TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATIONS AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL: CASE OF WEST University of Timisoara

Tîru, Laurentiu Gabriel,
West University of Timisoara (Romania), Sociology Department, Lecturer PhD
E-mail: *laurentiu.tiru@e-uvt.ro*
Tîru, Carmen Maria,
West University of Timisoara (Romania), Teacher Training Department, Lecturer PhD
E-mail: carmen.tiru@e-uvt.ro

Abstract
The physical or curricular accommodations and adaptations are realities less known at the Romanian university level. Although, at the international level there is a constant interest for the study of various aspects of these accommodations, at individual and institutional level, in Romania these analyses are at the explorative stage level. The goal of the article was to describe the perception of the teachers from West University of Timișoara on different types of accommodations for students with disabilities. A cluster sample of university teacher was included in the research (n=248). The sample was defined considering the number of teachers from each faculty of the university. The results of the study were presented in a descriptive manner, specifying the obtained percents for each type of accommodation. The conclusion of the study was pointing that every accommodations which must be implemented at the university level were obtained similarly and a high level means. Relating to teachers' attitude on the type of accommodations which must be introduced in the educational process, the most frequently choose by the respondents was the allowing of using the computer in the classrooms.

Keywords: *perception, attitudes, disability, accommodation, university.*

When referring to the modalities through which disabled people have or must have access to education, the scientific discourse uses concepts like: academic accommodation, adaptation and modification. The usage of these terms is different from the conceptions which consider them as synonyms and designed them as totally opposite educational approaches. Also, the

misunderstanding of these concepts can be determinates incorrect interpretations. First of all, it must be differentiated between accommodation and modification. In the educational context, related to the persons with disabilities, the accommodations are changes which don't modify in a significant manner the curricular content. In other words, the level of difficulty regarding the transmitted information, the aimed educational objectives and competencies remain unchanged.

The accommodation refers to the modalities through which the student has access to the curricular content, without modifying the standards of the contents' delivery.

The concept of *instructional accommodations* defines, in a generic manner, the accommodations which sustain students with disabilities to participate and to have success in regular education environment (Vallecorsa, deBettencourt & Zigmond, 2000). Janney and Snell show that these accommodations modify the way in which a specific curricular content is taught and could include instructional stimulus and student response adaptations (Janney & Snell, 2004).

On the other hand, the concept of *modifications* proposes an intervention on the curricular content, within the meaning of facilitating the access of disability persons (Hallahan, Kauffman & Pullen, 2012:38). In the case of modifications, we can talk about profound transformations at the level of programmes for study, of the didactic strategy and also of the format and the educational tasks. In this respect, is very useful the definition of Comfort (1990) who considers that the modifications are adaptation or interpretations of formal curriculum by instructors into learning objective or learning activities that are more reasonable for students with different disabilities. The decrease of the learning requests (less educational objectives, less curricular contents) and the complexity of the tasks, the modification of the evaluation tests' dimensions or providing extra indications, the clues for task and tests solving are good examples for curricular modifications.

The specific literature shows the types of accommodations and groups them in different forms. In this context, could be discussed about four categories: presentation, response, setting and timing (Elliott et. al, 1997; Smith, Crockett & Griffin, 2012). The presentation accommodations include the accessibilities of the didactic materials which not reclaimed the visual decoding of the curricular content. For the persons with print-related disability, who don't read the standardized print formats (Wolfe & Lee, 2007) should be prepared alternative visual, audio or tactile materials. The accessibilities from this category are the following: large prints, sign

language, Braille, audio courses, human readers, and devices for sound amplification and text to speech applications. The response accommodations are these which allow to the students to tape the courses, to made the requested tasks and participate to the evaluation of the educational activities. The more frequently used accommodations in this case are the following: dictation to a scribe, using word processors or Brailler, speech to text devices, audio and video recorders. A special subcategory of the response accommodations is the assessment accommodation (Lovett, 2010) which refers to offering for students with disabilities the possibility to access standardized assessment formats, without modifying the proposed level of evaluation. Given the importance of the evaluation issue, these types of accessibilities were approached and have attract an increase interest from the part of many researchers (Thurlow, Lazarus, Thompson & Morse, 2005; Sireci, Scarpati & Li, 2005; Lovett, 2014).

The timing/scheduling accommodation reveals the time issue in the educational activities. The growing of time for different tasks, the programming of more breaks for students with disabilities or staging the testing process on more days are the most frequent types of accommodations from this category. In this category are included also the modifications in the time table of the educational activities, relating to the students' with disabilities needs (specific hours or time intervals).

The last category which we mention is the setting accommodations which refer to the change of the location for the educational activity, in order to facilitate the access of students with disabilities to it (for example, the change of the location from the upper floor to downstairs). Also, in this category should be included other facilities and physical adaptations which are useful for increasing the access of the students with disabilities to the educational activities: rooms for study, spaces for relaxation or learning spaces equipped with special equipment.

USA was considered a model for many educational policies for persons with disabilities. Starting with The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), which   opened the road for accessibilities of the public spaces for persons with disabilities and continuing with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 97) and its revision and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004), the American legislation was settled up on assurance for persons with disabilities the access to a high quality educational programmes. According to these acts, the educational institutions are forced to develop different types of accommodations for students with disabilities. Furthermore, we speak about the previously

accommodations which assure the access of the students with disabilities to the regular education curriculum and to the national evaluation forms.

Starting from the previous discussions, we could affirm that is a positive valorisation of the accommodation concept and a negative one for the concept of modifications. The accommodations treat the students as a special needs person and try to optimise his access to education. The accommodation doesn't modify the educational objectives which the student must be attended, but facilitates, supports and guides. The modifications are linked to changing, lowering, and decrease of the expectations, in order to become accessible for students who didn't fit into a statistically defined normality. The modifications approach the students, being dependent by a help, to the educational system and, in these conditions, the attended standard are much lowest.

The teachers' attitude on accommodations/modifications or their general attitude regarding the inclusive education was frequently approached subjects from the social science field perspective. An article from the beginning of the teachers' attitude on integration analysis period (Harasymiw & Horne 1976) presented as conclusions that the opinions and attitudes of the teachers should be modified through training programmes which could offer detailed information about persons with disabilities and present work experiences for persons with special needs. In addition, the support staff from schools could modify the perception of teachers about the integration of the students with special needs in the regular classrooms. Avramidis and his collaborators (2000) demonstrated that are perception differences on the concept of disability between teachers who had experimented working with children with disabilities and teachers who had not. Moreover, the positive attitude is correlated with educating students with significant disabilities. The socio demographic variable like gender, age, and the experience of teaching did not induce modifications in the structure of attitude of the respondent.

A study from the scientific literature which analysed teachers' attitudes towards mainstreaming, integration and inclusion, Avramidis and Norwich (2002) points out that in 2000s, the research in this field is on an uptrend, given the fact that the positive perspective of the teachers on the issues of inclusion and disability could influence the success of the policies for integration of students with disabilities in regular educational environments. After the analysis, they have concluded that teachers' attitudes must be correlated with other educational variables like: the quality of the professional training, the training opportunities in the field of inclusion or the experience of work with persons with disabilities.

Reusen, Shoho and Barker (2000), in a quantitative research about teachers' attitude on inclusion of the students with disabilities in general education classrooms (with a sample of 125 teachers) concludes that is a significant bond between levels of special education training, knowledge, and experience in working with students with disabilities and the positive attitudes about including and teaching students with disabilities in the general education classrooms. The authors remarks that over half (54%) of the respondent teachers have negative attitudes about students with disabilities inclusion in the general education classrooms. The most negative attitudes have got the teachers with low level of competence in special education training, knowledge and experience in teaching students with disabilities.

Another study on teachers' from US and Haiti attitude about the students' with disabilities integration (Dupoux, Wolman & Estrada, 2005) shows that teachers from both countries have a similar attitudes on integration. The fact that are clear differences between the two countries (educational philosophy, policies, economic power) made the authors to confirm the existence of a culture of teaching, which is above of the national and local culture. The regression analysis identifies three variables which had predicted attitudes toward integration of students with disabilities: (1) the other teachers attitude – those who perceive the others' attitude being positive have also themselves a positive attitudes; (2) the level of education – the teachers with diploma of higher education shows un upper grade of the positive attitudes and (3) the range of accommodation – teachers from both countries had correlated the accommodations with the type of disability, choosing primarily the learning disability category.

The conclusions of a recent study which analysed the attitudes of the teachers about inclusion of the students with different disabilities in their classroom (Donohue & Bornman 2015) revealed similarities with the previously mentioned studies. Thus, was mentioned as one of the most important accommodation the existence of the specialised support. According to the authors, this is the principal issue which determine the teachers' attitude on inclusion of the students with disabilities in regular schools. Were mentioned also the adapted educational materials, computers with special software and special or the professional training.

Methodology

This study has as a goal to explore university teachers' attitudes towards people with disabilities and about accommodations for disabilities students. The study was made in The West University of Timișoara, Romania, between July-August 2014, on a sample of 248 teachers. This number resulted after

three consecutive sessions for sending invitation to the 706 teachers from the analysed university to participate at this study, through the institutional email (surname.name@e-uvt.ro). The teachers were invited to respond to an online questionnaire about the persons with disabilities and the accessibilities which The West University of Timișoara should implement in order to assure the participation and success of students with disabilities. The sample was selected following the rules of cluster sampling, taking into account the number of teachers from each faculty of the university, assuming a confidence interval of 95% and a margin of error of +/-0.05.

The final sample of the study consisted in 98 (39.5%) women and 150 (60.5%) men. Also, 51 (20.6%) were teaching assistants, 95 (38.3%) were lecturers, 65 (26.2%) associate professors and 37 (14.9%) were professors. The distribution at the level of each faculty of the university was the following: Faculty of Chemistry, Biology, Geography-18 teachers (7.3%), Teacher Training Department-10 (4%), Faculty of Arts and Design-18 (7.3%), Faculty of Law and Administrative Sciences-15 (6%), Faculty of Economy and Business Administration-51 (20.6%), Faculty of Physical Education and Sports-11 (4.4%), Faculty of Physics-9 (3.6%), Faculty of Letters, History and Theology -1 (16.5%), Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics-20 (8.1%), Faculty of Music-14 (5.6%), Faculty of Sociology and Psychology-26 (10.5%) and Faculty of Political Sciences, Philosophy and Communication Sciences-15 (6%). Regarding the didactical experience of the respondents, 105 (42.3%) are teaching for over 15 years, 60 (24.3%) have a didactic experience between 11-15 years, 57 (23%) are teaching for over 6-10 years and 26 (10.5%) have a didactic experience less than five years.

The questionnaire was built on the following aspects: (I) Attitudes toward people with disabilities –was developed a number of 9 statements which represent attitudes on persons with disabilities (for example: persons who need a special attention, normal person who must be treated in the same way in which are treated the other ones, persons who have the right for education like any other persons or persons who must be supported). Each of this affirmations was evaluated by the respondents on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 represents a strongly disagree accordance with the affirmation and 5 represents a strongly agree accordance with the affirmation. (II) Educational experiences with disability students- a number of four questions focused on teachers' didactic experience with the disability students (for example: You believe that a person disability is an obstacle for the educational process? You had work in your career with persons with disabilities?) (III) Barriers in participating of students with disabilities at academic activities-was identified, in accordance with the Romanian educational realities, with 12

items which reflect the possible barriers on accessing the university programmes by the students with disabilities (for example The teaching strategy for courses and seminaries, The modalities for evaluation of the academic performance of Teachers' knowledge lack about disabilities). (IV) Support services for teachers –on a Likert scale (1 represents a strongly disagree and 5 represents a strongly agree) was evaluated by the respondents a number of six services (for example Training Courses in disability issue, Counselling offered by a specialised persons and Guides for practice in this field) which the university can offer to the teachers who works with disability students. (V) Accommodations and adaptations – assumes two sets of accommodations/ adaptations, one more generally, at the university level and one related to the curricular content (for example Tactile surfaces (for blinds), Announcements at large scale (big letters), Elevators for access, Supplementary time for evaluation, Evaluation tests in Braille, Corse/ seminary materials in alternative formats).

Results

For attending the goal of the study, we present, in a descriptive manner, the most important results, obtained on dimension V. A detailed description on dimension I-IV, a correlation analysis, a comparing of the means for independent of the groups (T Tests, ANOVAs) will be developed in a future study.

As we previously mention in Methodology Section, the V dimension has two sets of indicators which' utility was appreciated by the respondent to the questionnaire on a Likert scale (1 represents a strongly disagree and 5 represents a strongly agree). In addition, the scale which evaluates the accommodations at university level (which must be implemented at university level) has one more level, namely, "already exist".

Table 1. Results for the accommodations that should be implemented in the university

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Already exist
Access ramps	1.6%	1.6%	4.4%	3.6%	44.4%	44.4%
Access lifts	1.6%	1.2%	4.8%	9.3%	39.5%	43.5%

Grab bars	1.6%	1.2%	4.8%	15.3%	54.0%	23.0%
Modified/accessible toilets for persons with disabilities	1.6%	0.8%	4.8%	12.9%	57.7%	22.2%
Large-format printings	4.0%	7.3%	20.2%	18.1%	44.4%	6.0%
Braille printings	5.2%	4.0%	17.3%	18.1%	47.6%	7.7%
Providing advice in resolving administrative issues	1.6%	4.8%	19.0%	15.3%	48.4%	10.9%
Orientation in physical space by devices of light and sound	5.6%	4.0%	17.3%	19.0%	47.6%	6.5%
Training courses for teachers about working with people with disabilities	5.2%	8.5%	15.7%	19.8%	44.0%	6.9%
Counselling services and technical support on working with people with disabilities	1.6%	6.0%	10.1%	16.9%	52.4%	12.9%
Tactile surfaces (for blind people)	4.0%	4.4%	6.5%	21.4%	56.5%	7.3%
Large-format notices	3.6%	7.3%	16.1%	18.5%	44.4%	10.1%
Braille notices	5.2%	3.6%	14.9%	23.0%	47.2%	6.0%
Resting rooms	6.5%	8.5%	22.6%	16.1%	35.5%	10.9%

The access ramps, as a university adaptation measure to the needs of persons with disabilities, were considered necessary by the respondents (strongly agree - 44.4%). The same percent of teachers known about the existence of the access ramps in the university and choose the "already

exists" response. Disagree and strongly disagree measure were mentioned by 1.6% respondents for each option.

The access lifts are existent in the university and 43.5% respondents known this fact, choosing the response option already exists". A percent of 39.5% respondents considered the access lifts necessary (strongly agree). The other options were identified in the teachers' responses with 10% percents.

As physical environment accessibilities for persons with disabilities in university, the grab bars are existent from the point of view of 23% of respondents. The respondents were "strongly agree" (54%),"agree" (15%),"neither agree nor disagree" (4.8%) with the necessity of the grab bars. The sum of the percents of the respondents which not consider this issue a necessity was only 2.8%.

22.2% of respondents known the fact that in the university exist modified/accessible toilets for persons with disabilities. 57.7% of respondents considered that the toilets should be necessary, affirming "a strongly agreement" with this issues, 12.9% with an attitude of "agree". The percent of respondents who didn't consider it useful is approximate to 2%.

The large-format printings were considered useful in the university as following: 44.4% of the respondents was "strongly agree", 18.1% of the respondents was "agree", 20.2% of the respondents was "neither agree nor disagree", 7.3% of the respondents was "disagree" and 4% of the respondents was "strongly disagree". A percent of 6% of teachers mention that such printing formats "already exists".

The Braille printings are considered by teachers as a useful accessibility modality with an attitude of "strongly agree" (47.6% of the respondent teachers). The negative options on the evaluation scale ("disagree" or" strongly disagree") were obtained a percent of approximately 10%. 7.7% of teachers mentioned the existence of the Braille printings.
10.9% of teachers consider that the students with disabilities have received a professional advice in resolving administrative issues. A large number of teachers (63.7%) mentioned that such an initiative is "useful" and "very useful" for students with disabilities. The options for "disagree" and "strongly disagree" obtained a percent of 4.8% and 1.6%.

Another support for persons with disabilities is the orientation in physical space by devices of light and sound. Thus, almost a half of the respondents mentioned this accessibility useful in a percent of 47.6% with a

strongly agreement" and 19% with "agreement". For the negative options of the scale, the responses are: 4% -"disagree" and 5.6%-"strongly disagree".

The teachers considered that training courses for teachers about working with people with disabilities are useful, expressing a "hard agreement" (44%) and an "agreement" (19.8%) in this sense. 15.7% are oriented on the option "neither agree nor disagree". A percent of 13.7% were disagreeing or strongly disagree with the idea of utility of these courses.

In the West University of Timișoara the existence of the counselling services and technical support on working with disability people was a certainty for 12.9% of respondents. These services necessity were perceived by 52.4% of respondents with a "strongly agreement" and by 16.9% of respondents with an "agreement". A little percent of the respondents, about 7.6%, didn't consider these services useful for university teachers.

The tactile surfaces (for blind people), as part of a series of accessibilities for the physical environment, were considered by 56.5% of the respondent teachers very useful ("strongly agree"). 8.8% of teachers didn't see the utility of these surfaces and have oriented their responses on the negative area of the scale ("disagree" and "strongly disagree").

The large-format notices (big letters) were considered by 44.4% of the respondent teachers very useful ("strongly agree") and by 18.5% useful ("agree") for facilitate the access of students with disabilities to the university.

The Braille notices are one of the services mentioned by respondents as very useful by 47.2% ("strongly agreement") and useful (23% of respondents being "agree"). The option for "neither agree nor disagree" was preferred by a percent of 14.9% respondents. The negative options on the evaluation scale ("disagree" or "strongly disagree") obtained a percent of approximately 8.6%.

The resting rooms for students with disabilities are considered necessary for them, with a "hard agree" attitude by 35.5% of the respondents and an "agree" attitude by 16.1% of them. The "neither agrees nor disagrees" attitude was assumed by a number of 56 respondents (22.6%).

The "disagree" attitude was preferred by 8.5% of the respondents and 6.5% of the respondents choose the option "strongly disagree".

Table 2. Results for the accommodations needed to be implemented in educational activities (courses and seminars) –first part

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Priority places in classrooms	10.1%	6.9%	15.7%	19.0%	48.4%
Changing the place for doing the course	26.6%	12.9%	23.8%	18.5%	18.1%
Allowing the use of the computer in the classrooms	9.7%	3.2%	10.9%	15.3%	60.9%
Audio reception devices (audio system for people with hearing loss)	6.5%	4.4%	12.1%	30.2%	46.8%
Software for accessibility	7.7%	6.0%	25.4%	16.9%	44.0%
Differentiated evaluation depending on the specifics of the disability	7.3%	5.2%	19.0%	23.0%	45.6%
Extra time for evaluation	6.0%	4.8%	21.4%	22.6%	45.2%
Alternative assessment tasks	11.7%	8.9%	21.0%	21.8%	36.7%
Person who read the assessment tasks	25.4%	16.9%	18.1%	13.3%	26.2%
Person to record evaluation (scribe)	19.8%	16.9%	27.0%	15.3%	21.0%
Evaluation tests printed in large format	10.5%	6.0%	16.1%	29.0%	38.3%

We observe that 48.4% (strongly agree) of the respondents' opinion was that the curricular adaptation regarding the priority places in classrooms are very appropriate for their course and seminary activities. 19% of teachers were agree, 15.7% of teachers were neither agree nor disagree, 6.9% of

teachers were disagree and 10.1 % of teachers were strongly disagree with the previously mentioned issue.

From the total of respondents 26.6% were strongly disagree with changing the place for doing the course/seminary. Also in the area of disagreement, were placed 12.9% of respondents who choose the option "disagree". The respondents' teacher who choose the option "strongly agree" with the changing the place for doing the course/seminary obtained 18.1% and who choose "agree" 18.5 %. The remaining 23.8 % of the respondent selected "neither agree nor disagree".

At the level of curricular adaptation, allowing the use of the computer in the classrooms obtained the highest percent (60,9%) for the option "strongly agree", followed by "agree" with a percent of 15,3%. 10,9% of respondents were selected "neither agree nor disagree". At the last two places, were classified the options for "disagree" (3.2%) and for "strongly disagree" (9.7%).

The audio reception devices (audio system for people with hearing loss) were matched for usage in course/seminary at the university level for 46.8 % of respondents (strongly agree) and for 30.2% (agree). Those who were not placed in a positive area with their responses are the 12.1% respond "neither agree nor disagree". At the opposite pole, were situated the teachers who not consider that the audio reception devices are appropriate for their course/ seminary (10.9%).

We observe that 44% of respondents were have the opinion that a software for accessibility is appropriate for course/seminary (strongly agree) and 16.9% were agree with this affirmation. The negative area of the scale obtained an approximately 13% of responses.

From the total of 45.6% respondents, a percent of 23% were strongly disagreeing with differentiated evaluation depending on the specifics of the disability and23% are agreeing. In the area of disagreement, was placed a percent of 5.2% of respondents who choose the option "disagree" and 7.3% of respondents who choose the option "disagree". 19% of respondents select "neither agree nor disagree", without expressing their opinion on differentiated evaluation of students with disabilities.

For the affirmation regarding the "extra time for evaluation", as we previously mentioned in Table 2, the share of the answers were on a downward slope from the agreement to disagreement, as: "strongly agree" (45,2%), "agree (22,6%), "neither agree nor disagree" (24,4%), "disagree" (4,8%) and "strongly disagree " (6%). The highest percent of the answers had the positive options, so the teachers were considered this curricular accessibility being useful and applicable in the educational context.

For the affirmation regarding the "alternative assessment tasks", the highest percent was obtained for "strongly agree" opinion (36,7%), followed by "agree" opinion (21,8%). 21% of the respondents chose "neither agree nor disagree". The last ones were the somewhat agree with the alternative assessment. The last two places on a hierarchy of responses are the answers:"disagree" and "strongly disagree" with 8,9% and 11,7%.

As an optimisation method for working with persons with disabilities, a presence of a person who read the assessment tasks determined 26.2% of teachers to be "strongly agree" and 13.3% to be "agree". 25.4% of teachers choose the option "strongly disagree" and 16.9% of teachers "disagree. The option for "neither agree nor disagree" was choose by a percent of 18.1% respondents.

21% teachers considered that the utility of a person to record evaluation (scribe) of the students with disabilities are very important (strongly agree) and 15.3% important (agree). In the area of disagreement, were situated 16.9% of teachers who choose the option "disagree" and 19.8% who choose the option "strongly disagree". The option for "neither agree nor disagree" was choose by a percent of 36.7% respondents. Can be pointed out the positive percent of 36.3% respondents which were very close to the negative one (36.7%).

Up to 67% of respondents was strongly agree with the using of the evaluation tests printed in large formats in evaluation activities and 29% are agree. A percent of 16.1% was sceptic, choosing the option for "neither agree nor disagree". The sum of the options on "strongly disagree" and "disagree" options was a percent of 16.5% respondents.

Table 3. Results for the accommodations needed to be implemented in educational activities (courses and seminars) –second part

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Evaluation tests printed in Braille	10.1%	6.9%	15.7%	23.8%	43.5%
Permission to take the exam in extra-session	26.2%	13.3%	21.4%	15.3%	23.8%

Allow registration of educational activities	**14.9%**	**3.2%**	**17.3%**	**28.2 %**	**36.3%**
Didactic materials in alternative formats	**4.8%**	**4.4%**	**18.1%**	**29.0 %**	**43.5%**
Course/seminar materials in advance	**11.7%**	**4.0%**	**24.6%**	**22.2 %**	**37.5%**
Diagrams with written explanations	**16.1%**	**9.7%**	**23.8%**	**19.0 %**	**31.5%**
Handouts of Power Point presentations with written explanations	**11.3%**	**2.4%**	**26.6%**	**22.2 %**	**37.5%**
Participation in courses/seminars with a preferential student	**14.1%**	**3.6%**	**26.2%**	**19.0 %**	**37.1%**
Person who takes notes	**21.4%**	**5.2%**	**22.2%**	**25.4 %**	**25.8%**
Modified attendance requirements	**19.0%**	**12.5%**	**27.0%**	**14.9 %**	**26.6%**
Permission to take more frequently breaks	**7.7%**	**10.5%**	**27.4%**	**23.0 %**	**31.5%**
Sign interpreter	**17.7%**	**14.5%**	**25.0%**	**16.9 %**	**25.8%**

From the total of the respondents, about 43.5% choose the option "strongly agree" and 23.8% choose the option "agree" considering the evaluation tests printed in Braille being useful for the course/seminary activities. In the area of disagreement was placed 6.9% who declare that "disagree" the previously idea and 10.1% being "totally disagree".

Approximately 40% of teachers who answered to the questionnaire not considered opportune the permission to take the exam in extra-session. An nearly similar percent for the teachers' responses (39.1%) can be identified to the opposite side of the scale, the respondents being agree with the idea of implementation of this type of accessibility for students with disabilities in their activities.

For the indicator "Allow registration of educational activities", the highest percent was obtained for the option " strongly agree" (36.3%), followed by the option "agree" with a percent of 28.2%. 17,3% of respondents were manifest their impartial attitude, choosing "neither agree nor disagree". The negative options ("disagree" and "strongly disagree") were identified on the last two places of the top with 3.2%, respectively 14.9%.

We observe that 43.5% of teachers choose the opinion that the didactic materials in alternative formats could be useful for courses/seminaries in a very high manner (strongly agree). 29% of teachers considered their utility in a high manner (agree), 18.1% were impartial, choosing the option "neither agree nor disagree", 4.4% choosing the option "disagree" and the rest of 4.8 % choosing "strongly disagree". Therefore, 70% of teachers who participated to our study were agreeing with the idea that the didactic materials in alternative formats could determine the growing of the accessibility of the students with disabilities at university level.

37.5% of the respondents considered that the course/seminar materials in advance could help the students with disabilities, being a useful curricular accessibility. Also, a positive appreciation for this affirmation was made by 22.2% of teachers who choose the option "agree". Approximately

15% of respondents not considered useful this accessibility for students with disabilities.

From the total of respondents, 31.5% were "strongly agree", foreseeing the utility and applicability of diagrams with written explanations. 19% were manifested their agreement with this idea, in a much moderating manner, choosing the option "agree". In the area of disagreement were situated they who choose the options "strongly disagree" (16.1%) and "disagree" (9.7%).

23.8% of teachers didn't specify clearly their agreement or disagreement and were place in the neutral area of the scale.

37.5% of respondents were in accordance with the idea that the handouts of Power Point presentations with written explanations could be a curricular accessibility for students with disabilities, choosing the option "strongly agree". 22.2% were oriented on the option "agree".

24% of respondents were disagreeing that the handouts of Power Point presentations with written explanations are useful and 1.3% of respondents strongly disagree this idea.

Analysing the information from Table 2, we observe that 37.1% of respondents choose the opinion that the participation in courses/seminars with a preferential student is appropriate for their courses and seminaries. The next right away percent, in the pound of responses was of the undecided respondents (26.2%- "neither agrees nor disagree"). The group of sceptical was best represented by those of 14.1% respondents who not considered that the participation in courses/seminars with a preferential student is a curricular adaptation appropriate for their activities.

Over 51% of respondents are in accordance with the curricular adaptation that supposes a person who takes notes in courses/seminars (29%-"agree", 38.3%-"strongly agree"). A percent of 22.2% sceptics preferred the option "neither agrees nor disagree". The variants "strongly disagree" and "disagree" totalise a percent of 26.6%.

From the total of respondents, 26.6% were "strongly agree" with the modified attendance requirements at course/seminaries and 14.9% were "agree". In the area of disagreement, were situated they who choose the option "strongly disagree" (19%), respectively "agree" (12.5%). The rest of 27% respondents choose "neither agrees nor disagree", placed in the neutral area of the scale.

From the total of respondents, 31.5% were "strongly agree" with the permission to take more frequently breaks and 23% were "agree" with that idea. In the area of disagreement were situated they who choose the option "strongly disagree" (7.7%), respectively "agree" (10.5%). The rest of 27.4% respondents choose "neither agrees nor disagree", placed in the neutral area of the scale.

Over 42% teachers were in accordance with a sign interpreter, 16.9% choosing the option "agree" and 25.8% "strongly agree". A 25% percent of the respondents were undecided regarding the sign interpreter. The sum of the options for "strongly disagree" and "disagree" totalised 32.2%.

Conclusions

The physical or curricular accommodations and adaptations are realities that determine the universities to take contact if it is wanted to grow the participation and the academic success of the persons with disabilities. Our study is a part of an extensive research on the attitudes that the science of education experts and teachers from West University of Timisoara and Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu (Romania) have manifested on the accommodations and adaptations for disability students and their utility in the actual educational context.

Analysing the obtained results regarding the evaluation on the accommodation and adaptation that should be implemented in the university, revealed the fact that all the physical or curricular adaptations and accommodation, which were proposed in order to be evaluated (from the perspective of their utility at the university level) by the respondent teachers, were obtained means at the superior part of the evaluation scale (1-5). These results proved that the respondents didn't distinguish between the evaluated elements and were positively appreciate the necessity of the mentioned accessibilities. Prioritizing the options of the respondents, could be contoured two categories: the physical adaptations or accommodations, which were obtained the highest means, M=4.5 (for example the access ramps, the grab bars, the access elevators or toilets for disability persons were obtained the highest means) and the curricular accommodations, which were obtained close means, but slightly lower than that form the first category.

For the accommodations and adaptations that should be implemented in courses or seminars we could say that: "Allowing the use of the computer in the classrooms" (M=4.15, SD=1.30), "Audio reception devices (audio system for people with hearing loss)" (M=4.06, SD=1.16) and "Didactic materials in alternative formats" (M=4.02, SD=1.11) were obtained the first places in the teachers' responses hierarchy. It is interesting to mention that the lowest means were obtained by those accessibilities which suppose an effort form the part of teachers or that which implicate other external persons to the educational process, meaning "Changing the place for doing the course/seminary" (M=2.89, SD=1.44), "Person who read the assessment tasks" (M=2.98, SD=1.54) and "Permission to take the exam in extra-session" (M=2.97, SD=1.51).

Even if there is a declared opening for the physical and curricular accommodations and adaptations, from the teachers' responses, it seems that they are not able to make clear hierarchies regarding its utility. This situation could be explained by the lack of information about disabilities and integration modalities of the students with disabilities in regular classrooms, the lack of the educational experience with disability students or, because of the sensitive aspect of this theme, by a strong feeling of compassion for disability persons.

Acknowledgement

developing and implementing a support programme based on ICT technologies, to increase access to higher education for persons with disabilities.

References

Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-336, 104 Stat. 328 (1990)

Avramidis, E., & Norwich, B. (2002). Teachers' attitudes towards integration/inclusion: A review of the literature.*European Journal of Special Needs Education*,*17*(2), 129-147

Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). A Survey into Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Educational Needs in the Ordinary School in one Local Education Authority. *Educational Psychology*, 20(2), 191-211. doi:10.1080/01443410050027973

Comfort, R. (1990).On the idea of curriculum modification by teachers.*Academic Therapy, 25*(4), 397-405.

Donohue, D. K., & Bornman, J. (2015). South African Teachers' Attitudes toward the Inclusion of Learners with Different Abilities in Mainstream Classrooms.*International Journal Of Disability, Development & Education*, 62(1), 42-59. doi:10.1080/1034912X.2014.985638

Dupoux, E., Wolman, C., & Estrada, E. (2005). Teachers' attitudes toward integration of students with disabilities in Haïti and the United States.*International Journal Of Disability, Development & Education*, 52(1), 43-58. doi:10.1080/10349120500071894

Elliott, J., Thurlow, M., Ysseldyke, J., & Erickson, R. (1997).*Providing assessment accommodations for students with disabilities in state and district assessments* (Policy Directions No. 7). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes

Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., & Pullen, P. C. (2012). *Exceptional learners: An introduction to special education*. Boston: Pearson.

Harasymiw, S. J., & Horne, M. D. (1976).Teacher Attitudes toward Handicapped Children and Regular Class Integration.*Journal Of Special Education*, 10(4), 393.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act [IDEIA]. (2004) Public Law 108-446

Individuals with Disability Education Act Amendments of 1997 [IDEA]. (1997)

Janney, R. E., & Snell, M. E. (2004). Modifying schoolwork: Teachers' guides to inclusive practices (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks.

Lovett, B. (2010). Extended time testing accommodations for students with disabilities answers to five fundamental questions. *Review of Educational Research, 80*, 611–638.

Lovett, B. J. (2014). Testing accommodations under the Amended Americans with disabilities act: the voice of empirical research.*Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 25(2), 81-90.

Sireci, S. G., Scarpati, S. E., Li, S. (2005). Test accommodations for students with disabilities: An analysis of the interaction hypothesis.*Review of Educational Research*,75(4), 457-490.

Smith, S. J., Crockett, J. B., & Griffin, C. C. (2012).*Inclusive instruction: Evidence-based practices for teaching students with disabilities*. Guilford Press.

Thurlow, M. L., Lazarus, S. S., Thompson, S. J., & Morse, A. B. (2005).State policies on assessment participation and accommodations for students with disabilities.*The Journal of Special Education*,38(4), 232-240.

Vallecorsa, A. L., deBettencourt, L. U., & Zigmond, N. (2000). *Students with mild disabilities in general education settings: A guide for special educators*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Van Reusen, A. K., Shoho, A. R., & Barker, K. S. (2000).High school teacher attitudes toward inclusion. The High School Journal, 7-20.

Wolfe, G. L., & Lee, C. (2007).Promising practices for providing alternative media to postsecondary students with print disabilities. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 22(4), 256-263.