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# Slide 2:

Agenda

* Context
* Policy
* Enterprise Architecture Review Process
* IT Collaboration
* Trainings and support for implementation
* Q+A

# Slide 3: Context

Starting Point and Policy Work

# Slide 4: University Context

* Tufts University
* My Role
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# Slide 5: How we got buy in: Our Partners

* Tufts Technical Services (IT)
* General Counsel (legal)
* Library Staff
* Communications Staff
* Who created the following:
	+ Web Accessibility Working group
	+ Electronic/Information Technology Accessibility Committee

What people in your university would fill similar roles and partnerships?

# Slide 6: How we got buy in: The Mission

“Tufts is enriched by the many experiences and perspectives each individual member brings to our community. We are committed to providing every student, faculty and staff member with the best possible experience, regardless of their race, color… ability.”

-Tufts Strategic Theme: Diversity and Inclusion

# Slide 7: How we got buy in: Legal Landscape

* [ICT Refresh’s effects of Section 508](https://www.access-board.gov/guidelines-and-standards/communications-and-it/about-the-ict-refresh) (2017)
	+ Federal Guidance for Accessibility Standards
* [Changing Course: Ten Years of Tracking Online Education in the United States](http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/changingcourse.pdf)
	+ Trends, barriers, and approaches for MOOCs and digital resources
* [Online Nation: Five Years of Growth in Online Learning](http://www.babson.edu/Academics/Documents/babson-survey-research-group/online-nation.pdf)
	+ Growing popularity of online learning, considerations and barriers
* [Higher Ed Accessibility Lawsuits, Complaints, and Settlements](https://www.d.umn.edu/~lcarlson/atteam/lawsuits.html)
	+ Database for accessibility cases sorted by school

# Slide 8: How we got by in: The Proposal

* Accessible Digital Technology Policy (ADT)
	+ Addressed colleagues concerns

# Slide 9: Designing the Accessible Digital Technology Policy

Three protocols to implement the policy addressing particular concerns:

* Procurement
* Website Accessibility (including LMS and public facing)
* Centralized Captioning

# Slide 10: Procurement Protocol:

1. All RFPs for vendors have accessibility language.
2. All proposed products are reviewed by an accessibility team within TTS (each school will identify a point-person from TTS to conduct this testing).
3. TTS reports to Purchasing; Purchasing decides whether or not to purchase. (General Counsel and Student Accessibility Services provide Guidance if needed).
4. Appeals can be filed with the Chief Information Officer.

# Slide 11: Enterprise Architecture Review (Procurement Process)

Current Process and Development

# Slide 12: Enterprise Architecture Review

* Checks all purchases of more than $10,000 and/or any software that impacts large populations (all staff, all students, etc.)
* Verifies that they meet our standards on security, integration, compliance and how data & information is stored
* Had several questions about accessibility
	+ Though not often checked or understood by either side.

# Slide 13: Adding Accessibility in the Procurement Process

* Collected data by doing 6 months of testing
	+ Piggy backing of Enterprise Architecture Review Process
	+ Created an accessibility testing process
	+ Data on how it affects purchasing
	+ Time required
	+ Used data to justify:
	+ Add accessibility testing to the Enterprise Architecture Review
	+ Use a team of reviewers

[Image description: A cartoon pig playing in mud.]

# Slide 14: Downside of Piggybacking

* Inherit problems with the original system
	+ Not everyone goes through the Enterprise Architecture Review
	+ Some products are purchased before they get to the Enterprise Architecture Review
* The past purchases were not being checked more thoroughly for accessibility
	+ Checking for VPATs with no understanding
	+ Assuming accessibility
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# Slide 15: IT colleagues

Where they were, and where we are going

# Slide 16: Concerns

* Our IT Colleagues had a lot of worries, and do not want to be “the accessibility expert”
* Feel unprepared to make the call if a product is accessible or inaccessible
* Find the standard flexibility concerning
	+ Uncomfortable that there is not one “universal accessibility solution” for all people

# Slide 17: Support we provided

* Simplify to start, accessibility is a large field.
* Provide trainings
	+ Reference concrete resources ([WCAG 2.1 Understanding pages](https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/), [WebAim](https://webaim.org/intro/), [A11ycasts](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1yoOLhx_qA&list=PLNYkxOF6rcICWx0C9LVWWVqvHlYJyqw7g))
	+ Based on personal testing experience
	+ Followed up with a WebEx call for more context
* Provide moral support
* Discuss responsibility

# Slide 18: Procurement Protocol outcomes:

Three Possible outcomes:

1. Accessible
2. Not accessible, exception granted and an accessibility plan made
3. not accessible, no alternative option exists.

Testers do NOT deny a product from being purchased.

Legal takes their testing into advisement and makes the call.

# Slide 19: Trainings

* For testing accessibility in the Enterprise Architecture Review
	+ Includes testing instructions and a checklist
	+ Walk through of the Architecture Enterprise Review (provided in materials)
		- Include red-flags from my experience testing.
* When handing off the Enterprise Architecture Review, attended “Accessibility Support Group”
	+ 1 hour per a month, organized by the Accessibility Testing Lead

# Slide 20: Common Vendor Flags

* If a vendor says…
	+ “No one has ever asked if [product] is accessible before.”
	+ “No one has told us our [product] is inaccessible before.”
	+ “[Other College/University] has our product without it being accessible, it must be accessible enough.”

[Image description: A collection of different red flags]

# Slide 21: Checklist

* Instructions and Checklist for those new to testing to follow.
* Made to be used together to simplify WCAG 2.1 standards when performing a quick check.
	+ Often made to give a quick overview, not for a deep formal audit.

# Slide 22: Timeline

* Ideal timeline:
	+ A semester
* Actual timeline:
	+ Started August 2017
	+ Approved March 2018
	+ Implemented Spring 2018
		- Improved upon constantly
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# Slide 23: Questions?
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Thank you!

Kristen Dabney

Kristen.Dabney@tufts.edu