Ohio University, OH

Universal Design

Participation Start: 09-01-2016   **Participation End**: 08-31-2024

Date Completed: 04-19-2017

Team Leader: Joni Wadley

Team Member(s):   Michael Williford

This Results Report reflects the activity of Ohio University in the Action Project Collaboration Network. It is not an official document of the Higher Learning Commission.

Declaration

Q:

Briefly describe the project in less than 100 words. Be sure to identify the key organizational areas (departments, programs, divisions, units, etc.) and key organizational processes that this action project will affect, change, and/or improve.

A: The project w ill identify 6-8 courses in which the faculty are willing to redesign the course in accordance with the principles of Universal Design. The faculty w ill be provided training and mentorship in the area of Universal Design in order to redesign their courses. The Universally Designed courses would be expected to improve the learning experience and achievement of learning objectives for a broad spectrum of students. Additionally, there should be a reduction in the need for instructors to make arrangements for individual accommodations in these courses.

Q:

Describe your institution's reasons for initiating this action project now and how long it should take to complete it. Why are this project and its goals high among your institution's current priorities? Also, explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's recent or soon-to-be submitted Systems Portfolio.

A: Currently, there is an institutional priority in creating an accessible and inclusive campus with regard to people with disabilities. Additionally, the numbers of students with disabilities has greatly increased over the past few
years. Universal Design in instruction is proposed to create greater access for students with a range of abilities and reduce the need for individual accommodation. While UD emerged from a vantage point of creating inclusion for students with disabilities, it has been found to increase access to the curriculum for students without disabilities who may have a broad range of learning styles and individual strengths and weaknesses.

Q:

List the project goals, milestones, and deliverables along with corresponding metrics, due dates, and other measures for assessing the progress toward each goal. Be sure to include when you anticipate submitting the project for formal reviews.

A: The first major milestone for this project w ill be faculty participation in Universal Design for Learning (UDL) training. Following training faculty w ill be asked to complete a survey regarding the quality of the training, the delivery method, and the applicability to college teaching. This w ill allow us to assess the perceived quality and effectiveness of the training for university faculty. The second milestone w ill be the faculty redesign of courses and participation in a learning community. These milestones w ill occur in parallel as the learning community w ill be facilitated specifically to support faculty in addressing challenges and receive peer feedback regarding
the implementation of UDL in their courses. During this period faculty w ill be asked to submit course syllabi that follow s UDL standards as w ell as a sample lesson with a completed planning chart. The concluding session of the learning community w ill be

designed to allow faculty to offer feedback about the effectiveness of the learning community in supporting their implementation of UDL and course redesign. Feedback w ill be used to assess the effectiveness of the method as w ell as to increase the effectiveness of learning communities in the future. The final milestone w ill be the instruction of the redesigned course. At the conclusion of the project faculty w ill be invited to reconvene to discuss their experience in teaching using UDL and make recommendations for further implementation at Ohio University.

Student achievement outcomes w ill be measured primarily as the overall rate of students earning D's, F's, or W's in a given course. Grades of students enrolled in the UDL designed course w ill be compared to the grades of students w ho last took the class from the same faculty member prior to the implementation of UDL. While there are some limitations in drawing strong conclusions through this comparison, w e seek an indication that UDL may be connected to few er students failing to complete the course with a satisfactory grade to determine whether or not more widespread implementation and study of UDL may be warranted. Grade comparisons w ill be made at the conclusion of the project.

Similarly, the impact of UDL in reducing the need for individual accommodations for students with disabilities w ill be assessed through case comparison. Records of accommodation requests from the previous offerings w ill be compared the current course. It is expected that numbers of students with disabilities w ill be small so quantitative comparisons w ill not be possible, but case review will offer the opportunity to note trends in accommodations that may be less necessary in a UDL environment. Such data w ill be used in determining possible benefits of future expansion of UDL implementation.

Q:

Describe how various members of the learning community will participate in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration.

A: The Universal Design in General Education Curriculum project will impact the instructional design and delivery several courses in different academic units. The faculty instructing these courses will be provided training on the principles of Universal Design and offered consultative support to create classes that intentionally aim to teach and access a broad spectrum of abilities and learning styles.

Student Accessibility Services will be the office primarily responsible for the project. The project will also directly include 6-8 faculty from various departments.

Q:

Describe how the institution will monitor project progress/success during, and at the completion of this project. Be sure to specifically state the measures that will be evaluated and when.

A: Spring 2016: Faculty participants have been identified as well as identifying a qualified external consultant to provide training

Summer 2016: Faculty will receive UDL training from external consultant and participate in faculty learning community to support their redesign of course

Fall 2016: Faculty teach Universally Designed courses and project concludes

Q:

Describe the challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: During the previous timeline there was a barrier presented by insufficient faculty response among those who would be teaching the re-designed course in the target semester and had also taught the course recently enough to have comparison data. This resulted in the project not meeting the completion target. The project is now on track for completion in the fall 2016 term as sufficient interested faculty are scheduled to teach courses they have identified for re-design.

Q:

Provide any additional information that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project.

A: Presently there are potential participants from media arts and studies, engineering, nursing, teacher education, management information systems, linguistics, recreation, exercise physiology, modern languages, and restaurant and hotel management. There are twelve to fifteen faculty w ho will participate in the training and intend to redesign their courses, but it is expected that some may not complete the project. If the project meets the anticipated goals, the student evaluation feedback should be significantly more positive in the Universally Designed courses as well as seeing an improvement in the overall grades in the courses and a reduction of the number of students receiving below a C and potentially retaking the course later to improve their grade.
Faculty should be able to report greater achievement of student learning objectives. Additionally, there should be a reduction in the need for instructors to make arrangements for individual accommodations in these courses.

Concluding Report

Q:

What is the primary reason for closing this project?

A: This project was proposed as a way to pilot the application of, and support for, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) at Ohio University. The pilot phase has been completed and we are now working to apply our learning. There is now sufficient support for UDL within our Office of Instructional Innovations as well as our faculty participants to sustain, support and expand UDL.

Q:

What aspects of this project would you categorize as successful?

A: Overall the creation of a network of advocates who can assist in developing faculty buy-in and guiding the manner in which UDL is expanded and discussed on our campus is the most valuable outcome. The qualitative data received from individual faculty participants, particularly recommendations on how to generate interest and commitment from other faculty was an important part of the pilot phase. Additionally, having a small group of faculty who can speak to their specific experience with UDL and the benefits they have identified. Four of the project participants were department chairs or course coordinators, and therefore, have a greater immediate sphere of influence as they develop the course curriculum and/or provide training and resources to those who teach their courses. Another success was the inclusion of several instructional designers who are now positioned to work within their unit to embed UDL in their processes as they support faculty in course design.

Q:

What aspects of this project would you categorize as less than successful?

A: The less successful part of this project was the lack of connection between the implementation of UDL and the more easily measured outcomes of grades. It is possible that a connection does exist, but other factors may have mitigated the effects. Similarly, there was not as strong of a connection between UDL and a reduction in the need for accommodations for students with disabilities as was anticipated.

Concluding Review

Q:

Do you have any final thoughts or feedback for this institution in regards to this project? Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: Good work! The Institution created a pilot and is now working to ensure it learns from the pilot before taking the project to scale.

Project: Universal Design

Version 2.0 - Project

Q:

What is the current status of your project?

A: Completed

Q:

Please indicate the original project start date, original project end date, and anticipated completion date if project is not completed. Please list dates on separate lines.

A: Original Start Date: July 1, 2015

Original End Date: June 30, 2016

Revised/Actual End Date: December 31, 2016

Q:

Briefly describe the current status of the project. Explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's most recent or soon-to-be submitted systems portfolio, if applicable.

A: Although the project has now reached completion, faculty participants and project coordinator continue to further examine data and identify ways to extend and expand the utilization of Universal Design Learning (UDL) to assist the University in fulfilling its mission.

Preceding the project there had been several years of increases in the numbers of students with disabilities enrolling at the institution. At the time the project was proposed there was an institutional priority to work proactively toward an inclusive and accessible community. This institutional priority remains true at this time.

Q:

List the project goals as stated in the original project declaration along with the metrics/measures for assessing the progress for each goal.

A: Stated Goals:

1. The project will identify 6-8 large lecture style courses (125 or more students in a single section) in which the faculty are willing to redesign the course in accordance with the principles of Universal Design.

- There were a total of 7 faculty/instructors who participated although only 4 of 7 had large courses.

2. The faculty will be provided training and mentorship in the area of Universal Design in order to redesign their courses.

- Faculty attended a one-day workshop facilitated on campus by a faculty trainer from the CAST Institute. Faculty had access to the trainer in following weeks for questions and also access to resources provided and developed during the training. Faculty also participated in a Faculty Learning Community after training through the conclusion of the project.

3. The universally designed courses would be expected to improve the learning experience and achievement of learning objectives for a broad spectrum of students.

- Qualitative feedback from faculty participants indicated that, overall, students were more engaged and connected to the curriculum when they used UDL. Additionally, most faculty articulated a greater confidence that learning which occurred when using UDL resulted in a deeper understanding of, and connection to, the material.

Expected Outcomes:

1. Reduction in the need for instructors to make arrangements for individual accommodations in these courses is anticipated.

- While it is difficult, at best, to assess this quantitatively several examples support the idea that UDL may reduce the need for individual accommodations depending upon the extent to which it is implemented. The most common accommodations among students with disabilities presently are test taking (extended test time and a reduced distraction location) and notetaking assistance. One course was designed so that students would not need to take notes and a few weeks in to the semester one student cancelled their request for note taking assistance because there was no need. Similarly, in one course the instructor designed the course such that no in-class tests would be given if students actively participated each week to demonstrate their content mastery – ultimately no in-class tests were given.

2. If the project meets the anticipated goals, the student evaluation feedback should be significantly more positive in the Universally Designed courses as well as seeing an improvement in the overall grades in the courses and a reduction of the number of students receiving below a C and potentially retaking the course later to improve their grade.

- There were not significant differences between the distribution of grades from the prior semester and the semester in which UDL was utilized. Overall faculty did receive more positive student feedback about engagement in the course although, in some instances, they also noted what they perceived to be a high level of work in the course.

3. Faculty should be able to report greater achievement of student learning objectives.

- Overall faculty reported feeling that students exhibited a greater mastery of the course material and that the learning was more internalized.

Q:

Describe what has been accomplished with this project over the past year, specifically referring to quantifiable results that show progress. You may need to include a discussion clarifying how the original goals and anticipated outcomes may have shifted during the year.

A: Due to the fact that this project sought to identify faculty teaching a broad range of subjects and relied on faculty willingness to participate, the project goal shifted away from a focus on large lecture courses in the general education curriculum. Instead, the project accepted interested faculty regardless of the historic enrollment in their course.

During the past year, the call for interested faculty was released and a list of 15 interested faculty was generated. Since the project was designed for a faculty group of 6-8, the final participant list was driven, in part, based on the availability of faculty to participate in training as well as continued interest. All 15 faculty were contacted in Late March to determine their continued interest at which 3 faculty declined based on other projects that had begun to move forward and one never responded. Of the remaining 11 faculty, 8 were invited to participate in the project. Selections were made based on having representation from different academic colleges and subjects as well as their identified reasons for wanting to participate in the project. Ultimately, 6 of the 8 faculty indicated availability to attend a full day training. On the day of the training, one faculty member contacted the coordinator to drop-out from the project due to time constraints.

Training took place on May 25, 2017 and included a total of 13 participants including the 5 selected faculty, the project coordinator, 2 course coordinators from University College, and 5 Instructional Designers. During the course of the training, the 2 course coordinators were offered the opportunity to participate in the project by implementing aspects of UDL in the courses they individually instruct, bringing the total number of participants to 7.

Following training, project participants had access to support from the trainer, an online resource collection developed as part of the training, and access to the instructional designers. Additionally, participants had access to each other informally as well as through formal Faculty Learning Community (FLC) meetings. FLC meetings in the summer focused on supporting each other to identify specific elements of their course they wished to revise or new elements they wished to introduce as well as supporting each other in the implementation. FLC meetings during the fall semester focused on sharing their teaching experiences and challenges with UDL while instructing the course. The project concluded with a final FLC meeting at the end of the semester that functioned as a focus group to capture participant ideas about how UDL could be advanced within the institution as well as identifying considerations that need to be made as UDL is expanded.

Due to the strong interest of participants to share their experience with other faculty, during the Fall 2016 semester faculty submitted a plan for UDL expansion to the institution's Academic Innovation Accelerator for consideration.

Q:

Describe how various members of the learning community have participated in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration, particularly during the past year.

A: During the past year the direct project participants have represented 6 separate academic departments in 6 separate academic colleges. While others within their departments have not been directly involved in the project, participants reported engaging in conversation with colleagues about the project and the potential of integrating UDL into their curriculum. In one instance the faculty participant co-taught one class with another faculty with whom he had to discuss UDL and garner the support of the co-teacher. Similarly, three participants also serve in the role of course coordinator which afforded them the opportunity to infuse elements of UDL into the curriculum they establish as well as the training provided to course instructors. Specifically, two hours of training regarding UDL was added to the

teacher assistant training for COMS 1030 as well as curricular alterations. Additionally, the UC 1000 and UC 1100 course coordinators altered their training delivered to 225 participants to include elements of UDL and made alteration to course materials made available for instructors to use in the instruction of their individual course. UC 1000 course instructors are a combination of staff and graduate students while UC 1100 instructors are faculty within a specific academic discipline.

In addition to faculty connections, there were 5 instructional designers who support faculty in 5 different academic colleges and attended training. The instructional designers were then able to utilize their knowledge to encourage faculty to infuse elements of UDL into their course as part of good instructional design. Rather than presenting UDL as a specific approach to teaching, instructional designers have been able to present approaches from UDL as a compliment to a faculty member's pedagogical approach to increase student engagement and access to the curriculum. The project also led to the opportunity to have conversations with the Senior Vice Provost for Instructional Innovation about the value of UDL and how it may be supported by areas within the Office of Instructional Innovation beyond being embedded into the practice of instructional designers.

Q:

Describe the effect that this project has had on the institution, students, and others in the learning community. What has the institution learned that can be identified as a good practice to use in other aspects of its quality work or from which other institutions might benefit?

A: One of the main impacts of this project was to create a small core group of faculty advocates who have intentional training and direct experience with UDL in a classroom at Ohio University. Faculty participants indicated strong interest in advocating for UDL within their academic colleges based on their personal experience. Overall, faculty participants indicated that they perceived students to be more engaged and active in the learning process and, in many cases, perceived that students had internalized their learning more significantly than in their prior experience. The faculty participants all reported an enthusiasm for teaching that was renewed or strengthened by their experience with UDL. Overall, the conclusions faculty participants reached during this project were that UDL brings a significant "value added" to teaching and learning at Ohio University, that UDL can be easily introduced in partnership with other pedagogical approaches already utilized, and that elements of UDL can be infused over time so that it is not overwhelming for faculty. These conclusions will prove valuable as we seek to expand UDL on our campus and create intentional messages for faculty to generate interest and commitment to UDL.

Q:

Describe the anticipated challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: The primary challenge to fully institutionalizing the knowledge gained from this project is the faculty discretion in approach to teaching. Individual faculty cannot be compelled to implement a specific pedagogical approach. However, significant efforts can be made to assist faculty in understanding the value of UDL and support those who choose to infuse concepts of UDL into their teaching.

A secondary challenge raised by faculty participants is the perception that UDL is teaching about students with disabilities. During the final focus group, participants strongly recommended that the institution give careful consideration to crafting a message about UDL as supporting student engagement in the curriculum to establish UDL as good teaching practice for all students. This also requires the advancement of UDL to be separated from Student Accessibility Services and centralized with other institutional support regarding teaching and learning.

Q:

In light of the project goals, current circumstances, institutional learning from this project, and anticipated barriers to success, list the next steps to be taken over the course of the next 12 - 24 months in order to complete or institutionalize the results of this action project. Provide a timeline for completing each next step.

A:
- The project coordinator will meet with the instructional design supervisor to review their processes to assure UDL is embedded within both their production processes as well as their services to support faculty in curriculum design and delivery. March 2017
- Present a session on UDL at the Spotlight on Learning Conference to provide internal professional development for faculty. April 2017
- Develop a communication campaign regarding UDL with the intent of garnering interest to then offer training and support to interested faculty. Summer 2017
- Develop a "tool kit" that may serve as a resource for faculty interested in utilizing UDL. Summer 2017
- Infuse UDL into the reflective teaching practices course facilitated by the Center for Teaching and Learning. (Summer 2017)
- Offer information regarding UDL at new faculty orientation. August 2017
- Offer a general training for faculty on UDL. (One faculty participant sought the support of her college to become a UDL trainer and completed training in October 2016). Fall 2017
- Facilitate faculty learning communities within each academic unit that are led by faculty participants from this project. Ongoing academic year 2017-2018
- Identify internal opportunities within each academic college to provide training to faculty or facilitate faculty discussion regarding UDL (i.e. College of Business pedagogical trainings, Russ College Engineering Fundamentals team). Various times academic year 2017-2018

Q:

Provide any additional information, inquiries, or concerns that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: At the time this project was proposed the institutional support to faculty regarding teaching and learning was more diffuse and there was not a Senior Vice Provost for Instructional Innovation. The project coordinator has had meetings with the Senior Vice Provost for Instructional Innovation who is committed to supporting UDL through multiple avenues. It is expected that, due to the introduction of the VP position and the restructuring of our resources to support faculty, future progress around expanding UDL will continue and be more easily advanced than under the direction of Student Accessibility Services.

Version 2.0 - Update

Q:

I certify that this project is ready for review.

A: I agree.

Version 2.0 - Review

Q:

Please comment on anything that is omitted or incomplete in the project status, dates and summary field. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: NA

Q:

Check for accuracy and completeness against the original Project Declaration. Are the right metrics or measures included for each goal? If not, what revisions to the metrics/measures would you suggest that the institution consider?

A: Ohio University's project update and the declaration demonstrated congruency in measures. Each lists stated goals as a target number of faculty to participate, training and mentorship to support the faculty role, and select courses to be redesigned to incorporate Universal Design Learning (UDL). These goals were realized through completion of the Action project.

Q:

Has the institution acted in meaningful ways to pursue project success, making progress as anticipated in the original project declaration? If meaningful progress or project success has not been achieved, has the institution made appropriate revisions to the goals or anticipated outcomes for this project? • Are descriptions of resources, organization, concrete results, and reaching milestones included? • Make a statement of global judgment. (i.e. "The institution is making [excellent/good/satisfactory/ acceptable/slow/ casual/no] progress in this action project.").

A: The University noted an increase in students with disabilities and through this project created goals, action steps and a timeline that required a vigorous pace. Ohio University made very good progress to accomplish the action steps in a 1.5 year period. The timeline was extended 6 months to coincide with course offerings. Expected outcomes of the project were discussed in the update and noted to be met. The outcomes suggested that students needed less individualized accommodations, faculty perceived students to have more class engagement and course mastery,and students provided positive feedback. The University noted that there was no identifiable difference in course grades.

Q:

Are the appropriate people involved sufficiently for the nature and scope of the project?

• Is there sufficient breadth of involvement?

• Are the right people involved? • Emphasize the roles of those who can enhance the impact, success, or effectiveness of the project.

• Tactfully call attention to any people that appear to have been omitted or bypassed.

A: Faculty representatives from six depatments from across campus participated as did instructional designers. Although this project was not broadly applied, it served the prupose to pilot UDL processes in this large University setting. With three of the faculty participants being course leaders, they may have greater influence on expansion of the UDL approach. Additionally the University noted that the curriculum for teacher assistant training added UDL training into select courses. Instructional Designers that participated in the project have advocated for use of UDL as an adjunct to the faculty's pedagogy. Expansion of courses using the UDL approach and faculty training will be next steps that are well detailed in the update. As wisely noted, faculty advocates are important to gaining buy-in and the use of learning communities led by the advocates can spread enthusiasm for the UDL approach.

Q:

Does the institution show evidence of learning from what it did well?

• Acknowledge any practice that could be replicated internally in future projects.

• Encourage the sharing of best practices with other institutions.

A: In completing this project, the University has demonstrated Principles of High Performing Institutions through investing in processes that improve student learning, respect for people with disabilities and foresight in using an innovative approach. Learning that the University reported was that the UDL approach was value-added and can be slowly infused. Creating a participant group that included faculty as well as Instrutional Designers proved to be an effective model to effect change through different avenues.

Q:

Does the institution have a realistic understanding of what it needs to address in order to achieve progress and, ultimately, project success? Does it assess its internal and external environments, recognizing the potential forces that could hinder success? Is anything overlooked?

A: The University is aware that it will continue to have challenges that include faculty acceptance, framing UDL as a form of student engagement rather than targeted services to students with disabilities, and broadening UDL as not solely under the auspecies of Student Accessibility Services, but in academic course design through support processes of the Senior Vice Provost for Instructional Innovation, as the project team noted.

Q:

Does the institution understand the current status of its project and know how it intends to pursue project success?

A: The University has a good understanding of next steps to institutionalize the use of UDL in a list of steps with timelines for the next academic year. This project has completed and sets the baseline for moving forward.

Q:

Overall, does the institution demonstrate a good faith effort in its pursuit of continuous quality improvement through this action project? Is there anything of concern that should be brought to the attention of AQIP via your mentor?

A: This project demonstrates the University's commitment to quality improvment through meeting student needs and managing a challenging change process.

Project: Universal Design

Version 1.0 - Project

Q:

What is the current status of your project?

A: In-progress

Q:

Please indicate the original project start date, original project end date, and anticipated completion date if project is not completed. Please list dates on separate lines.

A: Original start date: 1/1/2016

Original end date: 12/31/2016

Anticipated completion date: 12/31/2016

Q:

Briefly describe the current status of the project. Explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's most recent or soon-to-be submitted systems portfolio, if applicable.

A: Project is in progress. We originally submitted this Action Project in March 2016 and are waiting for an AQIP review.

Q:

List the project goals as stated in the original project declaration along with the metrics/measures for assessing the progress for each goal.

A: The first major milestone for this project w ill be faculty participation in Universal Design for Learning (UDL) training. Following training faculty w ill be asked to complete a survey regarding the quality of the training, the delivery method, and the applicability to college teaching. This w ill allow us to assess the perceived quality and effectiveness of the training for university faculty. The second milestone w ill be the faculty redesign of courses and participation in a learning community. These milestones w ill occur in parallel as the learning community w ill be facilitated specifically to support faculty in addressing challenges and receive peer feedback regarding the implementation of UDL in their courses. During this period faculty w ill be asked to submit course syllabi that follow s UDL

standards as w ell as a sample lesson with a completed planning chart. The concluding session of the learning community w ill be designed to allow faculty to offer feedback about the effectiveness of the learning community in supporting their implementation of UDL and course redesign. Feedback w ill be used to assess the effectiveness of the method as w ell as to increase the effectiveness of learning communities in the future. The final milestone w ill be the instruction of the redesigned course. At the conclusion of the project faculty w ill be invited to reconvene to discuss their experience in teaching using UDL and make recommendations for further implementation at Ohio University.

Student achievement outcomes w ill be measured primarily as the overall rate of students earning D's, F's, or W's in a given course. Grades of students enrolled in the UDL designed course w ill be compared to the grades of students w ho last took the class from the same faculty member prior to the implementation of UDL. While there are some limitations in drawing strong conclusions through this comparison, w e seek an indication that UDL may be connected to few er students failing to complete the course with a satisfactory grade to determine whether or not more widespread implementation and study of UDL may be warranted. Grade comparisons w ill be made at the conclusion of the project.

Similarly, the impact of UDL in reducing the need for individual accommodations for students with disabilities w ill be assessed through case comparison. Records of accommodation requests from the previous offerings w ill be compared the current course. It is expected that numbers of students with disabilities w ill be small so quantitative comparisons w ill not be possible, but case review will offer the opportunity to note trends in accommodations that may be less necessary in a UDL environment. Such data w ill be used in determining possible benefits of future expansion of UDL implementation.

Q:

Describe what has been accomplished with this project over the past year, specifically referring to quantifiable results that show progress. You may need to include a discussion clarifying how the original goals and anticipated outcomes may have shifted during the year.

A: Project is in progress, and results will not be available until the fall semester concludes.

Q:

Describe how various members of the learning community have participated in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration, particularly during the past year.

A: Please see the original declaration.

Q:

Describe the effect that this project has had on the institution, students, and others in the learning community. What has the institution learned that can be identified as a good practice to use in other aspects of its quality work or from which other institutions might benefit?

A: Please see the original declaration.

Q:

Describe the anticipated challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: Please see the original declaration.

Q:

In light of the project goals, current circumstances, institutional learning from this project, and anticipated barriers to success, list the next steps to be taken over the course of the next 12 - 24 months in order to complete or institutionalize the results of this action project. Provide a timeline for completing each next step.

A: Please see the original declaration.

Q:

Provide any additional information, inquiries, or concerns that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: These "update" questions are difficult to answer because the project was initiated and reported in March 2016. We are awaiting an AQIP review from that submission. We have migrated that report from the old system to the new system as best as we could.

Version 1.0 - Update

Q:

I certify that this project is ready for review.

A: I agree.

Version 1.0 - Review

Q:

Please comment on anything that is omitted or incomplete in the project status, dates and summary field. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: This update is not complete. There seems to be a misunderstanding, with OU expecting a review of the project declaration. There is no review in the project declaration phase, only after an update.

Q:

    Check for accuracy and completeness against the original Project Declaration. Are the right metrics or measures included for each goal? If not, what revisions to the metrics/measures would you suggest that the institution consider?

A: The original project declaration was complete and included appropriate goals and metrics.

Q:

    Has the institution acted in meaningful ways to pursue project success, making progress as anticipated in the original project declaration? If meaningful progress or project success has not been achieved, has the institution made appropriate revisions to the goals or anticipated outcomes for this project? • Are descriptions of resources, organization, concrete results, and reaching milestones included? • Make a statement of global judgment. (i.e. "The institution is making [excellent/good/satisfactory/ acceptable/slow/ casual/no] progress in this action project.").

A: It is impossible to tell if OU has made sufficient progress on this project. Most questions are answered by stating that data will not be available until after the fall semester ends. OU could have reported on how many courses are using Universal Design, how many faculty, and how many students are enrolled in those courses. Other data that could have been included successful completion rates in courses prior to UD was implemented.

Q:

    Are the appropriate people involved sufficiently for the nature and scope of the project?

    • Is there sufficient breadth of involvement?

    • Are the right people involved? • Emphasize the roles of those who can enhance the impact, success, or effectiveness of the project.

    • Tactfully call attention to any people that appear to have been omitted or bypassed.

A: There is not enough information provided in this update to determine the breadth of involvement in this project. This update could have contained names or titles of everyone who is involved at the time of the update.

Q:

    Does the institution show evidence of learning from what it did well?

    • Acknowledge any practice that could be replicated internally in future projects.

    • Encourage the sharing of best practices with other institutions.

A: No best practices could be identified due to insufficient information being provided in this update.

Q:

Does the institution have a realistic understanding of what it needs to address in order to achieve progress and, ultimately, project success? Does it assess its internal and external environments, recognizing the potential forces that could hinder success? Is anything overlooked?

A: It is unclear if OU has a realistic understanding of what it needs to successfully complete this project, since no update was provided.

Q:

Does the institution understand the current status of its project and know how it intends to pursue project success?

A: N/A

Q:

Overall, does the institution demonstrate a good faith effort in its pursuit of continuous quality improvement through this action project? Is there anything of concern that should be brought to the attention of AQIP via your mentor?

A: The status of this project is unclear. Updated information could have been provided, but was not. This creates a concern that little or no action may have been taken on this project.