

LILY BOND: Welcome everyone, and thank you for joining this webinar entitled "The Road to EIT Accessibility at Four Colleges-- A Centralized Approach." I'm Lily Bond from 3Play Media, and I'll be moderating today. I'm joined today by Rob Eveleigh.

In 2015, the Five College Consortium in Western Massachusetts created a new shared position to better address EIT accessibility across four private colleges. Rob is now the Five College EIT accessibility coordinator for Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, and Smith colleges.

There are five handouts for this presentation, which Rob will be referencing throughout. You can download them now in the Handouts window of your control panel. And with that, I'm going to hand it off to Rob, who has a great presentation prepared for you.

ROB EVELEIGH: OK, hello, everyone. Indeed this is "The Road to EIT Accessibility at Four Colleges-- A Centralized Approach." This is February 2, 2017, and I am Rob Eveleigh, the Five College EIT accessibility coordinator.

Our agenda for today, we've got kind of these four components of the agenda. We'll look at some background on the Five College Consortium and position. We'll look at an EIT accessibility environmental scan and questionnaire. We'll talk about programs, committees, and subcommittees. And then I will share some lessons learned in these fairly new programs, though I think, I hope, that throughout the session there will be additional lessons learned beyond what we list at the end.

So today's handouts, as Lily mentioned, there's five handouts. And I'm just going to run through them really quickly here. We have handout one, is an EIT accessibility questionnaire, and it is a blank sample. I should note that these are Word docs and Excel files, so you can do with these what you want. Handout number two is a vendor/bidder EIT accessibility questions list. Handout number three is a WAVE API accessibility evaluation tool quick notes sheet. Handout number four is an EIT accessibility roadmap-- again, kind of a blank template sample. And handout number five is an EIT accessibility committee charge, also a template sample.

So a little bit about me. One important thing to know is that I am not a lawyer. So other things to know about me is, I've been working in the field of access technology for 15 years. I started by working with books on tape and then kind of moved into more advanced, alt formats, and

assistive technology solutions. And now in my current position I really work full time addressing campus-wide IT accessibility.

Again, a little background about the Five College Consortium here in Western Massachusetts. It was established in 1965. And we just celebrated the 50th anniversary. And honestly it was a big deal around here. It was very exciting to celebrate 50 years. We are made up of four private liberal arts colleges and the Amherst campus of the state university. So the list is Amherst College, Hampshire College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and UMass Amherst.

So just an important role of the consortium involves shared use of resources and facilities. And I just wanted to list a couple of these things here about how we all work together, is there's open cross-registration amongst the five schools. So if you are enrolled in one of the schools you can take courses at one of the other schools. There are some shared departments and programs. We have a very integrated library system and collections. And we have a free bus, intercampus transportation, a free bus amongst these campuses that are all within, say 20, 25 minutes of each other.

So here's some numbers I pulled off the website. It's kind of Five Colleges by the numbers for 2014-2015. Cross-registered courses, a little over 5,000. Professors teaching on multiple campuses, 81. Certificate programs, 16. Rides on the Five College bus, a little over a million. Campus investments in collaboration, \$9 million. And then the really big bullet here at the end, collective return on investment is \$40 million. So the idea is that the ultimate mission here is for students and education. But I think another mission here is saving money. And by saving money, we certainly are addressing our number one mission, which is students and education.

So this position that the Five College electronic and information technology accessibility coordinator, it's actually a four college position. There's four colleges are participating in this position and program. And so these colleges are Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, and Smith.

This position came about-- basically it was kind of a multipronged proposal. There were folks talking, about with the Dear Colleague letter, and then the FAQ. And we had committees forming. We had disability services directors. We had a Five College tech access committee. We have Five College risk and compliance. All these folks, as the resolution agreements kept pouring in, is we're like, wow, we really need to do more. We need to do something.

And so a proposal-- I think it might have been more than one, but the one I'm aware of, when sent to the CIOs, the CIOs said, wow, this is important. We need to do something, or do more. And then that proposal was sent from them up to the presidents, and they agreed. They said, we need to address this proactively. And so indeed, this new position was created. It was posted in June of 2015. And the position was filled by me in September of 2015. I should mention that the position is partially grant-funded for three years by the Davis Educational Foundation.

So an interesting thing, it's a new position, new program. And so one of the big concepts or ideas was that we were going to do an IT accessibility audit, meaning an audit of IT, specifically of technologies. And something that I kind of advocated for was I said, it would be really great if we could do a broader assessment. And so we proposed and conducted this four college EIT accessibility questionnaire and environmental scan. But we weren't just looking at technologies. We were looking at workflows, capacity, what folks had in place to address campus-wide IT accessibility.

So we had three data gathering methods for this environmental scan. We had interviews, attendance at standing meetings, and then a questionnaire. So just really quick, the interviews, no surprise, the first four there are the IT folks, starting at the top with CIOs, IT directors, instructional technologists, and IT specialists.

And then I also met with the disability/accessibility services folks at each of the four schools. I met with librarians. I met with general counsel at the schools that have a full time general counsel. And then also we have a Five College compliance and risk management department. And I spoke with the director there.

So then also the second component of our environmental scan was attendance at standing meetings, so these meetings that are already existing. I kind of came in and I think people were expecting to hear from me. And I really was more-- I was on a listening tour. So it was interesting as I was attending these meetings more taking notes than asking questions. So the first, there's the academic educational technology services, certainly standing meetings I was attending at different campuses, administrative technologies.

A couple of campuses did have IT accessibility initiatives in place, some pretty solid work. But I wouldn't say any of them were full campus-wide, though they were really making some great progress. So I attended those meetings, IT all staff meetings. Learning management systems,

this is pretty great, is all four schools participate in this program using Moodle, which makes things a little easier when addressing LMS. I sat in on some research and instructional librarians software committee meetings.

And then also one campus had a, or has, a software cross-functional task force. And this is a really interesting committee, and it's one I still participate in. They basically address software that comes into the campus. And so that's a great committee to be on regarding accessibility.

So also attendance at standing meetings-- we also have Five College standing meetings. Certainly the tech access committee is one I would attend regularly anyways, but also part of this environmental scan. We have a Five College ADA task force. And then we have a couple library committees there, the library resource management and the library discovery committee that I also just sat in on, but I don't sit in on regularly.

So that was the second component of our environmental scan. The third component is we have a questionnaire. And I have the kind of headings or the breakdown of the questionnaire. And I'm just going to kind of read through them, and then we can take a look at it because it is a handout.

So the components are, the first one is IT accessibility policy. Second one is IT accessibility program, then learning management systems, classrooms, learning spaces, procurement, library, IT accessibility audit. And then our number eight, our section number eight here I really consider a wild card. It's additional questions.

So let's take a look at this document. We'll see how this works. So this is indeed a Word doc. And you can see the components we had just identified. But then I kind of go a little deeper, deeper in with these questions where I say, do you have a policy? I say, how has it been disseminated to college personnel? I say, what guidelines have you endorsed, specifically, as a 508 or WCAG?

So you can see under these categories, I like to just kind of dig in. For here, accessibility program is, I say, who are your team members and how often do you meet, questions like that. So I think this questionnaire was a really big-- it was a really big benefit. What I would consider it actually is this questionnaire is kind of a reverse roadmap, because we're looking at what could be components of a roadmap and we're just kind of coming to these campuses and just posing these roadmap components just as a questionnaire.

So after the environmental scanning questionnaire, I generated about a 60-page document. And there was a lot of information and a lot of takeaways. But one of the fundamental outcomes, I think, was this idea that we wanted to create-- each campus should have a central, campus-wide technology access committee. And so this is something we have in place all four schools. A couple of them have the same name, a tech access committee, a tech access committee. We have an IT accessibility working group at one school and an IT accessibility task force at another school.

So this is really pretty critical. I'd say even just in the University of Miami agreement, or Miami University agreement, just from last fall specifically calls out, in the proposed consent decree-- I'm reading it here-- "The university accessibility committee will have overall responsibility for implementing the requirements of this decree." So this is clearly a model that's being proposed also by the federal government where you have this committee that addresses campus-wide IT accessibility.

So this next slide, I really like this. This is a slide from a session I attended 10 years ago at Los Angeles Airport, which is where the CSUN conference used to be held. So this was a session by the California State University, a session on their accessible technology initiative. And I remember at the time, back 10 years ago, I was more of an alt format kind of assistive technology kind of guy. And I was kind of scratching my head. What's this all about? But with a little more time, I certainly get it.

So what they've done is they're looking at a campus-wide program here. And they've come up with these three divisions that kind of fit into a Venn diagram-- web accessibility, instructional materials, and procurement. And so I really like this. I like this way of breaking it up. I've seen other institutions-- some institutions break things up into, say, 10 different categories, 10 different subinitiatives or working groups addressing accessibility. But I really like this kind of simple three subdivision model.

And so what we've done is we've proposed the same thing at all four colleges, is that we want to adopt this model with the goal of having these three subcommittees, and then also have some sort of parity between the four campuses. I mean, having the same structure at all four campuses certainly is going to make a collaborative effort easier.

So what I want to do is look at some of the work of each of these subcommittees. So for the first one, accessible instructional materials-- something worth noting is one campus was doing

their first MOOC basically when I arrived. And I don't like to do it too often, but I basically kind of raised my hand and kind of waved the red flag saying, this is an accessibility emergency. This is one of these things where you really need to go for universal accessibility. I think the enrollment in the MOOC actually might have been higher than the enrollment in the entire college. So this idea that you've got capacity or your disability services or IT are going to be able to provide accommodations is not a solid plan.

So this is really great because this campus, they really dug in. Both the faculty, disability services, IT really stepped up and really put in a lot of effort and learning and labor to make sure that their MOOC content-- it was an edX course-- was universally accessible.

I want to just add another kind of lesson learned here with the MOOC, is that there was the agreement between the Department of Justice and edX. And that was, I think, spring 2015. And specifically in that agreement-- and I remember reading this at the time. It said, "Develop a guide for content providers entitled, 'Accessibility Best Practices Guidance for Content Providers.'" To which I said wow, this is great. When these guys get this thing done, this could be a real go-to resource.

And indeed it is. I don't think every campus needs to develop their own comprehensive guidance documents for accessibility of online course content, is that edX has really generated a really great one. Certainly each campus needs to have some sort of website and contact for people that need help with this. But I like, as far as a really comprehensive guidance doc, I would like pointing folks to that edX document.

Another thing that came out of the environmental scan was that we were using Kurzweil at all four campuses, that we really had kind of a variety of different licenses. One campus had two licenses. One had 10. The two others had 30. And it's this idea-- you know, I think in every case we were considering, can we grow this?

So we were in touch with the Kurzweil folks, and they were really great because they offered us a consortia rate. So by saying that we're all going in on this together, it was a reduced price, kind of volume purchase. And it really helped us make this decision to go campus-wide.

So for participating campuses we went campus-wide. And this really is apples and oranges where we went from counting licenses and saying, we've got 10 licenses. You register with Disability Services, et cetera. Now we pretty much have, we've got universal access to these literacy tools for all community members on these campuses regardless of ability or disability

or self-identification. So this was, I think, a really big win.

Also, environmental scan revealed we were conducting captioning. We have captioning programs on each of the four schools, but we wanted to consider growing those. So we talked to some vendors. And specifically we talked to 3Play Media that also gave us a nice consortia rate.

We went in with all four schools. All four of the schools of this program are using 3Play Media. And we have a consortia rate. And we're doing really well with this. I think we've really advanced this. And we've increased budgets to address this, which is a big challenge and concern. But I think we're doing really well with this.

I'll say just from my perspective, working on four campuses with 3Play and captioning is, it's really easy. With one log in, I can see the work of all four schools. And I just have to say, they have a really nice interface and this has been a real plus with advancing our captioning programs.

One last thing under instructional materials is, there was this idea with the four schools, can we share our old formats, and do we set up a repository? What's involved with labor? There's some really nice, really excellent national repositories. And do we really need for all four small liberal arts colleges a repository?

And what we came up with is we can just share lists. We don't necessarily need a repository. We're all in contact through a listserv. We can come up just with spreadsheets of all formats generated in any given semester and we can share those documents amongst our schools.

So the procurement subcommittee-- it's an interesting subcommittee for a number of reasons. One is, it doesn't necessarily have to meet, I think, so often. But it certainly does have to meet. Certainly initial meetings of this is where you really ask these questions.

And I have them up here. Identify the procurement workflows, which really vary campus to campus. And you ask these questions of who receives purchase requests, who signs contracts. That's a really big one, because the person who signs the contracts is likely the person in charge of inserting-- we have an EIT accessibility contract clause for all four schools. And so this is a big role is who signs contracts and who addresses that accessibility clause. And then also this question of how are enterprise services acquired, and at what point in that process is accessibility on the agenda of the acquisition of enterprise services?

So this is ongoing on different campuses as we address different workflows. And it's great because there's work we need, but we're also in contact just through email and other channels to make sure we're all on board as we develop these programs for how we're addressing accessibility and procurement.

So that's the committee. I'll tell you when I first arrived though-- I'm on to number two here. It says, create vendor questionnaire. A lot of people were asking, they said, "Rob, what can I do? I want to purchase something. I don't even know the questions to ask."

So we made this question. I worked with people on more than one campus. And so let's just take a look at this guy right here, handout number two. It's a list of questions for vendors.

Now, there's more comprehensive programs. And our programs are more comprehensive than this. But this is just a great document, to me, that any individual that is working with a vendor can initiate the conversation by providing this list of questions. So we see the questions. There are six of them.

Do you have a VPAT, voluntary product accessibility template? Tell us about your accessibility exceptions. Describe your accessibility conformance testing process. Do you have an accessibility roadmap? Does your company have an accessibility mission statement? And what is the name and contact information where we can direct questions about accessibility?

So what's also great about this is that by using multiple schools, one school might submit this to a vendor and they say, oh, yeah, we've got to do this for this school. But right now we've got all four schools are using this. And I know it's not just us in the consortium. There's schools all across the country that have similar type documents or that are working with vendors with these same questions. I think the vendors are really starting to get it, that this is important. This can make or break a decision on what is procured. So I think this is just very effective. The more this is used, the more effect it has.

So also the last item there for the procurement subcommittees that comes up with these questions were like, especially small liberal arts colleges, do we have the capacity for accessibility testing? And the answer is that can be challenging. So we currently have some proposed budgets for accessibility testing where we say, well, we really want, if we're going to make accessibility part of our workflow for enterprise service acquisition, we need to make sure we've got something in the budget then for testing of products before they're fully kind of

procured.

The third of our three subcommittees is the web accessibility subcommittee. And something I knew I wanted from the start with the web accessibility program-- there's a program at each of the four schools-- is that I wanted some sort of automated testing tool. So I know testing tools, we know they don't catch more than 40% of, say, possible accessibility errors. So they're not a complete tool. It's a component of a web accessibility program.

But what they do really well to me is they measure what I call relative accessibility, which is, really, if you scan 100 URLs and then sort by your number of errors, you find out what URLs or what websites might need the most attention, just relative to the others. And the other way I use it for relative accessibility is over time. If I do a scan in October and then work on some remediation, and then do another scan three months later, another quarterly scan, is I can document how much we fixed. We can document our remediation at that point.

So I'm aware of tools. We looked at tools. Some are \$10,000. Some are \$20,000. Some are \$30,000. And just kind of pricey, and also I wasn't able to get a consortia rate for any of the tools. So it was just going to be tool times four as far as cost. So I remember back four or five years ago, Jared Smith of WebAIM had given a presentation talking about introducing the WebAIM WAVE API, the application program interface, for their WAVE toolbar. You can use their browser toolbar or extension.

And so this sparked my interest. I don't have the ability to write. So what this needs is this needs an interface. You need a computer programmer to write an interface for this API.

So luckily, thankfully Hampshire College stepped up, one of our four participating schools, and contributed a developer, Vince Abruzzo, who just did an excellent job creating this interface for the WebAIM WAVE API. So we have this tool. It's an open source tool on GitHub. And so this is what we're using now to run and generate reports for web accessibility.

So I do have a handout, handout number three. Let's take a look at that. It's just kind of some quick notes on this tool. So I'm not going to read through this all. I'm just going to point out some important parts.

This first one, this says, basically the tool is free, but you need credits from WebAIM. And those are about \$0.03 apiece. That's what a credit costs is \$0.03 apiece. However, if you go to WebAIM, when you register, you get 100 free credits, which allows you to tinker with this tool.

So I think that's pretty great.

I will say here, this paragraph says, this is up on GitHub. And a feature of GitHub is that a fully functional demo is available up on that website. So this is where I use it. We could have an implementation locally, but I just use the one up on the GitHub site.

So some things to know about this tool is basically it can do summary scans or detailed scans. And I usually do both, which comes out to about \$0.06. That's two credits. It can scan about a hundred sites in about 60 seconds. Now this is really great because if you use the WAVE toolbar or Chrome extension is you know that you can only scan one site at a time. And so this is great. You can scan multiple sites.

Now here's the real really important bullet, number three, is you can generate reports of the summary or summary detailed results. So this is really super because we want to generate reports. So the reports you can generate in CSV, JSON, or HTML. I really like the HTML because I can bring that into a spreadsheet program like Excel and then kind of just work with the data, whether that's sorting or other things. Plus by generating a report is we can then share the results with website owners.

And then we can share the results and direct them to the free Chrome extension, which if you've used it, you know it's a great training tool. That's probably half of what we want in a web accessibility program is training. We want to measure accessibility and we also want training and remediation. So by sending results to folks and then have them-- they've got access to this free tool, the Chrome extension. It helps them fix accessibility errors and learn about web accessibility.

So the link was there in the handout. I also put it up here in the slide. But what I want to say here at the bottom is, so part of our plan, our phase 1 plan, was that we wanted to run a top 100 URLs, top highest impact URLs. And the way we did this was-- we did it two ways. We compiled two lists. We made one list was, we did a Google Analytics scan that pretty much showed us what are the highest amount of page views-- what are the sites with the highest amount of page views?

And then we also made a second list that I like to call the thinky list where you think about it and say, what's a site that might not get the highest amount of page views but it's really important that it's accessible? So for example, disability services. Their website might not get the highest amount of page views, but certainly the accessibility of that site is really important.

So we made this list and we're doing this on multiple campuses of the top 100. Usually it comes after more than a hundred because we have trouble agreeing on a hundred. But what we're going to do, we're going to take a look at this. Hopefully this isn't too hard to follow. I'm going to jump around a little bit between Windows here.

So this is the tool as it exists at GitHub. So what I can say here is that you choose either summary or detailed. You put in your WAVE API. You put in your list of URLs here. So there's our list of a hundred URLs. And then you hit Scan.

Now I will say a really nice feature that Vince built into this is, I've got my recent results here that I can call up. So this is kind of like the Cooking Channel. I've put all this in. I actually didn't put in an API. But I make believe I'm saying scan URLs. And boom, there's my result.

So this was our first baseline scan at Hampshire. The folks at Hampshire said, yeah, sure, Rob, you can share this. This is all about learning.

So here's our list. And you can see these familiar categories-- errors, alerts, features, structures, HTML5 and ARIA and contrast. And these are these familiar results that you're used to getting one page at a time with the Chrome extension. But here we are, we've got a report.

Now what's really great, too, here, though, is we go to export report. And here's where I can choose from my three file types. I choose HTML. I go in here and I call my-- I'll call it cooking channel, because this is kind of, at this point, you're going to see, this is a little bit of make-believe. There, cooking channel. I save my HTML. And I will open it now into Excel. And look at that, it's already nice formatted and nice.

So that was the cooking channel, meaning that this file already exists. I also pared it down to just the top 10 instead of a top 100. But you get the idea that you can pull this into a spreadsheet file. We've got our summary here. And then you've got your detailed results down below that you can share. What I want to do, especially with a list of 100, but I do it with 10 here, is-- and I've already done it-- is I have a tab that sorts these URLs by errors. We can get into alerts and we can get into these other features. But for phase one we're focused on errors.

So what we do is, we share these results. And then we have a remediation plan for three

months. And then three months later, we go back. And what we'll see here is then I have the results just from last week. And these are from-- so these are recent results for the same list, summary and detailed. And what you can see here is-- this is really exciting-- is, boy, we see a bunch of zeros where we didn't see zeros before, and some ones.

So basically when I pull these into my spreadsheets and tally all this up, what we found is we have over a 50% reduction in detected errors in our first quarter, which to me is really exciting. It's funny, I told the folks at Hampshire about this, and they were a little disappointed. They said, wow, we thought we did even better. But this is just great. I'm really happy about this. So now we're on to the next quarter, next quarter of remediation, and we'll address these things.

So I just want to give kind of maybe an example of what it would be like. We say we look at the academic calendar that came up with the highest number of errors in our baseline scan. That had seven. Now it's down to three.

Let's see what it would be like if we contact that person, and they click. They go to their site. And now here it is. This is the W, this is the free, this is the WAVE Chrome extension. They can click on there, and we tell them they have three errors. They get the same results. They go here, they say ah, look at that, we've got three times multiple form labels.

And you click on these over here on the left panel. You say OK, where are that? There they are. And they say, boy, but what does that mean? And they can click on it and just say more information. And there we go. They say what it means, why it matters, how to fix the algorithm in English.

So I really like this process. And I will say running, scanning a hundred URLs cost us \$6. So I don't think that's cost prohibitive. So this is working out really well. And you can see how this is a nice training tool. I should point out down here too, you can also, for the developers, they can look at the code of where these errors have been identified.

So this is it. This is kind of the first phase of our web accessibility program is that we developed this open source tool.

I should mention, I sat down with Jared Smith both in November and March to talk about this. He's seen this [INAUDIBLE] tool and talk about it. And he said he really likes it, and that he's very interested in this idea-- right now we're using the API server in Utah, I expect, at WebAIM, and this idea that we could have local servers. And at that point if we had local services, we

wouldn't be counting APIs. You'd just have unlimited scans.

So he's very interested in moving forward with this. I know there's licensing challenges he's addressing. But the bottom line is what he's hoping to do-- and we'll see-- is just make something like a local API server with unlimited scans available at a very, very, very affordable price. So the best I can say there is, stay tuned.

So now we have our top 10 list of lessons learned in the first year of our EIT accessibility programs. So I'd like to start-- with any good top 10 list, start with number 11. I don't have a slide for it. I just want to throw it out there. As part of any campus-wide EIT accessibility program, you want to have training and awareness. And something that all four schools did-- and I'm really excited about this-- is they all registered for the virtual access group rate for the Accessing Higher Ground conference, which really is the premier conference for technology accessibility in higher education.

So this is great, is I submitted a lists of everyone on our tech access committees and everyone on our subcommittees for all four campuses have access to all the virtual, all the captured sessions for that conference. And that conference really is the latest, greatest information presented by national experts. So I really like this lesson learned number 11.

So on to number 10. Consider conducting a contract inventory. I think this is an interesting one. I wouldn't have thought of it. But talking to the persons or people that sign contracts is, I heard a story about a contract shows up on someone's desk and it says, we need this renewed by tomorrow. Well, this person in charge contracts looks at it, says the accessibility clause isn't in there and we need to get it in there, needs to work with the vendor.

So the idea of this person was, we don't need to wait until the last minute. We don't need to wait until renewal day. We could go back, do a survey or an inventory of our contracts, see which contracts do and don't have our EIT accessibility clause, and then pick the ones that don't and engage the vendors well in advance before the renewal date. So I thought this was a really good lesson learned.

Number 9, this one's kind of a little pie in the sky here. Continue to press for national sharing of vendor accessibility testing results. This comes a lot at conferences and listservs, just this idea of, boy, we're doing so much redundant work. Some campuses are really pouring some resources into accessibility testing, but they're just not able to share the results for a variety of reasons right now. So all I can say is it would be really great. We should continue pressing.

And it would be really great if we could do some better sharing of accessibility testing results.

Number 8, prioritize the future. Focus accessibility evaluations on procurement. This is kind of part opinion, but I also think if you think about the ADA and physical accessibility, I think there's a focus or priority on new construction and renovations. And if you look at the 508 refresh that really recently here, again, there's kind of a safe harbor for legacy, static websites where, in both those cases, I think they're saying focus on the future.

And so I really like this idea. You're going to have finite resources and you have to set priority. By saying let's stop buying broken things, especially broken new cool things, is to address that before we go address some legacy website that might not be getting a whole lot of hits. And I'm not saying we don't-- it's still an important part of our campus program. But I think lesson learned is that you have to set priorities. And I will say they're different on all four campuses. And they're all a good list of priorities.

So number 7, evaluate how EIT accessibility overlaps/interfaces with campus strategic plans. I really like this one. This one I've used actually for years now, is you can look at a strategic plan approved by the highest level of an institution, and it's something you can point to when working with someone else or advocating for change or just IT accessibility to say look, this is in the strategic plan that says inclusion and diversity are a priority. So this is really, I think, powerful. And it's really interesting.

One of our campuses with a new strategic plan in its current budget cycle actually requires, if you are going to propose a budget for anything new, you have to point to the strategic plan and say how is this supporting this strategic plan. So they've actually built it into their budget proposal process right now.

It's also worth noting, I was lucky enough to be involved in generating an IT strategic plan at one campus. And that's just a great opportunity. If you can be part of that team where you get to basically advocate and say, look, let's make sure we get the word accessibility in there a bunch, and that can be really powerful then, down the road where you can use that.

Number 6, generate and utilize an EIT accessibility roadmap and partner priorities document. So this is a handout. This is an Excel file that we've used. We've really kind of developed it. Let me see if I can increase that real estate a little-- yes.

So what we see here is, I made this roadmap basically by reading a lot of resolution

agreements, and then also my experience working with canvasses and figuring out, what do we need to get done? So you can see on the left column there, we see our kind of categories. We've got policy. We've got committee and group. We've got program.

But then you also see, I kind of get a little deeper down with some specifics. What is the technical standard here on policy mechanisms for ongoing review? This one, clearly important consequences for nonconformance to the policy where we saw University of California system has a really great IT accessibility policy. But one of their campuses kind of got called out just with a question about whether their free content they were making available beyond their campus was indeed accessible.

So let's look down here with your group. Are your meetings being recorded? Also, do you have regular meeting frequency? It's really important to have the regular meeting frequency as opposed to just saying, oh, let's see when we can meet each month. So this has been a really great document to have.

So we can move on to these four columns, which are the four colleges. Now again, this is erroneous data. This has nothing to do with what's going on at the schools now. But this shows you what we can put in each box. We have a green box marked "DONE." We have a yellow box marked "In Process." We have a blue box marked "Hold," a red box marked "Road Block." And then a double dash means "not started."

Now I will say I didn't come up with these words. Those came up with conversations with IT leadership at more than one campus. But the one I want to point out is the Road Block is a really powerful one. I don't want to use it too much, but what that is is that's kind of a call to the CIO to say, there's something here we need help with that either I individually or our campus tech access committee can't get done. And it's basically a call for help. It's saying, we need your help on this. And that's what Road Block means in that case.

So another thing we're saying is if you were to see this, the real version of this, you'd see something that is not so uniform. You'd see green and yellow and blue and red boxes scattered around, and then the words scattered around. And it's really great is that any given college can see what the other colleges are doing. And I think there's some sort of incentive there to say, oh, look, this college has this done. It's an incentive to say, oh, look, this is doable. We can do this.

And also then, like with policy, we're sharing language among campuses. Not all four

campuses have to start from scratch. So if Hampshire has their policy up, they've got a done green box, and the other schools can say, oh, we can pull at that. We can use that as, perhaps, a starting point or model.

OK, on to number 5, develop resources and staff allocation. This has been a big one for-- this has been a growing field. For 10 years for me, this has been a challenge is resources and staff. And so specifically, I refer to down at the bottom with this equation, the EIT accessibility rate, where we ask the question, how fast are we addressing the challenges? Is it the rate we want? And the rate-- I came up with this equation-- equals expertise times labor. Specifically I threw the word "growing" at the beginning of that equation so I could get a really cool acronym at the bottom there, my GEITAR. The GEITAR equals E times L.

I think we're doing an excellent job with expertise. I mean, we've created my position. And the committees and subcommittees are all really engaged and really interested in learning as much as possible. I think we're doing a really good job with labor. But it is kind of an ongoing challenge. If we have more labor, we can increase our accessibility rate.

Number 4, address if/how EIT accessibility is represented on the IT org chart. I wouldn't have necessarily thought of this, but during the environmental scan I saw that it indeed was on one of the org charts. And I thought to myself, well, this is a great idea.

Some people ask, "Is it important?" I said, "Yeah, I think this is important." I think this sends a message to your IT department that EIT accessibility is important. It sends a message to your campus. And it also sends a message to individuals and departments outside of your campus that might want to kind of just come to your website and see that EIT is indeed a priority and on your org chart.

So number 3, present a charge for a campus technology access committee to be approved by the highest level of the campus, president or president's cabinet officers. This is another one I was asking, is it necessary? And I think, absolutely. This is one of the most important things. This is a super lesson learned.

And so let's look. We have a sample charge here. Let's find it. So this is just kind of a template sample charge that we have used in our program. And I just want to point out something. So it's a charge to create a campus-wide accessibility committee. And you see right here, this is a really important line. It says here, appointed by the president and cabinet.

So what this means is when we're doing the work of this committee is we can go to anyone on campus and say to them, say "Look, no one is above this. We have a mandate from the president to address this." So this is really powerful.

I want to just kind of highlight a couple more verbs that we really spent some time with. We have "coordinates." We have "charged with developing," and "will develop the capacity." Now in these cases, the committee is not going to get all the work done. The committee works on goals and strategies, and then makes proposals on how to move forward and get things done. So it's important to say that the committee doesn't get it all done. The committee works out how to get it done.

So this is a two pager. I just want to highlight a couple of other things that are really great to have in the charge. We have the authority to consult with college counsel. We can recommend and develop plans to use consultants. And then here's a really big one. This one's pretty awesome. The committee shall develop a budget. So this is really just super. This shows that we have the full support of the institution for this committee.

And so again, this is a Word doc. You can take it. You can run with it. I hope you can get this up to the highest levels of your institution if you don't have a charge already for campus-wide tech access committee.

So number 2, generate, approve, and disseminate an IT accessibility policy. So whether it's a lesson learned or simply resolution agreement 101, this really, it's often the first item listed in a resolution agreement is that you have to have an IT accessibility policy. The challenge with this is that it's hard.

On any given campus-- so I've worked on multiple campuses. And the idea, the process, the workflow to generate, approve, and disseminate an IT accessibility-- or just a policy, it can be very challenging. And it might not even be set out what the right workflow is. So I think that's a big part of the challenge, because I know there's a lot of enthusiasm. I will say that this idea of an IT accessibility policy has really risen to be a real top priority right now in our programs.

So I do want to kind of go here is, this was specifically-- Hampshire College indeed does have their IT accessibility policy up on the web. And this is really great. This was approved by the highest level of the institution. So I share this also because I want to share the model. I really like this model. This is basically what we have is kind of a brief policy.

So this first paragraph, it basically says, we're going to make our IT accessible because it's the right thing to do and because it's the law. And then our second paragraph says, and so we're going to do this. And I'll say, specifically it refers to we're going to do this in accordance with the accessibility standards. And when it's not feasible, we're going to have accommodations or modifications.

So what's really great is that it's very short. And then we have the accessibility standards are below, and those are longer. Now what we can do, though, is the accessibility standards are in the hands of the tech access committee. So what that means is that if we want to go from adopting WCAG 2.0 AA to WCAG 2.1 when it comes out, we don't have to change our policy. We can modify our standards to just, say, more robust standards.

And this is kind of fun. I think this is fun. When we look at the accessibility standards is you may note that specifically, they are divided up by the three categories of our subcommittees. So we have accessibility instruction materials, web accessibility, and procurement. So what we do is in each of these subcommittees where we're developing expertise and coming up with solutions, is those are the folks that are responsible for putting the information into these standards.

So we're just looking here at the procurement process. We see we've got the vendor/bidder questionnaire that I shared earlier. It says check with the IT accessibility working group. That's their campus tech access committee. There's a link to the contract clauses, where we have the EIT contract clauses, and then a way to just get help. So this is really big. I'm really excited that we have this at Hampshire. And we're well on our way at the other campuses to getting policies up also.

So here we go, number 1, top 10 list lesson learned. Now this, it is an oldie but goodie, and it's likely no surprise. I used to say executive sponsorship. Now I do refer to executive sponsorship and engagement. I call it sustained sponsorship where sponsorship might be, OK, here's a committee. Run with it. But what we really need is the ongoing engagement, the sustained sponsorship-- really critical to the success of any program.

And what I also have-- I'm going to share just three more slides here that kind of reinforce this concept. So this is some slide content from 2012. This was John Harwood from Penn State University presented at Educause. Penn State had a landmark IT accessibility agreement. And his number one lesson learned, in 2012, was you cannot develop and implement a university-

wide plan without executive sponsorship.

We also have here at Temple University, they've done an outstanding job with their campus-wide IT accessibility program. And Paul Paire led the charge there. And he's quoted here in this article as saying, "The greatest success factor at Temple was having the CIO be a strong leader on the effort."

And then one more slide to share. This is the University of Colorado Boulder folks. They presented at both AHEAD and Accessing Higher Ground in 2015. And again, this is their lesson learned. It's lesson learned number one, is you must have executive buy-in. The higher level your support, the better your chance of success.

So here we are. Here's our top 10 list. I'm going to just go through it really quickly.

Starting at the bottom, number 11 that we can't see, is register all your stakeholders with a group virtual access to the Accessing Higher Ground conference. Conduct a contract inventory. Advocate for national sharing of vendor EIT accessibility testing results. Prioritize the future. Evaluate strategic plans for EIT accessibility opportunities.

Use an EIT accessibility roadmap and partner priorities document. And that's where I shared a roadmap as an Excel file. Develop resources and staff. See if you can get EIT accessibility on your IT organizational chart.

Generate a charge and submit it to the highest level of the institution, a charge for a campus tech access committee. Generate and post an IT accessibility policy. And then executive sponsorship and engagement.

So that's the end of my slide deck here. So I believe I'm going to pass it back to Lily. And she'll take over as moderator.

LILY BOND: Thanks so much, Rob, for an amazing presentation. So Rob, the first question here is, I'm interested in your take on the Section 508 refresh. What should be revised to meet 508 first, public-facing content?

ROB EVELEIGH: Boy, you know, I hate to kind of dodge this question, but I just attended-- I just learned a little bit more about it Tuesday. And I plan on learning a lot more about it. It's going to be another year before it's fully implemented or that we need to comply with it. So I hate to say it is that I'm not prepared to answer questions about the 508 refresh. But actually if you can ask the

question again, maybe I can just-- regardless of the 508 refresh. What was the question?

LILY BOND: Just wondering what content should be prioritized, whether that should be public-facing content?

ROB EVELEIGH: Or nonpublic-facing content?

LILY BOND: Yeah, I would imagine.

ROB EVELEIGH: So what's hard is that we know it's all important, right? But, what we also know is we have to set priorities. So the priorities we have set is that-- I think this is safe to say, and maybe this is just my opinion-- is that education is the priority. So we're making sure that our main mission is to educate students. And so we make sure-- and whether that is publicly facing or not publicly facing, is that we are focused on the educational content.

That's not to say that we're not addressing accessibility of noneducational content. But as far as priorities, that's something that, in conversations, I think we discussed it that way.

LILY BOND: Thanks, Rob. A couple of questions about faculty. So how has faculty responded to this accessibility initiative? And do you have any advice on getting faculty buy-in?

ROB EVELEIGH: So two pieces here. One is actually, faculty buy-in is tough. Working with faculty can be tough. It can be very rewarding, and it also can be challenging.

Something that I think is really powerful-- so we had an IT accessibility committee at one campus. But when we broadened it to be considered fully campus-wide, that involved bringing in a representative from the dean of faculty's office. And I think this was a really huge thing.

This is a committee that meets every two weeks. And we've got someone from the dean of faculty's office there, who's really up to speed with this whole initiative. And then that person acts as the interface with faculty. So this is really great.

And that was going to be my second answer was to get the dean of faculty on board and to be a spokesperson for these initiatives. So I'd say, by having the charge that listed the membership and included faculty, and then getting that person on board and really able to interface with faculty has been really, really important.

LILY BOND: Great. Thanks, Rob. Another question here is, for your captioning program, who submits videos? Is it staff or is it faculty?

ROB EVELEIGH: Yep, very good question. I'm going to say, what's interesting is that the captioning program, we've got four different programs at four different schools. So I'd say we see a bit of a spectrum. I'd say in general is-- I can think of one campus where, in order to have video for the course and up in Moodle, is that interfaces through our library and information technologies department. And that's where the faculty can request that a video is captioned, simply as part of that workflow.

So it kind of goes down to the workflow. Idea is, how do you build it into the workflow? There are faculty that are game enough to try to build it into their workflow.

In other cases-- again, we've got four campuses-- is there are workflows where we have-- and we have captioning teams where we have got educational content. We've got things like communications and college relations where we have specific individuals that are kind of fluent. As great as the 3Play website is, it still takes a slight learning curve to use it, as with any piece of technology.

So I think we would like to get to the point where it's just kind of universal and that folks can work independently. But I think right now we're doing a lot of assistance in that workflow.

LILY BOND: Thanks, Rob. Another question here, so you mentioned that your position is new. How did the executive sponsorship originate at the Five College Consortium to develop this position?

ROB EVELEIGH: That's where I really think it was a multipronged proposal. There were folks talking back and forth. You have your disability services directors. You have your IT folks, and others, and risk and compliance. And simultaneously, three groups or more were reading about these resolution agreements and the Dear Colleague letter. And really what it came down to, I'd say Five Colleges played this critical role of being aware of the dialogue in these different committees and groups of people and pulling it all together to say, what's our best path?

I will say the best path-- and I see it in a lot of resolution agreements-- is through IT, specifically through the CIOs taking a leadership role on this. And then what was great was when the proposal there was to the group of CIOs is they then presented it to the president.

So I'd say it was-- yeah, I guess the answer is, it was both bottom up and top down. There was just a lot of conversation going. Everyone was aware. A lot of people were talking about this. And then Five Colleges played this crucial role in collecting everyone's thoughts, ideas on how to handle this, and what a good next step would be, which is the shared position.

LILY BOND: Great, thanks. Someone else is asking, with the WAVE tool that you demonstrated, are you able to scan URLs that exist on your LMS behind a firewall?

ROB EVELEIGH: So the answer to that right now is no. But what we're itching to get to is the point where we can have the WAVE API server on our own campus, and we might be able to set that up where we can set up scans like that. So until we get the opportunity to give that a whirl-- my understanding is it should work. It should work if we have the WAVE API server on our campus and we set up authentication to scan internal sites. But until we get a chance to do that, I can't say for sure yes. But I've been told yes.

LILY BOND: Thanks, Rob. Another question, who answered the questionnaire in your environmental scan of the colleges?

ROB EVELEIGH: That's a great question. Basically the way that worked is, I did the interviews and attended standing meetings. So I initially filled it out. I filled it out based on what I knew. And then I followed up with individual meetings, individual interviews with folks. I sent the questionnaire to them with the answers I put in. And then there was, I'd say, some robust editing, which is healthy.

And then even beyond that is it would go to individuals. But the questionnaire, we would bring it up at the tech access committee, in front of the whole group, and say, let's answer these questions collectively as a group. That was actually at the campuses that had a tech access committee at that point.

But so it was. It was where I initially filled it out, worked with individuals. And then it was put in front of groups of people. So I think it was a really good process. It was a fair amount of effort, the environmental scan. But I think it was a really good result, a really good snapshot. It let us know where we're at with all four schools.

LILY BOND: Thanks, Rob. A similar question, who does the charge work on each campus?

ROB EVELEIGH: Oh, who does the charge work, meaning-- so the charge I mentioned was a charge for the committee. The charge was to create the committee. So I'm going to say who does the charge work?

The charge was to create the committee. And then we have someone on each campus that is very much not me. You have someone with some authority on each campus, chairs our tech

access committees. And all four are doing a great job, I will say.

But as far as the charge work, I'm trying to think. They were charged to get the work done. That's where the committee come up-- so here is my answer.

If I were to say how does the work of the committee get done, well, we can use outside consultants for some work. We're talking about developing budgets. But we're also-- this is really important-- is that we're looking at a distributed model. We want to make addressing IT accessibility part of everyone's job. Actually, if you look at the roadmap, you can see it's actually one of my specific questions, is accessibility listed as a percentage of job descriptions?

So I think that probably best answers the question is that, who does the work is that we're trying to distribute it amongst everyone. Certainly the folks that are on each committee and subcommittee are doing most of the work. But as we move forward, we want to make sure that as many people as possible are doing the work.

LILY BOND: Thanks, Rob. And I think that that's a really nice note to end on. It is 2 o'clock now. So thank you so much for a really informative and wonderful presentation. It was much appreciated by everyone.

ROB EVELEIGH: Thanks for having me.

LILY BOND: And thank you to everyone who attended. You will receive an email tomorrow with a link to view the recording and the slide deck. And I hope that everyone has a wonderful rest of the day.