

Attended: Kate Jolley, Kim Starke, Robin McHale, Lisa Beach, Jennifer Richardson, Erin Daniels, Corrine Haverinen, and Paul DeMartini.

I. HOUSEKEEPING; CHECK IN; RUMORS**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

February 24, 2025 Meeting Minutes (Approved as is)

III. COMMITTEE GOALS FOR 2024/25

- Assess and prepare for the implementation of the ACMM

IV. NEW BUSINESS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

1. Accessibility Capability Maturity Model (ACMM) Goal 1 (Governance & Strategic Planning)
 - Still in progress. Kate shared some updates and follow up. Lisa edited the master document accordingly.
2. Accessibility Capability Maturity Model (ACMM) Goal 2 (Educational Materials and Technology)
 - Committee began review of Goal 2. Lisa shared that we should do well on this one as there is already a process. Corrine stated that we are probably ahead of other schools in this area. Still need to work on Faculty training and areas outside of online classes. Some discussion about Board Policy around this. CCLC 4104 (almost ready for Cabinet to review).
 - Lisa added edits to master documents as committee reviewed and discussed. (attached)

V. OLD BUSINESS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION**VI. MEETING RECAP & PLAN NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

- Committee to continue review of Goal 2 of ACMM at next meeting

Next meeting – April 28, 2025

Committee edits to Goal #2

Goal 2 – Educational Materials and Technology

The organization has developed processes to ensure educational materials and technology, across all modalities of instruction, conform with current accessibility standards.

Subgoal 2.1 – Educational Materials

2.1.1 Develop a process to create accessible educational documents and communication materials.

Faculty have the option to access online materials to aid in efforts to create accessible content

Some limited training is available, needs to be expanded

Faculty learn about accessibility in Online Instructor Certification course, in presentations to new faculty, and through the new accessibility software that shows faculty areas that need attention

Hoping to change focus to Universal Design for Learning

Need to ensure we have a specific policy for accessibility of course materials

- Currently have 3.28P -> AP4105 which should go to Cabinet soon
- AP3725 is the one that contains the IT accessibility policy
- Need to find a way to tie all the policies together that deal with digital accessibility

How can we align this work with the Textbook committee work?

- Kim has asked that her Alt Media Specialist be appointed to the committee
- Tech purchases go through Purchasing where they are reviewed for accessibility

Textbook materials are part of academic freedom, but that can come up against accessibility and sometimes also copyright

2.1.2 Develop a process to evaluate, prioritize, remediate, and replace existing educational documents and communication materials.

Process of course reviews have been in place since 2009

Most faculty are aware of course reviews via departments, DE outreach

There is no process for identifying and remediating non-digital course content or F2F classes outside of those with a registered DRD student

Cycle of reviews and parameters are documented on DE website

Records of accessibility evaluations are kept and shared with faculty

Due to large increase of online courses, the scope of reviews is being adjusted

Responsibility and authority are difficult to describe in current environment and awareness is key

Database of course reviews and cycle of review is maintained, but needs to be updated to new SIS system, to be in place by 2025

- Could we have a PDA that is focused on accessibility?
- Could we have a DDAD that is focused on accessibility?
- Could it be added to the faculty contract that all faculty need to use part of their FLEX hours to do accessibility training?
- Could it be considered part of mandatory IDEAA training?

The state provides WebAIM courses to train faculty to remediate their own content for accessibility

2.1.3 Develop a process to create accessible video and audio content for use in education.

The state, through the DECT Grant, provides funding and a process for captioning educational videos

Faculty can order their own captions for videos uploaded to 3CMedia (a state-provided video streaming/storage platform) – not all faculty are aware of this

The DECT Grant can also provide audio descriptions for blind/low-vision students

The DECT Grant covers videos in all courses, not just online/hybrid

2.1.4 Develop a process to evaluate, prioritize, remediate, and replace video and audio content used in education.

2.1.5 Develop a process to evaluate accessibility of eTextbooks and Open Education Resources (OER).

Good conversation for Textbook committee and Bookstore staff

Can we have the Bookstore require that eTexts go through an accessibility review? Can Stephanie reach out to them?

What happens when an instructor says that the only digital text/course material available for their subject is not accessible?

OER accessibility can vary widely

2.1.6 Develop a process to ensure the accessibility of student-facing course content within the LMS or other secured websites used in education.

2.1.7 Develop a process to create, maintain, and update accessibility statements for course content.

Is this a syllabus statement? If so, should that be required?