Accessibility as a Learner Engagement Strategy

motivating instructors by reframing the conversation
After this session, participants will be able to

• Reframe the accessibility conversation with faculty as a way to increase learner engagement.
• Employ scalable strategies for built-in accessibility that also improve course transparency.
• Share accessibility resources with faculty in ways that are not intimidating or conflictual.
Our story

• Stand-alone law school

• Pioneers in online legal education, but...

• Traditional teaching methods

• Urgent need for accessible documents
What did we do about it?

• Sent IDs, Library Support, and Student Services through the same accessibility trainings
• Targeted crucial courses first
• Repeated successes
  • Developed a system (and tracked results)
  • Found a few tools for many solutions
  • Built templates
  • Offered simplified, repeated workshops and resources for faculty
Then the faculty discovered...

- Materials were cleaner
- Courses were easier to navigate
- Students were more engaged
- Students asked fewer questions
- Templates and other resources made it easier
Accessible *and* easier for students to use

**Before...**

**After...**

**Commerce Clause Time Line (Text Version)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Degree of Federal Intrusion (1-10, low to high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons v. Ogden</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Congress may regulate those internal concerns “[1] which are completely within a particular State, [2] which do not affect other States, and [3] with which it is not necessary to interfere, for ... the general powers of the government.”</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sheboygan Case</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Congress may regulate carriers. “In all matters having such a close and substantial relation to interstate traffic that control is essential or appropriate to [1] the security of that traffic, [2] to the efficiency of the interstate service, and [3] to the maintenance of ... fair terms without monopoly or hindrance.”</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford v. Wallace</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>“Whatever amounts to more or less constant practice, and threatens to obstruct or unduly to burden the freedom of interstate commerce is within the regulatory power of Congress.”</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Your Top Results

- **30%** Accommodating
- **27%** Avoiding
- **17%** Competing
- **17%** Compromising
- **10%** Collaborative

[More Details]
Strategies to Reframe the Conversation

• Student-centered conversation
  • Who are they?
  • What do they expect/appreciate?

• Opportunity, not obligation
  • Show successes/praise peers
  • Come to the table with a solution-opportunity

• Be prepared
  • Strong baseline knowledge and skills for staff
  • Have templates/job aids ready
  • Know your tools (and their VPATs)

• Baby steps in training
  • Empowerment
  • Support
  • Pick your battles
Mistakes of law and fact

Criminal Law
Professor Kruse

- This slide slow covers mistakes of law and fact.
Legal and Ethical Obligations in Teaching

Accessibility

- Identifying Web Accessibility Issues
- Why Accessibility for Screenreaders Matters
- One-Page Guides for Accessible Documents
- Accessible Syllabus Templates
What would you do?

Scenario 1
A professor has 65 video+PowerPoint presentations in their course. The PowerPoints are full of inaccessible features (no titles, no alt text, SmartArt, color for emphasis, etc.). You know there's a student using a screen reader in their class next semester. The professor refuses to redo all 65 recordings (simply overwhelmed with workload) but is amenable to revising the PowerPoints. What do you do?

Scenario 2
Students in a class share hand-drawn pictures with each other in a discussion forum. They're required to review their peers' posts and provide feedback. It's the most successful and best-liked activity in the class. How do you resolve the accessibility issue and get buy-in from the professor?

Scenario 3
You are meeting with an instructor who is new to online learning. How do you introduce accessibility in a way that positively focuses on the benefits of Universal Design for Learning?
Appendices
Resources


“Address Accessibility Challenges with AURS.” Quality Matters, 21 December 2018.


“Legal Obligations for Accessibility.” UDL on Campus: Universal Design for Learning in Higher Education.


Functional Definition of Accessibility

Provide students the opportunity to

- acquire the same information
- engage in the same interactions
- enjoy the same services

as students without disabilities, with substantially equivalent ease of use.
Your legal versus your ethical obligation

**Legal**

- Access must be “equally effective”
- “Academic adjustments” (reactive accommodations) for students with registered disabilities are acceptable.
- Opt out if accommodation changes essential academic requirements
  - fundamentally alters the nature of a service, program or activity
  - results in an undue financial or administrative burden.

**Ethical**

- Proactively accessible materials, OR
- Offer multiple means of engagement
- Consider needs of students who do not have a registered disability
- Improve everyone’s learning experience (UDL)
- Start with accessible tools