First-Year Seminars and Experiences which has three statements. Second practice is Common Intellectual Experiences which has three statements. Third practice is Learning Communities which has four statements. Fourth practice is Writing-Intensive Courses which has three statements. Fifth practice is Collaborative Assignments and Projects which has three statements. Sixth practice is Undergraduate Research which has two statements. Seventh practice is Diversity/Global Learning which has two statements. Eighth practice Community-Based Learning which has two statements.

Ninth practice Internships and Capstone Courses which has two statements. Last practice is Projects which has two statements.

Validity and Reliability

The questionnaire items were translated into Arabic and proofread to preserve the exact meanings. Then, they were exhibited to five experts who measured the validation of the questionnaire's contents who were recommended some revisions to the questionnaire and then the approval of research ethics was obtained from KAU. Thirty-five participants were randomly selected from KAU to undertake a pilot study. The survey asked whether they wanted to participate in the study. Thereafter, the questionnaire's internal reliability was measured using Cronbach's alpha; all scales indicated excellent reliability (0.96).

Procedure and Data Analysis

After obtaining the data, these data were managed in an excel file and then inserted in SPSS 23 software. For the first question was analyzed through the use of descriptive analysis including mean. For the second question, researchers used T.test to explore the faculty perspectives based on the gender variable. For the second question, researchers used the ANOVA analysis to explore the faculty perspectives based on the gender variable.

Results

Table 1 shows that the total responses of the study sample on the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities scored (4.29) with a standard deviation of (0.58), which infers that these practices are applicable for students with disabilities. Also, it was shown the means of the domains of the study instrument ranged between (4.24-4.43), they all were applicable. At domains, the ninth and tenth domains (communit) ranked first with a means of (4.34), a standard deviation of (0.92). Then, the ninth and tenth domains (intership and projects) ranked first respectively with a means of (4.30) and (4.30), a standard deviation of (0.78) and (0.71). In the last place came the fourth domain (courses) with a means of (4.24), a standard deviation of (0.78).

The t-test for two independent samples was used to show the differences between the means of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities attributed to the faculty gender variable. Table 2 shows no statistically significant differences at (0.05) between the means of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities attributed to the faculty gender variable on all domains and the whole scale. The values of the statistical significance were higher than (0.05).

As shown in Table 3, the one-way ANOVA was used to reveal the differences between the means of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities attributed to the faculty' teaching experiences variable which showed no statistical significance, $F(1.26) = 1.90$, $p = .169$, denoting similarities in the application across all domains of high-impact educational practices. As can be seen from the table, the group (From one to three years) was similarly chose a neutral applications of high-impact educational practice for students with disabilities. However, the group (From four years to seven) and the group (From eight years or more) similarly believed that high-impact educational practice.

Discussion

The first question was revealing total responses of the study sample on the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. The results of this question indicated that these practices can be applied to students with disabilities from faculty perspectives. This can be realistic

as high-impact educational practices regard the individual differences among students with and without disabilities. Also, these practices can be applicable because they are built on the engagement and interaction between students and faculty (Godovnikova et al., 2019).

The second question was revealing the differences between the means of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities attributed to the faculty gender variable. The results of this question indicated that there was no a statistically significant differences among male and female faculty towards the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities (Almog, 2018). This would infer that female and male faculty have received the similar knowledge in the Saudi universities regarding the application of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. Another reason why there was no a statistically significant differences attributed to gender is that all Saudi universities have the similar academic preparation for both male and female students and this maybe resulted in having the same outcomes for both gender in terms of the application of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. The last question was revealing the differences between the means of the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities attributed to the teaching years of faculty variable. The results of this question indicated that there was no a statistically significant differences attributed to the teaching experiences of faculty towards in all domains of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. However, there was a differences among the years of experiences as faculty with more experiences who believe the HIPs can be applicable to postsecondary students with disabilities. This may be because the faculty with more experience have acquired knowledge and facts about the of high-impact educational practices for faculty of students with disabilities due to of their attendance and participation in several training programs and courses during their years of work (Muñoz et al., 2019), This provide them with a clear picture of these practices. This may also be attributed to faculty with longer experience having a more in-depth, diverse, and cultural view of the HIPs and what meets the needs of their students with disabilities.

Recommendations and future researches

The current study revealed that it is possible to apply the HIPs in the education of postsecondary students with disabilities. the next step is to apply these practices on the students with necessary modifications to meet their abilities and then to investigate its impacts empirically on their learning. Applying the HIPs empirically on students with disabilities can be an area of a future research. Also, the current study found that faculty with low experiences intend to not applying the HIPs on postsecondary students with disabilities compared to faculty with longer experiences. Therefore, future studies can focus on their lacks of experiences related to the HIPs and the effectiveness of training in increasing the faculty's knowledge and preparation of HIPs.

Conclusion

The current study has investigated the faculty perspectives related to the application of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. The faculty responses revealed that HIPs can be applicable for postsecondary students with disabilities. However, there was no significant differences for both male and female faculty regarding the application of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities. Also, faculty with more experiences intend to apply HIPs with postsecondary students with disabilities compared to faculty with low experiences.

Tables

Table 1. The means and standard deviations of the participants' responses on the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities

Domains	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
First-Year Seminars and Experiences	249	2.00	5.00	4.2677	.78555
Common Intellectual Experiences	249	2.00	5.00	4.3347	.66767
Learning Communities	249	2.25	5.00	4.2962	.68933
Writing-Intensive Courses	249	2.00	5.00	4.2423	.78671
Collaborative Assignments and Projects	249	2.3	5.0	4.311	.6406
Undergraduate Research	249	2.50	5.00	4.2851	.68172
Diversity/Global Learning	249	2.50	5.00	4.2811	.67746
Community-Based Learning	249	1.00	5.00	4.3494	.92152
Internships and Capstone Courses	249	1.00	5.00	4.3012	.78265
Projects	249	1.50	5.00	4.3072	.71490
Average	249	2.62	5.00	4.2961	.58768
Valid N (listwise)	249				

Table 2. T-test analysis for the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities attributed to gender

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	female	88	4.2386	.79742	.08501	.431	247	.667
First-Year	male	161	4.3644	.63004	.04965	.429	175.865	.669
Seminars and Experiences	female	88	4.2803	.73219	.07805	.950	247	.343
Common Intellectual	male	161	4.3245	.67306	.05304	.909	157.629	.365
Experiences	female	88	4.2443	.71917	.07666	.877	247	.381
Learning	male	161	4.2547	.78397	.06179	.860	169.158	.391
Communities	female	88	4.2197	.79572	.08482	.335	247	.738
Writing-Intensive	male	161	4.294	.6502	.0512	.333	176.753	.739
Courses	female	88	4.341	.6251	.0666	-.552-	247	.582
Undergraduate	male	161	4.2919	.68820	.05424	-.558-	185.119	.577
Research	female	88	4.2727	.67342	.07179	.212	247	.832
Diversity/Global	male	161	4.2826	.67496	.05319	.213	182.363	.831
Learning	female	88	4.2784	.68589	.07312	.047	247	.963
Community-Based	male	161	4.3602	.89654	.07066	.046	176.573	.963
Learning	female	88	4.3295	.97050	.10346	.251	247	.802
Internships and	male	161	4.3043	.82001	.06463	.245	167.298	.807
Capstone Courses	female	88	4.2955	.71373	.07608	.086	247	.932
Projects	male	161	4.3137	.71331	.05622	.089	200.949	.929
	female	88	4.2955	.72173	.07694	.192	247	.848
Average	male	161	4.3075	.57414	.04525	.191	177.228	.849
	female	88	4.2753	.61450	.06551	.411	247	.681
						.403	168.919	.687

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
First-Year Seminars and Experiences	From one to three years	11	4.2424	.90788	.27374	2.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4190	.70478	.06751	2.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1421	.82261	.07243	2.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.2677	.78555	.04978	2.00	5.00
Common Intellectual Experiences	From one to three years	11	4.4242	.65134	.19639	3.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4312	.61246	.05866	2.33	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2455	.70529	.06210	2.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.3347	.66767	.04231	2.00	5.00
Learning Communities	From one to three years	11	4.4091	.73547	.22175	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.3968	.66685	.06387	2.50	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2016	.69602	.06128	2.25	5.00
	Total	249	4.2962	.68933	.04368	2.25	5.00
Writing-Intensive Courses	From one to three years	11	4.2424	.85753	.25855	2.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.3609	.73020	.06994	2.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1421	.81838	.07205	2.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.2423	.78671	.04986	2.00	5.00
Undergraduate Research	From one to three years	11	4.303	.7372	.2223	3.0	5.0
	From four years to seven	109	4.419	.5956	.0570	2.3	5.0
	From eight years or more	129	4.220	.6595	.0581	2.3	5.0
	Total	249	4.311	.6406	.0406	2.3	5.0
Diversity/Global Learning	From one to three years	11	4.1818	.92932	.28020	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4358	.62398	.05977	3.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1667	.68560	.06036	2.50	5.00
	Total	249	4.2851	.68172	.04320	2.50	5.00
Diversity/Global Learning	From one to three years	11	4.3182	.71668	.21609	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4083	.64609	.06188	3.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1705	.68607	.06040	2.50	5.00
	Total	249	4.2811	.67746	.04293	2.50	5.00
Community-Based Learning	From one to three years	11	4.4091	.73547	.22175	3.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4266	.82727	.07924	1.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2791	1.00760	.08871	1.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.3494	.92152	.05840	1.00	5.00
Internships and Capstone Courses	From one to three years	11	4.3182	.78335	.23619	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4266	.61924	.05931	1.50	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1938	.88897	.07827	1.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.3012	.78265	.04960	1.00	5.00
Projects	From one to three years	11	4.0909	.91701	.27649	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4495	.67681	.06483	1.50	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2054	.71155	.06265	1.50	5.00
	Total	249	4.3072	.71490	.04530	1.50	5.00
Average	From one to three years	11	4.3042	.73811	.22255	2.62	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4143	.53113	.05087	2.77	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1956	.60539	.05330	2.62	5.00
	Total	249	4.2961	.58768	.03724	2.62	5.00

Table 3. ANOVA analysis for the applications of high-impact educational practices for students with disabilities attributed to teaching experience

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
First-Year Seminars and Experiences	From one to three years	11	4.2424	.90788	.27374	2.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4190	.70478	.06751	2.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1421	.82261	.07243	2.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.2677	.78555	.04978	2.00	5.00
Common Intellectual Experiences	From one to three years	11	4.4242	.65134	.19639	3.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4312	.61246	.05866	2.33	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2455	.70529	.06210	2.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.3347	.66767	.04231	2.00	5.00
Learning Communities	From one to three years	11	4.4091	.73547	.22175	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.3968	.66685	.06387	2.50	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2016	.69602	.06128	2.25	5.00
	Total	249	4.2962	.68933	.04368	2.25	5.00
Writing-Intensive Courses	From one to three years	11	4.2424	.85753	.25855	2.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.3609	.73020	.06994	2.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1421	.81838	.07205	2.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.2423	.78671	.04986	2.00	5.00
Undergraduate Research	From one to three years	11	4.303	.7372	.2223	3.0	5.0
	From four years to seven	109	4.419	.5956	.0570	2.3	5.0
	From eight years or more	129	4.220	.6595	.0581	2.3	5.0
	Total	249	4.311	.6406	.0406	2.3	5.0
Diversity/Global Learning	From one to three years	11	4.1818	.92932	.28020	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4358	.62398	.05977	3.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1667	.68560	.06036	2.50	5.00
	Total	249	4.2851	.68172	.04320	2.50	5.00
Diversity/Global Learning	From one to three years	11	4.3182	.71668	.21609	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4083	.64609	.06188	3.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1705	.68607	.06040	2.50	5.00
	Total	249	4.2811	.67746	.04293	2.50	5.00
Community-Based Learning	From one to three years	11	4.4091	.73547	.22175	3.00	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4266	.82727	.07924	1.00	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2791	1.00760	.08871	1.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.3494	.92152	.05840	1.00	5.00
Internships and Capstone Courses	From one to three years	11	4.3182	.78335	.23619	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4266	.61924	.05931	1.50	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1938	.88897	.07827	1.00	5.00
	Total	249	4.3012	.78265	.04960	1.00	5.00
Projects	From one to three years	11	4.0909	.91701	.27649	2.50	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4495	.67681	.06483	1.50	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.2054	.71155	.06265	1.50	5.00
	Total	249	4.3072	.71490	.04530	1.50	5.00
Average	From one to three years	11	4.3042	.73811	.22255	2.62	5.00
	From four years to seven	109	4.4143	.53113	.05087	2.77	5.00
	From eight years or more	129	4.1956	.60539	.05330	2.62	5.00
	Total	249	4.2961	.58768	.03724	2.62	5.00

Acknowledgement
Financial support from the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Abdul-Aziz University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (G:432-324-1442) is gratefully acknowledged.

References

Banerjee, M., & Brinckerhoff, L. C. (2010). Helping students with disabilities navigate the college admissions process. In S. F. Shaw, J. W. Madaus, & L. C. Dukes (Eds.), Preparing students with disabilities for college success: A practical guide to transition planning (pp. 229-256). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Davies, C., & Fisher, M. (2018). Understanding research paradigms. Journal of the Australasian Rehabilitation Nurses' Association, 21(3), 21–25

Sohail, M. S., & Hasan, M. (2021). Students' perceptions of service quality in Saudi universities: the SERVPERF model. Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). Excerpt from high-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 14(3), 28-29.

Almog, N. (2018). " Everyone Is Normal, and Everyone Has a Disability": Narratives of University Students with Visual Impairment. Social Inclusion, 6(4), 218-229.

Dangoisse, F., Clercq, M. D., Meenen, F. V., Chartier, L., & Nils, F. (2020). When disability becomes ability to navigate the transition to higher education: a comparison of students with and without disabilities. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 35(4), 513-528.

Du Toit, N. H. (2018). Designing a model for facilitating the inclusion of higher education international students with disabilities in South Africa. Social Inclusion, 6(4), 168-181.

Eccles, S., Hutchings, M., Hunt, C., & Heaslip, V. (2018). Risk and stigma: students' perceptions and disclosure of 'disability' in higher education. Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning, 20(4), 191-208.

Eguavoen, E. O., & Eniola, M. S. (2016). Influence of self-concept and social acceptance on academic achievement of students with visual impairment in Oyo State, Nigeria. AFRREV IJAH: An International Journal of Arts and Humanities, 5(3), 213-230.

García, M. G. D. C. G., García, M. D. R. G., & Gonzalez, J. A. T. (2022). Capacidades docentes que mejoran el desarrollo integral del alumno en la FCAT-UAT. *Vinculatégica EFAN*, *8*(5), 79-92.

Godovnikova, L. V., Gerasimova, A. S., Galchun, Y. V., & Shitikova, E. V. (2019). The Competency Levels of Disabled Students Who Study in University. Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 14(1), 99-110.

Kutsche, M. J. (2012). An exploratory study of perceptions of benefits and barriers to study abroad for students with disabilities.

Lang, L. (2015). Responsibility and participation in transition to university–Voices of young people with disabilities. Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research, 17(2), 130-143.

Maric, L. (2018). The struggle of adolescents with physical and sensorial disabilities at further and higher education levels.

Medola, F. O., Sandnes, F. E., Ferrari, A. L. M., & Rodrigues, A. C. T. (2018). Strategies for Developing Students' Empathy and Awareness for the Needs of People with Disabilities: Contributions to Design Education. Studies in health technology and informatics, 256, 137-147.

Moisey, S. D., & Moore, B. (2002). Students with Disabilities: Their experience and success at Athabasca University. IDCE/CADE Conference.

Mosia, P. A., & Phasha, T. N. (2020). Student experience and quality of tertiary education for students with disabilities in Lesotho. Journal of Student Affairs in Africa, 18(1), 13-28.

Muñoz, R. M., Salinero, Y., Peña, I., & Sanchez de Pablo, J. D. (2019). Entrepreneurship education and disability: An experience at a Spanish University. Administrative Sciences, 9(2), 34.

Özhanci, E., Aklibaşinda, M., & Tirnakçi, A. (2018). The disability standards and unimpeded design at Nevşehir Haci Bektas Veli Unıversity Campus. Akademik Ziraat Dergisi, 7(1), 83-92.

Pinion, C. (2022). *Barriers to Seeking and Obtaining Academic Accommodations in College Classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, Eastern Kentucky University).

Salome, N., Mbugua, P., & Ong'eta, W. (2013). Gender and disability: Voices of female students with disabilities on gender-based violence in higher education, Kenya. International Journal of Education and Research, 1(4), 1-12.

Swart, E., & Greyling, E. (2011). Participation in higher education: Experiences of students with disabilities. Acta Academica, 43(4), 81-110.

Wormald, C., Rogers, K. B., & Vialle, W. (2015). A case study of giftedness and specific learning disabilities: Bridging the two exceptionalities. Roeper Review, 37(3), 124-138.

Zungu, L. I., Tugli, A. K., Ramauela, N. J., & Anyanwu, F. C. (2013). Perceived challenges of serving students with disabilities in a historically disadvantaged tertiary institution, South Africa.

تطبيق الممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير لدعم طلاب الجامعات ذوي الإعاقة في المملكة العربية السعودية: من وجهة نظر أعضاء هيئة التدريس

د. عبدالعزيز بن شوق السلمي

أستاذ التربية الخاصة المشارك

جامعة الملك عبدالعزيز–جدة– المملكة العربية السعودية

asalsolmi@kau.edu.sa

د. تركي بن مهدي القرني

أستاذ التربية الخاصة المشارك – جامعة نجران

tmalqarni@nu.edu.sa

مستخلص. استقصت الدراسة الحالية وجهات نظر أعضاء هيئة التدريس المتعلقة بتطبيق الممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير للطلاب ذوي الإعاقة .وقد شارك في هذه الدراسة ٢٥٠ من أعضاء هيئة التدريس من جامعة الملك عبد العزيز في ملء استبيان عبر الإنترنت حيث تتكون من عشرة مجالات للممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير .وقد تم استخدام التحليل الوصفي والاستنتاجي للتحقيق في المتغيرات المتوسطة والديموغرافية المتعلقة بتطبيقات الممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير لطلاب ما بعد المرحلة الثانوية ذوي الإعاقة .كشفت ردود أعضاء هيئة التدريس بأن الممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير يمكن أن تكون قابلة للتطبيق على طلاب المرحلة الثانوية من ذوي الإعاقة .ومع ذلك، لم تكن هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية لكل من أعضاء هيئة التدريس من الذكور والإناث فيما يتعلق بتطبيق الممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير للطلاب ذوي الإعاقة .علاوة على ذلك ، أظهرت الدراسة بأن أعضاء هيئة التدريس الذين لديهم خبرات تعليمية عالية أكثر قابلية على تطبيق الممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير مع طلاب ما بعد المرحلة الثانوية من ذوي الإعاقات مقارنة بأعضاء هيئة التدريس ذوي الخبرات المنخفضة. وقد تمت مناقشة التوصيات والدراسات المستقبلية لدعم مشاركة طلاب ما بعد المرحلة الثانوية ذوي الإعاقة في التعليم العالي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: طلاب الكلية من ذوي الإعاقة، الممارسات التعليمية عالية التأثير (HIPs) ، الجامعة