

Year 2 Web Accessibility Annual 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 One: Web Accessibility (Administrative), due August 15, 2008.

The questions 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. 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. Auditing and monitoring processes: What do you have in place and what is planned to track your prioritized redesign of websites? What criteria do you use to establish priority; who measures outcomes; who audits?	
1a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Web monitoring via HiSoftware of all identified institutional websites for over one year.</p> <p>Manually identified all non-LMS instructional pages. Created an application that allows instructors to update listings for public directory and future monitoring.</p>
1b. Plans for 2008/2009	The bulk of campus webpages reside on campus Intranet, which is scheduled for replacement in late 2008 and early 2009. All page owners will be expected to manually test their pages and either remediate or abandon prior to migration.
1c. Barriers to completion	Skilled resources; breakdown in communication as to requirements.
1d. Observations/discoveries	Most administrative units are happy to use the campus templates, which enforce accessibility, but when they don't use the template, the accessibility results have not been good. Sites made with independent designs are much less likely to be accessible.

2. Accountability and documentation procedures: Who is responsible? What is documented? How is information that is gathered used to improve the process?	
2a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Web page checklist, which includes accessibility along with privacy statements, information security, and other requirements, has been approved by campus IT Governance. IT will be used for signoff during the migration from the CPP Intranet.</p> <p>Web Policy, which includes accessibility, has passed the Senate, approved by the President and is currently in a meet/confer status with the unions.</p>
2b. Plans for 2008/2009	Document procedures for accountability—The Intranet replacement will set conditions for moving files which include testing for accessibility by web page owners. It will include provisions for removal of inaccessible web pages.
2c. Barriers to completion	<p>Past campus history doesn't encourage enforcement.</p> <p>Barrier for documentation: Resources.</p>
2d. Observations/discoveries	A lot can be accomplished without accountability & documentation.
3. New websites and content: How does your campus encourage accessible design and authoring for new additions to the administrative web?	
3a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Accessible web templates using structured HTML and CSS, usable with Adobe Contribute and Dreamweaver.</p> <p>Contribute workshops for staff and faculty. Contribute licenses provided to attendees.</p> <p>Developed and promoted use of Spinneret (a web application that creates a navigable site using the CPP templates, with content added by Contribute) for creating accessible websites.</p> <p>Encouraging instructors and organizations to use Blackboard instead of creating their own sites.</p> <p>Using trained I&IT web developers.</p>
3b. Plans for 2008/2009	Investigate content management systems.
3c. Barriers to completion	Resources

3d. Observations/discoveries	A clear distinction needs to be made between web designers and web content providers. Web designers often don't have the necessary skills to make compliant web pages. Web content providers need the ability to provide content without having to worry about accessibility.
4. Exceptions to accessible administrative web content (such as People Soft, your LMS or library web applications): Have you identified exceptions, and if so, how do you document these issues and your decision to leave them as an exception to accessibility? What are your plans for specific exceptions to provide accommodation to achieve equally effective alternate form?	
4a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Initial evaluation of BroncoDirect (campus PS portal). Issues being logged and in some cases addressed when possible.</p> <p>Blackboard screen reader tutorial was developed and tested. It included work-arounds in accessibility issues.</p> <p>Training Blackboard content providers (e.g., faculty) in how to create accessible content.</p>
4b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Evaluate Library online catalog (Webpac).</p> <p>New versions and releases of these applications will continue to emphasize accessibility requirements.</p>
4c. Barriers to completion	<p>Resources</p> <p>Existing software created or procured prior the guidelines</p>
4d. Observations/discoveries	Accessibility will play a major role in replacing existing systems, such as the PS Portal.
5. Critical administrative websites that require remediation: What is your process for identifying critical administrative websites that require review and possible redevelopment? How will you select the most important 500 pages that need evaluation and a commitment to redevelop if needed?	
5a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	Virtually all of these sites have moved into the templates. 85-90% of administrative units use the templates.

5b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>Continue to work with units that use outside vendors to develop web sites and web content.</p> <p>Move off of Intranet, which will provide opportunity to communicate and enforce accessibility requirements and responsibilities.</p> <p>I&IT Web Development team will continue to work with administrative units.</p> <p>Develop RFP language to include accessibility requirements for outside vendors that provide web development and web content.</p>
5c. Barriers to completion	Administrative units using outside vendors to create web sites.
5d. Observations/discoveries	The lack of understanding of accessibility by off-campus vendors. The claims made by vendors. The desire to duplicate visual elements of other websites independent of their ability to meet the functional needs of Cal Poly Pomona.
6. Training Plan: What is your plan to train administrative web developers, student assistants and content contributors? Have you developed curriculum? Do you have regular training times? Do you require certification and / or continuing education?	
6a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>ATI training plan addresses web development and its content using campus-provided templates and tools.</p> <p>Accessibility training for new I&IT web development staff.</p>
6b. Plans for 2008/2009	More of the same
6c. Barriers to completion	<p>Web content providers have a full time job and accessibility is an additional requirement that takes time that they lack.</p> <p>More motivation to comply so that accessibility is made a component of job plans and performance reviews.</p>
6d. Observations/discoveries	<p>Some web content providers are interested in accessibility and motivated to improve.</p> <p>Accessibility training experiences the same challenges as other campus training (attendance, follow-through, etc.)</p>

7. Communication plan: How has your communication plan proceeded this year? Have faculty, staff and students been contacted? What approximate percentage of each group has been exposed to the campus web accessibility requirements?	
7a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	General ATI communication plan (President's email, Fall Conference, brochures, emails, etc.) to faculty and staff. We estimate that 80-90% have been exposed to some level of communication. There have been some presentations to students.
7b. Plans for 2008/2009	Intranet migration will affect everyone that has web content (faculty, staff, and students). The communication plan for this effort will be multi-faceted, and crucial for success.
7c. Barriers to completion	The usual barriers to campus communications.
7d. Observations/discoveries	Having complete buy-in by both President and CIO is a real plus.
8. Evaluation process: How is progress measured? What metrics do you use to determine if you are better off this year than last year? How did you choose your metrics?	
8a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	Though we know our progress has improved, there is no systematic way for generating metrics.
8b. Plans for 2008/2009	Self-evaluation will be required during the Intranet migration. Address the limitations of this area.
8c. Barriers to completion	Our focus has been on enforcing accessibility for initial site reviews and new sites but we haven't had resources to re-visit sites.
8d. Observations/discoveries	Once accessible doesn't mean always accessible.
9. Roles and responsibilities: Please identify the responsible parties and their roles associated with the above processes.	
9a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	Expanded the sense of responsibility to include top-level administrators in additional areas.
9b. Plans for 2008/2009	Intranet replacement will push more responsibility onto page owners as a requirement for migrating their sites.
9c. Barriers to completion	Formal definitions of responsibilities. Communication.

9d. Observations/discoveries	<p>Campus culture for accomodating rules with minimal effort as contrasted to making significant break-through changes.</p> <p>The usual resistance to responsibility, especially for vendor-provided websites.</p>
<p>10. Milestones and timelines: How do your milestones and timelines conform to the ATI Coded Memoranda? Did you meet your milestones? If you will miss a deadline why do you think that happens? Please list strengths and weaknesses in your planning. Both will be useful for the CSU to analyze system trends.</p>	
10a. Accomplishments in 2007/2008	<p>Cal Poly Pomona has met all of the ATI Priority 1 milestones, with a very small percentage of noncompliance or backsliding.</p> <p>We did not meet all of our more-aggressive local milestones (such as automatic distribution of web reports)</p>
10b. Plans for 2008/2009	<p>More communication.</p> <p>Ensure our timelines are consistent with CSU requirements.</p>
10c. Barriers to completion	<p>New websites have been added past the deadline but were not accessible due to a lack of knowledge of the requirements.</p>
10d. Observations/discoveries	<p>100% compliance is not always possible. Progress has been measured in breadth of spreading the message.</p>