

Technology Accessibility Task Force

MARCH 1, 2018

MINUTES

PRESENT

JP Sherry, Kaitlyn Sherer, Katrina Harman, Gabe Ross, Mario Rodriguez, Dawn Pedersen, Julia Kehew, Albert Garcia, Tammy Montgomery, Greg Beyrer, Jena Trench, Marie Cooley, Melanie Dixon, Michael Poindexter, Gwyn Tracy, Nisha Beckhorn, Leslie Reeves, Marsha Reske, Tom Danford, and from CampusWorks, Nick Laudato and Barbara Frey (*via Video Call*)

ABSENT

Christina Ocrant, Monica Pactol, Yolanda Garcia-Gomez, Kevin Flash, Scott Crow, Gary Aguilar, Amy Brinkley, and Sue Slager, Angela Prelip.

1. Status and Update

JP welcomed the group back. He reiterated that at the January meeting the Task Force agreed to add one faculty member from each of the four colleges and thanked Gary for delivering. We were joined by two of the four new faculty members. Everyone introduced themselves and their role within the District.

JP updated the Task Force on the deliverables from the January meeting. First, JP, Gary, Jamey, and Carlos have discussed the page selection process and have agreed on an anonymous review. CampusWorks will only reveal the accessibility issues that they find and will not reveal the college, faculty, or course information. We hope to negotiate a memorandum of understanding to be signed by the District and LRCFT in the next few weeks, so we can start the review process. Second, as previously shared, because of the State Technology Audit, we need to document the process by which we will respond to anyone who uses the accessibility link on the web pages. We are in the process of finalizing the written procedure for this. Lastly, JP charged the group with sending in the names of students and/or faculty members with disabilities that can assist us by sharing their input on accessibility issues and how we might remediate them.

2. Approve January Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the January meeting were sent out to the Technology Accessibility Task Force prior to the March meeting and were also an attachment to the agenda. The minutes were approved by consensus.

3. CampusWorks' Interviews and Page Selection

CampusWorks has conducted thirty-seven (37) interviews to date. Since their last update in January, they have heard two reoccurring themes: (1) there is a desire for accessibility training for faculty; and (2) there is an interest in communicating the issue of accessibility throughout the district.

CampusWorks has conducted an automated scan of over 29,000 webpages and over a million links using PowerMapper and SortSite. These automated scans suggest there may be issues with broken links, accessibility, browser compatibility, W3C Standards, and usability. Dawn expressed concerns about the accuracy of the scan results. JP stressed that the goal of the Task Force is not to point fingers or assign blame, but to work towards widespread accessibility within the District. Also, we are only in the automated stages of the website review process. The next step will be to conduct a manual, detailed analysis of the pages with the most traffic and accessibility issues according to the automated scans. JP assured the group that because of the volume of webpages and links that CampusWorks has reviewed, there are bound to be some accessibility issues. JP requested that Nick send the details from the automated scans, so they could be shared.

4. Draft Accessibility Statement

Nick explained to the Task Force that the idea for the Accessibility Statement is to have it regularly linked on the website and routinely shared with staff, students and faculty. The Task Force recommended adding a fourth paragraph to cover employees with disabilities. It was also suggested that because the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) are continuously updated, language should be added to ensure that our reference to WCAG remains accurate.

5. Draft Accessibility Program

JP reiterated that we will have three levels of documentation concerning accessibility. The first will be the Board Policy, which is a broad statement where the Board says what the District has to do. The second is the Chancellor's Regulation, which is how the District will implement the Board Policy. The third level will be the written procedures that will contain more detail about the accessibility practices. JP recommended that our policy contain a scope, definitions of key terms, standards and guidelines, and a statement on technology procurement. It was agreed that the draft policy CampusWorks presented would be posted on Google Docs for the Task Force to edit. It was further agreed upon that we would first build a policy that, once complete, would then shape our regulation.

6. Talking Points

JP restated that one of the Task Force's key responsibilities is to inform students, staff, and faculty about the issue of accessibility and to make the case in favor of ensuring good design to provide materials that are accessible to all of our students, faculty, and staff, and also to members of the public where that is appropriate. To assist the Task Force, Gabe created talking points. Gabe explained the purpose of the Technology Accessibility Task Force Talking Points as the framework for the conversations we have with faculty, staff and students about accessibility issues. They are meant to be a living document and will develop and change as we go. A few recommendations from the group were made about using positive language and adjusting some of the language.

7. Next Meeting Items

JP thanked everyone for their commitment to the Task Force and stated that we are steadily moving forward toward our shared goal of accessibility.

Before the next meeting, CampusWorks will conduct interviews with the new Task Force faculty members. Prior to our April meeting, the Task Force will provide the names of any students and/or faculty members with disabilities who the Task Force could listen to and learn from. Marsha will confirm whether any of our outreach centers have a DSPS office and will report back. Lastly, the Task Force will provide their insight on the accessibility policy via Google Docs by March 23.

At the next meeting we will discuss in more detail what the Task Force believes our policy exceptions (i.e., fundamental altercations, student generated content) should be. We will also discuss the accessibility policy in more detail after the Task Force has given their input.