Online Quality Committee

4/24/2020 Meeting Notes

To begin the meeting, Dr. Aulgur thanked everyone for attending and for all the work they have put forth. It is greatly appreciated. Today, we will go over two “proposals.” One from the Standards and Processes sub-group, and the other from the Accessibility sub-group.

Dr. Cass spoke on the work his committee (S&P) did for the documents presented (attached to this email). Rather than use the word “checklist,” they preferred the term “roadmap.” These are criteria that can be used by department heads, committees, and more, and they align with the handbook. Items were added and categorized. S&P will also have language that will outline the process for review and make sure that those who want to use items like QM, or OLC, still can. They wanted options. The documents are not threatening and there was no negative feedback from the sub-group.

* Dr. Aulgur thanked the sub-group. He noted that ideally, at our next OQC meeting, all the documents (including language for the process) could be presented as one package.
* Dr. Cass agreed but wanted to present what S&P had created to show their progress.
* Dr. Aulgur invited any committee questions.
* Dr. Smith does not understand how documents are created in Blackboard, other than direct files. Can documents be created in Blackboard?
* Dr. Cass replied not to his understanding.
* Dr. Smith asked for clarification.
* Dr. Cass can strike that area or make the language clearer.
* Dr. Aulgur believes that much is open to interpretation by department.
* Dr. Smith knows that documents can be created in Word and attached in Blackboard. Does Dr. Aulgur do it this way?
* Dr. Aulgur does, but there are multiple ways.
* Alex stated there are pre-made headings, but any document can be loaded into that.
* Dr. Cass wanted us to know that this language serves as a reminder for faculty to utilize Blackboard. The intent was not about only creating their documents in Blackboard.
* Dr. Mitchell agreed, and stated the idea for the language came from usability for smartphones.
* Dr. Aulgur wondered what Dr. Eshelman’s thoughts were.
* Dr. Eshelman is pleased with the documents and the categories are easy for faculty to follow. He is looking forward to the next step.
* Dr. Cass also noted the documents should be viewed as the minimum standards that should be met.
* Dr. Austin likes this idea of meeting minimum standards. We need this for HLC.
* Dr. Cass replied “that is what we were thinking.”
* Dr. Aulgur agreed and stated that should departments want to go “above and beyond” minimum, they can.
* Weiwei wondered would the measurable outcomes at course level also tie to module outcomes?
* Dr. Aulgur’s thoughts are that at a minimum, they must align at the course level. Will probably need to hold trainings for alignment.
* Dr. Austin seconded this. Knowing these can be difficult, it will require PD on how important alignment is.
* Dr. Cass asked if he should change the document to reflect the above.
* Weiwei suggested adding language about the module level outcomes.
* Dr. Cass agrees with the training piece. But, they would like to get the roadmap out before fall begins.
* Weiwei also suggested changing the language about course design being 508 compliant, to instead being compliant with Web Content Accessibility 2.1 (as this is what Blackboard and Ally utilize).
* Dr. Lasey suggested making it generic policy language. This way, as updates come along, we will not have to change so many specifics.
* Dr. Cass liked this idea and noted he did not have a problem changing that. He also asked that Weiwei send suggested language for Dr. Cass to integrate.
* Dr. Aulgur stated that long-game was to receive considerable faculty feedback. The key-point here, is that what is presented meets the tasks set forth by the VPAA. It does, and we can receive recommendations for change over the next year. This is fluid and good. He asked if there were any specific objections.
* There were none. A motion was made, and seconded. It carried with no objections that the committee would like to put forth these documents to Dr. Johnson for consideration. We’ll circle back at the next meeting following revisions and the addition of the language document. Afterwards, the “package” content can be sent to the VPAA.

Weiwei spoke about the Accessibility sub-group’s draft policy proposal. It will also be reviewed by Legal. Weiwei thanked his sub-group and disability services representatives for all their work. The policy draft was sent before this meeting. Any questions?

* Dr. Eshelman wondered about Ally. Faculty will need help understanding this tool. Where will this policy go? The policy is fine, but we need to word accessibility compliance and Ally usage more persuasively for faculty. Especially when it comes to announcing Ally. Lead with how Ally helps. The policy alone, with no additional, will be daunting.
* Dr. Aulgur let the OQC know that Ally purchase is currently being worked on and may be available before we receive the policy back from Legal.
* Dr. Austin noted that faculty understand the need for this. Ally, and this policy, are both good things.
* Weiwei asked Dr. Lasey if we could offer an accessibility training for New Faculty Academy.
* Dr. Lasey does not have a problem with this. It may be best to offer it during the orientation week. That schedule is complete, but she will see if this training piece can be added.
* Weiwei would also like Dr. Lasey (CETL) to recommend that faculty (all faculty) participate in accessibility trainings throughout the year.
* Dr. Lasey stated she could do this. We need to make sure trainings are available in various ways: F2F and online. Module idea within T2TOL is significant as well.
* Weiwei let the OQC know that Thomas Pennington was creating a policy as well, but it would only be geared towards accessibility of PDFs. We also do not have further updates from Legal on that.
* Weiwei will send the recommendations made to Dr. Lasey to Dr. Aulgur.
* Dr. Aulgur asked if we wanted to put forth the policy.
* This was motioned, then seconded. It carried with no objections.

There were no updates for the Open Forum piece.

Next meeting will be Friday, May 8. A WebEx will be sent prior to. We look forward to the final pieces from the Standard and Processes sub-group. If needed, thoughts can be shared for faculty input before our next meeting (via email). Remember, it is a recommendation. Does not have to be the final version.

Thank you all for attending and have a great weekend.