

## **Year 2 Instructional Materials Accessibility Report - Due August 15, 2008**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Section 508 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act (as amended in 1998), the California State University Coded Memorandum AA-2007-04 requires annual reporting of the implementation of the Accessible Technology Initiative by all CSU campuses. This report focuses Priority Two: Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan (IMAP), due August 15, 2008.

The topics identified in this form address your original plan from 2007 and provide a narrative description of your progress as well as obstacles in achieving your goals. The sub-bullets for each question should serve as prompts for areas that may be missing or need to be expanded upon in your plan. An appendix is provided that shows a mapping from the January 2008 IMAP main topics to this Year 2 IMAP Report.

Please provide updates to your original plan, reporting on significant tasks that were completed; what you expect to accomplish next year; areas of difficulty and barriers to completion; and any comments on your observations and discoveries. You may provide any attachments that you believe are relevant to this report.

**1. Timely Adoption – Specifically focusing on scope of materials and late-hire strategy**

**In addition to textbooks, how will your campus ensure timely adoption of all print based instructional material: Syllabi, Course packets, online notes, texts, assignments, e-Reserves, and media?**

**What are ALL the print based instructional materials used in your classes?**

**How do you handle print based instructional materials that are produced just-in-time for class?**

**How are late hired lecturers included in your process?**

**Are hiring policies interfering with timely adoption of materials?**

1a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008

Our two biggest achievements related to textbook accessibility are:

1. Campus-wide implementation of the online requisition system.
2. Finalizing the procedure we defined in our 07-08 IMAP. It was finalized with the support of the AVP of Undergraduate Studies and the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

Also, the continuing partnership with the bookstore and DRC has helped achieve extraordinary results in terms of timely completion of conversion requests. The timeliness rate for Spring 08 quarter increased to 98% from a previous 80-85 percent.

We use a variety of the print materials mentioned in classes. The DRC works with the faculty member to produce alternate materials prior to or immediately following the class only in those cases where a student is registered with the DRC. The faculty member also has access to equipment and staff support in DRC & I&IT Learning. We have also trained faculty to produce it themselves through various workshops.

The textbook procedures state that the department chair will select the text if there is a late-hire.

Late hire faculty are a result of last minute change in enrollment and/or budget availability - Neither of which always provide advance notice. Text book procedures did account for late-hire faculty by asking department chairs to adopt a standard text. However, there are times when departments have trouble following it due to unique circumstances.

<p>1b. Plans for 2008/2009</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved version of TextReq online by the start of Fall quarter, and department contacts trained on it by the Winter quarter requisitions due date</li> <li>2. Publicizing the new campus procedure to all colleges and departments with reinforcement from the deans/assoc. deans, in time for the Winter due date</li> <li>3. ATI checklist will be distributed to lecturers along with their contract appointment letter. This checklist provides guidelines for what faculty need to do to comply with ATI such as creating accessible materials and meeting deadlines.</li> </ol>
<p>1c. Barriers to completion</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Late hiring and assignment is still the biggest barrier for timely textbook adoption.</li> <li>2. Not all instructional materials are identified. There may be materials used by faculty that aren't following the campus policy for purchasing the book on campus or using e-reserve. At times faculty will use course materials that aren't shared with the bookstore or e-reserve. However there is no way of knowing what it is and whether it is accessible. Right now, faculty who are using these "alternative" sources tend to just submit their requisitions as "no textbook required" which is technically true but not really informative.</li> <li>3. Some faculty lack understanding for the correlation between classroom accommodations and preparing in advance... 504 versus 508.</li> <li>4. Getting faculty involvement in using the available resources (training, 1:1 support, etc.)</li> <li>5. Lack of resources to provide additional support and tools to faculty in how to create accessible materials.</li> </ol>

1d. Observations/discoveries	Once faculty “get it” about the impact their timeliness or lack thereof has on both accessibility and affordability, they really do want to cooperate and get their information ready on time. The problem is getting to that “ah-ha” moment with them – it is difficult to get faculty's attention with distributed information like flyers/memos/group emails. In-person presentations to small groups, like the one we gave to department chairs at each college about the bookstore/DRC partnership, were more effective, but it’s hard to scale that. We believe that we will gain more ground by adopting the strategy of “targeting” the STEM disciplines and trying to get buy-in from key faculty in those areas who can then be models for their colleagues.
<p><b>2. Process – Details/ Personnel/ Calendar for Initiative</b></p> <p><b>Who, what, where, when and how?</b></p> <p><b>What people / positions will implement the pieces: administrators, Senate and Council chairs, department chairs?</b></p> <p><b>What responsibilities are assigned to governance bodies and departments?</b></p> <p><b>Which revenue centers are involved: divisions, units, colleges?</b></p> <p><b>What is the integrated timeline? Accomplished at regularly scheduled meetings, special events, retreats, internal deadlines?</b></p> <p><b>How are individual tasks being done?</b></p> <p><b>What is your global strategy in detail?</b></p>	
2a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Resources have not changed since last year's report except for the addition of an AT Coordinator and AT Training Coordinator.</p> <p>Funding was received from the President's Cabinet in addition to resources committed from I&amp;IT, Student Affairs, Faculty Center, Procurement, Public Affairs, and Administrative Affairs.</p> <p>Related timeline is within our IMAP.</p> <p>Our 06-07 IMAP provides a description of our global strategy. The Steering Committee is reviewing &amp; revising tasks as we learn &amp; discover new things.</p>
2b. Plans for 2008/2009	Related timeline is within our 06-07 IMAP (dated 10/2007)
2c. Barriers to completion	Resources and time to work within organizational structure and to support one-on-one needs.

2d. Observations/discoveries	In 07-08 we created an ambitious plan that in reality was difficult to implement due to transitions in key positions and lack of resources (e.g., people's time). We are now reviewing more frequently on a quarterly basis so that we can make adjustments based on resources, feedback, etc.
<p><b>3. Identification Resources and Allocation Commitments</b></p> <p><b>What resources are currently dedicated to the provision of alternative instructional materials for students with disabilities?</b></p> <p><b>What additional resources are committed to make all instructional materials accessible?</b></p> <p><b>What budget allocations for the implementation of your IMAP were allocated in 07-08?</b></p> <p><b>What allocations are committed for fiscal years 08-09 and 09-10?</b></p> <p><b>Please, include captioning, multimedia costs and faculty training. If budget for the ATI is not part of the 08-09 and 09-10 budget commitment, why?</b></p> <p><b>How is the ATI budget managed on your campus?</b></p>	
3a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>DRC has 2 staff positions and several student assistants plus 6 workstations dedicated to alternate media production.</p> <p>Our 06-07 ATI budget includes student assistance for web monitoring, and faculty support. The budget also included scanning and captioning equipment.</p> <p>Other resource commitments from their respective divisions include I&amp;IT Learning (captioning, faculty training/support), Faculty Center (accessibility training, UDL communities), Library e-reserve (scanning equipment), and DRC (scanning support, instructional material assessment &amp; remediation support).</p> <p>ATI budget includes: DRC production specialist position has been dedicated to STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) related instructional materials, AT coordinator, and AT training coordinator.</p>
3b. Plans for 2008/2009	Advanced strategies for dealing with complex subjects (e.g., STEM)
3c. Barriers to completion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Resources and money</li> <li>2. Faculty not taking advantage of available resources</li> <li>3. As we realize the complexity involved in ensuring the accessibility of instructional materials, we lack advanced strategies for those complex situations (e.g., STEM).</li> </ol>

3d. Observations/discoveries	<p>Once they get the "ah-ah" moment, faculty respond better to one-on-one and just-in-time resources &amp; tools.</p> <p>The ability to transfer newly learned accessibility strategies to other accessibility challenges (e.g., MathSpeak for Chemistry formulas).</p> <p>Troubleshooting for complex circumstances takes time and specialized skills.</p>
<p><b>4. Institutional Policies &amp; Procedures that support the ATI through curriculum and personnel reviews</b></p> <p><b>What policies and procedures were adopted for Textbook and other Print Based Instructional Materials?</b></p> <p><b>Is a Pre-registration Process in policy?</b></p> <p><b>Is your campus planning an accessibility assessment in the Periodic Review of Academic Programs?</b></p> <p><b>Is accessibility assessment part of General Education Certification and Recertification?</b></p> <p><b>Is production of accessible content an element faculty satisfaction of roles and responsibilities?</b></p> <p><b>Does inclusion of students with disabilities currently have a place in retention, tenure and promotion evaluations?</b></p> <p><b>Is production of accessible materials part of the faculty evaluation relating to instructionally related activities, service or scholarship?</b></p> <p><b>Have you provided reassigned time to encourage the implementation of accessible instructional materials?</b></p>	
4a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Textbook procedure adopted to allow for early deadlines to accommodate alternative media requests with the publisher and DRC production times. Books for temp faculty are selected by the department chair.</p> <p>Students are prescribed early registration by the DRC based on their need for alternate media. Pre registration requests are submitted to the Academic Senate, along with other requests, for approval.</p> <p>Production of accessible materials is a specific focus in the faculty evaluation.</p> <p>Reassigned time is not offered but faculty have expressed interest. Stipends have been offered as part of UDL faculty learning communities.</p>

4b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Broaden the communication of the textook adoption procedure (e.g., include a flyer with the mailing of faculty contracts).</p> <p>Submit a referral to Academic Senate for integrating the requirement of ATI IMAP in the campus curriculum guide and new course proposal process.</p>
4c. Barriers to completion	<p>There is no accessibility assessment in the periodic review of academic programs. Accessibility assessment is not part of the GE certification and recertification process.</p> <p>Currently, inclusion of students with disabilities is not a specific focus in the retention, tenure &amp; promotion evaluations. Colleges &amp; departments determine RTP process.</p> <p>Length of time required to process academic procedure &amp; policy changes</p> <p>Time &amp; resources to develop and guide items through the Academic Senate</p>
4d. Observations/discoveries	<p>CSU ATI needs more understanding for the process &amp; procedures related to union requirements.</p>
<p><b>5. Commitments from All Stakeholders</b></p> <p><b>How do stake holders participate in the ATI planning process?</b></p> <p><b>How have you extended the ATI from planning groups within the administration and governance bodies of faculty &amp; students to the broader community of faculty, staff members &amp; administrators?</b></p> <p><b>How are these grassroots stakeholders participating in the ATI?</b></p>	
5a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Our steering committee represents the major stakeholders on campus. We have also outreached to Academic Senate, department &amp; college meetings, and individuals via faculty email.</p> <p>UDL communities have worked with individual faculty.</p>
5b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Continue with outreach effort to campus community.</p> <p>Consider adding new representatives to the steering committee to include a Academic Affairs administration representative, student representative, and/or librarian.</p>

5c. Barriers to completion	Time & resources. ATI duties are in addition to the other responsibilities that the steering committee members have.
5d. Observations/discoveries	Faculty respond better to one-on-one or small group interactions that are focused on the issues & concerns of their discipline.
<p><b>6. Shared Responsibilities</b></p> <p><b>How are the responsibilities divided between the divisions of Student Affairs (particularly the disabled student services unit) and Academic Affairs and Administration?</b></p> <p><b>Since Academic Affairs is responsible for delivering accessible materials to students, how do they assist with creation of accessible materials production?</b></p> <p><b>How are the other divisions contributing to the ATI?</b></p> <p><b>Do you consider this balance of responsibility to be healthy and sufficient to achieve success?</b></p>	
6a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	Our campus has a strong collaboration among Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, I&IT, Public Affairs, and Administrative Affairs. DRC is responsible for alternate media conversion. I&IT is responsible for media (captioning, etc.) and technology workshops for faculty (e.g., Blackboard, online courses, etc.). Academic Affairs provides Faculty development workshops and supports UDL communities. Procurement assists with accessibility assessments as well as related bidding requirements. Student Affairs, I&IT, Academic Affairs and Administrative Affairs have a shared responsibility for responding to accessible technology questions.
6b. Plans for 2008/2009	Work with new Provost to coordinate more involvement from Academic Affairs.
6c. Barriers to completion	Lack of priority with Academic Affairs due to other competing priorities (e.g., WASC) and Provost recruitment.
6d. Observations/discoveries	

## 7. Migration from Accommodation to Accessibility

How have you planned the migration from making individual accommodations to making courses fully accessible?

What is your plan to move from just-in-time production of alternative materials to universal production of accessible materials?

Who is taking the lead?

What processes have been established?

Are there improvements?

7a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	Faculty universal design learning communities have been established.  Summer Institute instruction for course design incorporates accessibility.  New faculty/lecturers information regarding accessibility requirements.  DRC sends letter to faculty when a DRC-registered student, who has been prescribed early registration for alternative media, enrolls.  IMAP team is taking the lead with representatives from DRC, I&IT, Faculty Center to manage the migration from accomodation to accessibility.
7b. Plans for 2008/2009	Self-assessment for accessible reviews of new material.  Work with new Provost to coordinate more involvement from Academic Affairs.  Market more to faculty already contacted by the DRC.
7c. Barriers to completion	Additional resources & incentives for faculty  No formal process has been developed for migrating from accomodation to full accessibility.
7d. Observations/discoveries	Faculty's normal work cycle doesn't allow prep-periods during hte school year. As a result, most faculy consider significant changes during normal work cycle. Development is normally "just-in-time" during quarter breaks preceeding the presentation. Individual improvements in videos, more accessible courses and more awareness have been encouraged, but more work is needed to address the holistic approach.

## 8. Early Identification of Students with Disabilities

Have you identified, through your planning, any assumptions, passivity or lack of activity that discourages students' access to the disabled students programs?

What percentage of courses has instructional materials provided that are appropriate to the students' needs?

Is there a difference between the numbers of course materials that are assigned to students with a declared need and the quantity of accessible materials produced to meet these needs? If so what is this difference? (To estimate you might take 1.5 assigned instructional materials per class as an average.)

Have you checked to see if your early notification is perceivable by the student with perceptual impairments?

Have you located accessibility roadblocks in the programs that deliver these notifications like the CMS portal or other inaccessible web sites?

What enhancements will you make to the remove these barriers?

How will you ensure that all students with a declared need and a desire to take advantage of access programs can do it?

8a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>DRC Identifies and prescribes accommodations to students. Priority registration is an accommodation that is prescribed to students based on DRC assessment. One basis for prescription is the alternative media needs of the student.</p> <p>The percentage that is appropriate varies based on the disability and the material needed. In Spring Quarter, we were able to achieve 98% timeliness rate with providing known course materials by the first day of the quarter or within 2 weeks of request.</p> <p>DRC did a survey in 07-08 where we asked students . Students were not aware of the importance of turning in the requests early. As a result, DRC now sends more reminders, etc. Communication is done personally via email and DRC office notifications.</p>
8b. Plans for 2008/2009	Continue current process
8c. Barriers to completion	<p>One of the barriers is that the student and course may be identified but the faculty may not have identified their materials yet. Therefore the student gets discouraged since they are not getting the benefit they need.</p> <p>Students need to understand the importance and benefits of registering early.</p>

8d. Observations/discoveries	Due to the variation of disabilities and materials it is difficult to ascertain what percentage of the courses have instructional materials that are appropriate to the student's needs at this point in time. Obviously the goal is to be 100% by 2012.
<p><b>9. Process for the Electronic Capture of course materials</b></p> <p><b>How are the faculty who assign instructional materials going to make those materials usable?</b></p> <p><b>Is the capability of scanning documents available to faculty?</b></p> <p><b>How have you addressed large volumes of paper documents?</b></p> <p><b>Is there a standard being set on your campus that an "acceptable" print quality of documents requiring scanning?</b></p> <p><b>Is there an efficient process for capturing electronic documents that are posted online?</b></p>	
9a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Scanners purchased for use by faculty &amp; staff in making materials usable (I&amp;IT, DRC &amp; Library). Scanners were also purchased for key colleges that demonstrated a need. These areas have staff and/or student that can assist faculty with the process.</p> <p>Faculty are being encouraged to provide online documents by integrating instructional materials and e-reserve through the faculty's Blackboard site. E-reserve only allows electronic submissions. Faculty are being encouraged to use Blackboard via workshops and presentations.</p>
9b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Continue communication with faculty</p> <p>Continue to provide student &amp; equipment support to faculty</p>
9c. Barriers to completion	<p>There is no standard on campus for print quality.</p> <p>Time and resources to convert materials or select new ones.</p>
9d. Observations/discoveries	Equipment alone does not encourage use. It also requires staff/student resources to assist and education to explain need.

## 10. Multimedia

**Have you determined the scope and size of the amount of multimedia involved in your plan: library, online media, RSS feeds, rich media and internet applications?**

**Have you found resources, created a budget around your needs, or determined promising practices for any aspect of multimedia accessibility?**

**Please include names of resources you have found, amounts budgeted or needing to be budgeted and best practices.**

10a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>The overall scope of campus-produced multimedia has been defined. We are currently in the process of reviewing each item in the inventory to determine its instructional use and relative priority.</p> <p>Budget has been created and resources committed to captioning effort.</p> <p>Captioning equipment (DocSoft, CaptionMic) have been purchased.</p> <p>Captioning services (transcriptionist service and Automatic Sync) were acquired when needed.</p>
10b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Define the priority and applicability of all campus-produced items.</p> <p>Produce captioning schedule based on identified priority and applicability.</p> <p>Continuing education of faculty for developing transcripts for lecture material that is presented online or in video.</p> <p>Evaluate Echo 360 as a possible tool.</p>
10c. Barriers to completion	<p>Uncertainty about the scope of videos (online or physical medium) that are used by faculty within their classes.</p> <p>Lack of resources to dedicate to captioning effort.</p> <p>Lack of understanding regarding the current population of campus produced videos which inhibites our ability to prioritize them for captioning.</p>
10d. Observations/discoveries	<p>Outsourced services offer better turnaround and quality but at a higher cost.</p>

## 11. Incentives

**What has been identified as incentives in your plan?**

**What incentives have proven successful?**

**What incentives do you believe need to be abandoned? What are the reactions to incentives?**

**Do you think incentives a waste of resources?**

11a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	The following incentives were provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* Stipends for UDL faculty learning community</li><li>* CSUN conference registration and travel</li><li>* Software licenses for attending workshops</li><li>* Chocolate for early textbook reqs &amp; certificates for workshop attendance.</li><li>* End-of-year party for participants in the CPP ATI effort. Included representatives from leadership, steering committee, faculty, students, and the CSU.</li></ul>
11b. Plans for 2008/2009	Continue use of incentives
11c. Barriers to completion	Lack of resources for more incentives. For example, faculty would love to take advantage of release time.
11d. Observations/discoveries	The "little" incentives are appreciated.

## 12. Training

**What are the specific plans to educate faculty and staff on accessibility?**

**What are the names and dates of the workshops and online training offered?**

**What has been the response?**

**Is there a plan to provide faculty and staff support in the context of a "Help Desk"?**

**What has proven successful and what is be abandoned?**

**What is planned in this area and what is the timeline?**

**Are resources defined, training in place, and plans set for 08-09?**

**Do you have a strategy for the development of faculty champion trainers?**

12a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008

Offered monthly training sessions for faculty and staff to learn how to create accessible documents. Training session consisted of ATI Overview, Making Accessible Word, PDF and PowerPoint documents, Making Accessible PDF Forms, Making Accessible Web pages w/ Contribute, Making Accessible Web forms, and JAWS for the Sited. (Dates can be provided on request.)

The Faculty Development Center has offered 4 all-day workshops for faculty focusing on the preparation of a variety of accessible instructional materials. (Dates can be provided on request.)

We hired a temporary ATI Assistant to assist w/ training coordination and facilitation of ATI-fits program, offers additional hands on, one on one assistance for faculty and staff. Identified effective training partners within our campus community.

Provided free Adobe Acrobat v.8 license and Contribute CS3 license for attending workshops.

Hired student assistants to work with faculty to create and assess accessible material.

Since the beginning of the year we have trained approximately 300 faculty and staff.

We encourage faculty champions through outreach & UDL communities.

12b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Resources and training partners identified, training set in place and current plan implemented for 08/09</p> <p>Dedicated trainer for introductory courses</p> <p>Advanced training for more complex issues.</p> <p>Hired resource to provide tier 2 support for more complex issues.</p> <p>Offer more departmental presentations</p> <p>Evaluate results quarterly</p> <p>See training survey for more information.</p>
12c. Barriers to completion	Unique complexities by individual & discipline
12d. Observations/discoveries	<p>Unique complexities by individual &amp; discipline</p> <p>Faculty respond better to 1:1 support.</p>
<p><b>13. Outreach, Communication, Awareness, Marketing</b></p> <p><b>Does your campus have an ATI Outreach / Marketing sub-committee?</b></p> <p><b>What presentations have been delivered and are planned?</b></p> <p><b>Have all major governance bodies been addressed?</b></p> <p><b>Has the material gotten to the unit and department level?</b></p> <p><b>Has ATI gotten on the agenda of major governance, retreats and training events?</b></p>	
13a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>We have conducted outreach sessions to multiple departments and at many training events</p> <p>We have implemented AT FITS program that provides one on one assistance to faculty.</p> <p>ATI brochures and flyers which identifies each role as a faculty, staff and student.</p> <p>Email messages from campus President and CIO.</p> <p>Launched campus-wide awareness presentations at Fall Conference.</p>

13b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Quarterly campus ATI Newsletter/communication</p> <p>Restructure campus ATI website to improve the ease for accessing information.</p> <p>Provide flyer with accessibility information in temporary faculty contract letter</p>
13c. Barriers to completion	<p>Time &amp; resources to implement ideas</p> <p>Time &amp; resources for faculty to attend events</p> <p>Competing campus priorities</p>
13d. Observations/discoveries	<p>Despite all the outreach &amp; communication, there are still people who are not getting the message.</p> <p>The message of accessibility works better when it is part of a more encompassing event (e.g., UDL, online course development, etc.)</p>

#### **14. Assessment of Faculty Materials to be made accessible**

**What is the estimated volume of faculty generated instructional materials involved in the implementation of the IMAP?**

**Have you identified continuing faculty members that need training?**

**How identified the new faculty members including lecturers as well as their accessibility needs?**

**How is their training different than other faculty?**

**How faculty members including new faculty and lecturers have identified and contacted regarding creation of accessible instructional materials?**

**How are faculty informed of accommodation needs for students with disabilities?**

**Does that training emphasize the need to create accessible conversions as quickly as possible?**

**Does faculty learn the concept of equally effective access in their training?**

14a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	Faculty of new courses for 2008 have been contacted.  New faculty receive communication as part of new faculty orientation.  DRC sends messages to faculty when a DRC registered student enrolls. DRC offers assistance to faculty.  Emails have been sent to all faculty regarding accessibility with offers for training and student assistants. Timelines are communicated as well.
14b. Plans for 2008/2009	More emphasis on complex content.
14c. Barriers to completion	Faculty still express concern over academic freedom for the instructional content and methods and equal & effective access to that content.  Faculty express concern about their workload and the ability to have time to learn methods for accessibility as well as revise their existing course materials.
14d. Observations/discoveries	In some cases, concerns for the more complex scenarios are preventing faculty from addressing the more simple tasks of accessibility.

**15. Tools for Document and Media conversion****What products were identified to assist document conversion?****What was purchased and put in to use during the 07-08 year?****What contribution did they make to success with your ATI plan?****What other products have been identified that you plan to use or purchase next year?****What rating do you give the products that you have used?**

15a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Additional high speed scanners were identified to assist with document conversion. It was determined that this would boost capacity to produce raw output for conversion to alternative formats. Canon DR 5010C scanners were purchased. This increased our production capacity and also distributed the ability to key departments on campus.</p> <p>A Braille embosser was also identified. Our existing one was broken and very old. The translator software for Braille embossing was also out of date. Duxbury Braille translator software (2 licenses).</p> <p>A tactile image machine was identified as well. Our existing one was broken and very old. Scientific Notebook software (2 licenses, Picture in a Flash (PIAF) machine and swell paper for tactile graphics.</p> <p>The Duxbury Braille translator and scientific Notebook software gave us the capability to produce Brailled math in Nemeth code which we couldn't do before.</p> <p>We give the highest rating to the results of the products</p>
15b. Plans for 2008/2009	Purchase of Daisy production and reading software.
15c. Barriers to completion	Money
15d. Observations/discoveries	

**16. System Wide Shared Resources (CAM etc.)**

**Is your campus using the CAM? If not, what method is used?**

**Is the CAM used to document all textbook and printed materials?**

**What are your expectations of the CAM?**

**What other ways has your campus shared resources with other campuses?**

**What system accessibility alliances / consortia include your campus?**

16a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Our campus uses CAM and we are the largest contributor. Our use of CAM is for text book materials that are requested by DRC students. It is not used for all print-based materials.</p> <p>Our CAM expectations include more streamlined processes to minimize duplication of effort. It is entered in the campus system and then again into CAM. Expectations of CAM have been captured via a prior survey with CAM.</p> <p>Our campus shares resources via community of practices, and other CSU-wide groups (CSUSSD directors Council, etc.). Staff also participate in many professional organizations (e.g., CAPED SIGs)</p>
16b. Plans for 2008/2009	No changes to existing approach
16c. Barriers to completion	The idea of creating additional organizations and alliances without duplicating existing groups will disperse resources as opposed to creating synergy.
16d. Observations/discoveries	

## 17. System integration

Have automated systems been identified that help in the delivery of instructional materials?

Have those systems been tested for accessibility?

Is there a method in place to ensure accessibility of instructional materials that are placed within a system (LMS, web sites, etc.)?

Has a system been established that identifies students alternative media needs during registration?

Please describe best practices here.

How is the system moving toward accessible material production that does not require conversion?

What automated systems do you have in place to facilitate any of the ATI functions and how do these interface with each other?

17a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>We encourage the use of Blackboard for the delivery of instructional materials.</p> <p>Blackboard has been tested at the CSU. A tutorial for screen readers was modified on campus.</p> <p>When a DRC-registered student register in a class, the DRC sends a message to the instructors notifying them of the expectation that their material is accessible. Help is offered to assist faculty with assessment or remediation.</p> <p>Workshops for new content development incorporate accessibility instruction.</p> <p>DocSoft was purchased to assist with the accessibility of video.</p>
17b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Continue training &amp; workshops in the use of Blackboard.</p> <p>Continue communication in requirements for video encouraging best practices for creating transcripts, etc.</p> <p>Communicate available resources (technologies, people, training).</p>
17c. Barriers to completion	<p>Time &amp; resources to convert or buy new materials</p> <p>Copyright challenges</p>

17d. Observations/discoveries	Faculty may limit use of video or online media in lieu of the effort or money needed to find accessible alternatives.
<b>18. Things not addressed by the preceding:</b> <b>Please describe any challenges, findings, trends, problems, recommendations and conclusions that you would like to share. If needed please include an appendix.</b>	

## Appendix

### Cross reference from Year 2 IMAP Report to IMAP Requirements

Year 2 IMAP Report Topics	IMAP – per Coded Memo AA-2007-04
1. Timely Adoption - Specifically, scope of materials and late hire strategy.	1, 2
2. Process – Details/ Personnel/ Calendar for Initiative	9-11
3. Identification Resources and Allocation Commitments	1-8
4. Institutional Policies & Procedures that support the ATI through curriculum and personnel reviews	6, 7
5. Commitments from All Stakeholders	1-8
6. Share Responsibilities	1-8
7. Migration from Accommodation to Accessibility	1, 2, 4, 5, 7
8. Early Identification of Students with Disabilities	3
9. Process for the Electronic Capture of course materials	1, 2, 4, 7
10. Multimedia	5, 7
11. Incentives	1-8
12. Training	7, 8
13. Outreach, Communication, Awareness, Marketing	8
14. Assessment of Faculty Materials to be made accessible.	1, 2, 4, 5, 7
15. Tools for Document and Media conversion	1, 4, 7
16. System Wide Shared Resources (CAM etc.)	1-8
17. System integration	1-8
18. Things not addressed by the preceding: challenges, findings, trends, problems, recommendations and conclusions	1-11

#### **Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan (IMAP) Main Topics (Coded Memo AA-2007-04):**

1. A process for timely adoption of textbooks by faculty.
2. A process for identification of textbooks for late-hire faculty.
3. A process for early identification of students with disabilities who require instructional materials to be provided in an alternate format.
4. A strategy to increase use of the campus LMS for delivering technology-enabled courses, and for posting syllabi and instructional materials online for traditional face-to-face and hybrid and blended courses.
5. A process to incorporate accessibility requirements in the purchase of digital or multimedia instructional materials (captions on videos, for example).
6. A method to incorporate accessibility (where required) in the educational policy addressing course development and delivery
7. A plan to support faculty in the creation of accessible course content.
8. A communication process and training plan to educate students, staff, and faculty about the campus Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan.
9. An evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the campus IMAP.
10. Identification of all campus personnel involved in implementing or overseeing the campus IMAP
11. Chronological listing of all IMAP deliverables (policies, timelines, milestones)