California State University, Chico

Accessible Technology Initiative Web Accessibility Second Year Report 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. This report focuses on Priority One: Web Accessibility due August 15, 2008.

1. Auditing and Monitoring Processes

- ✅What do you have in place?
- ✅What is planned to track your prioritized redesign of websites?
- ✅What criteria do you use to establish priority; who measures outcomes; who audits?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

During the summer of 2007, AccMonitor was installed and configured to scan the sites listed in the First Year Web Report. Since then, any new site that has been developed or redesigned through the Web Services department or has gone through the procurement process has been added to AccMonitor. Presently, AccMonitor is scanning approximately 100 individual sites on a nightly basis, and sites are being added on a weekly basis. Results from AccMonitor are pulled into an in-house web application, Juno, that distills the information into a dashboard interface for administrators while also providing developers with more granular information about the accessibility status of their sites.

Juno, the reporting service, tracks historical information about the success and failure rate of an individual site. This data illustrates the before and after compliance of a site once the redesign is completed.

In addition to automated monitoring tools, we have undertaken cataloging all known campus Web sites and their owners. Currently, there are 436 Web sites in the campus Web site matrix.

Type of Site	Count
Administrative Unit	109
Academic College	8
Academic Dept.	53
Student Org	157
Affiliate	28
Service	17
Program	64

This matrix, in addition to the Juno application, will be used to track the redesign of Web sites.

With regard to establishing the priority of sites to be redesigned and remediated, we have developed a set of criteria for determining "critical administrative" sites. This criteria, along with sites prioritized for inclusion in the pilot rollout of the new campus WCMS, will be used to prioritize redesign and remediation of Web sites.

Plans for 2008/2009

Plans for 2008/2009 include continuing to catalogue sites and site owners into [ATI Site Matrix](#), continuing phased addition of sites to monitoring and reporting services (plan to add 10-15 sites per week), continuing to identify and prioritize critical sites for redesign and remediation, tracking historical compliance information for each monitored site, and developing manual evaluation procedures.

Barriers to completion

Cooperation and participation from site owners will be critical in making sure that remediation takes place. Critical to site owner cooperation and participation is making sure that site owners and content contributors have access to documentation, training, and support to help them remediate their sites.

Observations/discoveries

The front page for our reporting tool, Juno, offers a basic score which highlights the percentage of accessible pages, as tested by AccMonitor. This *scoreboard* has fostered friendly competition and we've heard from departments that improving their score to avoid embarrassment was a motivating factor in bringing their site into compliance.

2. Accountability and Documentation Procedures

- ✅Who is responsible?
- ✅What is documented?
- ✅How is information that is gathered used to improve the process?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

Responsibility

We have identified who is responsible for the following:

- Remediation -- Site Owner
- Auditing and Monitoring -- Web Application Development team
- Implementation -- ATI Web Team

Documentation

We have undertaken cataloging all of the sites that comprise the Chico State web presence. At present this Web site matrix includes over 430 Web sites. We are continually adding contact information on specific site owners who are responsible for the sites to the matrix.

In addition, site accessibility data (as gathered by AccMonitor) is compiled and stored on a daily basis to provide historical data on the changes in accessibility for all sites being monitored.

Improving the Process

Identification of site owners is used to connect them to the reporting services to help them identify how they need to remediate their site. We will continue to refine the process as communications between the Web ATI Team and site owners occurs. In course of communicating with site owners, the reporting services have been modified to provide site owners with more accurate and relevant data.

Plans for 2008/2009

For 2008/2009, we plan to complete the identification of campus site owners and content contributors, develop processes for timely updates of site owners and contributors, and continue to develop and refine reporting tools to provide site owners with the most accurate site accessibility information.

Barriers to completion

- · Keeping site owner data current

Observations/discoveries

- · Many people are not aware that they have a web site or that they are responsible for a web site.

- · Some people are not aware that their site must be accessible

3. New Web Sites and Content

- · ⊘How does your campus encourage accessible design and authoring for new additions to the administrative web?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

Our campus encourages accessible Web design in several ways. Web Services has made self-service accessible Web page templates available to campus departments, as well providing accessible Web site development for campus clients. All new sites that are developed by outside vendors must go through Web Review process that evaluates the sites for accessibility. Online resources have been provided that help educate campus departments as to accessibility requirements as well as providing guides to simple steps they can take to improve the accessibility of their sites.

Plans for 2008/2009

For 2008/2009, we plan to continue to make accessible templates available. In addition, a phased rollout of the campus WCMS (using accessible templates and built-in accessibility enforcement tools) will begin. This will greatly simplify the process of building accessible Web sites. Campus departments will be encouraged to move their sites into the WCMS as the rollout expands.

We also plan to develop more self-help accessibility resources and tutorials, as well as accessibility trainings.

Barriers to completion

· Education and awareness of owners and contributors to the accessibility requirements

Observations/discoveries

· Lack of web expertise among content contributors

· Sites degrade overtime without active maintenance with accessibility awareness

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?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

The ATI Web Committee as developed a process for identifying critical sites. This definition includes the following possible exceptions:

Sites may be exempted from being considered during the current phase of ATI that:

· Require authentication for access, or

· Are a vendor-provided product

The ATI Web committee has the responsibility of identifying and approving all exceptions. Exceptions and their rationale are documented in our main ATI Matrix which tracks all 400+ sites on campus.

Plans for 2008/2009

Our plans for 2008/2009 include continuing to identify exceptions and to develop procedures for providing equally effective alternative forms for sites identified as exceptions.

Barriers to completion

Limited resources, as well as limited access to vendor code, inhibit our ability to remediate sites or to provide "equally effective alternatives" to sites identified as exceptions.

5. Critical Administrative Web Sites 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?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

The campus ATI Web committee has developed and approved a set of criteria that will be used to determine whether or not a site is a "critical administrative" website.

"*Administrative sites critical to institutional access"* shall be defined as follows:

- Official sites of administrative or academic units that:
  - Are used by large audiences or have a high level of use (even if by smaller groups), or enable important administrative or academic functions (or provide paths of travel to such materials)
  - Additionally, sites may be considered critical if:
    - They provide services specifically for persons with disabilities, or
    - There is no readily available alternative method of providing the information they contain
  - Sites may be exempted from being considered during the current phase of ATI that:
    - Require authentication for access, or
    - Are a vendor-provided product

Critical administrative sites are monitored using AccMonitor and the Juno application, which summarizes the information from AccMonitor. Historical data on critical administrative sites has been collected since the beginning of June, 2008.

Plans for 2008/2009

Rather than focus on a specific number of pages, we plan to take a site-oriented approach, focusing on sites of the most critical importance (as defined above) that are in the greatest need of evaluation and remediation.

In order to select these sites, we will capture a 30-day baseline of compliance for the sites that are currently being monitored in AccMonitor and the Juno application. Of these sites, sites identified as "critical administrative" sites will be prioritized based on their percentage of compliance. Sites with less than 60% of their pages in compliance will be prioritized for remediation and redevelopment based on their severity, with the sites with the lowest percentage of pages in compliance having the highest priority.

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?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

Both Web Application Development and Web Services have developed self-help tutorials for common accessibility issues and made them available to the campus. Due to a lack of dedicated personnel, we have not had a training plan in place for the campus.

Plans for 2008/2009

One of the top priorities for 2008/2009 is to develop and implement an accessibility training plan for campus. Trainings developed though this plan will likely involve a number of units on campus, including User Services (which provides technology training for faculty and staff). Trainings will be made available to anyone involved in maintaining administrative campus Web sites. It is unlikely that certification will be required. Some of the need for accessibility training (but not all) will be alleviated by the rollout of the campus WCMS.

Barriers to completion

Lack of dedicated personnel to develop a training plan, as well as develop and implement a training program, has hindered our progress with training. Recent and upcoming hires will alleviate part of that problem.

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?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

Part of the campus communication plan was determining the sites that make up the campus Web presence. We have undertaken cataloging all of the sites (and their owners) that make up the university's Web presence. Currently this site matrix contains over 430 individual Web sites. We

have determined the owners (and their contact information) for approximately 70 of these sites. We continue to add sites and site owner information as we proceed.

Faculty, staff and students have been contacted regarding web accessibility via memos from the University President. An unknown percentage of the campus community has been exposed to ATI requirements. Our focus is currently on addressing critical sites and working with the specific site owners and content contributors associated with those sites.

Plans for 2008/2009

For 2008/2009, we plan to continue to identify site owners for known sites, and to continue to identify new sites.

We plan to begin communicating with area vice presidents and AASs regarding sites identified as 'critical' in their areas. From there, we will contact individual sites owners and content contributors of critical sites to begin assisting them on remediating their sites. We will leverage the web developer users group to provide a channel for both mass communication regarding ATI and to provide channel for communication between and amongst web content contributors.

Larger scale communications via campus announcements or email may occur if warranted, but for the coming year our focus will remain on communicating with owners of critical sites.

Barriers to completion

Time/personnel constraints in managing contacts with site owners. Upcoming hire will alleviate this.

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?

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

Progress is measured using the automated Section 508 checking features of AccMonitor in concert with the Juno Web application.

Site compliance is currently measured as a percentage of total site pages that pass automated checking in AccMonitor. Since numeric data was not collected on evaluated sites last year, no quantitative comparison to our status this year can occur.

Metrics were chosen based on the automated Section 508 compliance checking in AccMonitor. "Sites" were established as individual directories or subdirectories on the campus Web server that had unique and identifiable ownership. Each site was scanned on a daily basis, and the total

percentage of pages within the site that passed automated Section 508 checking was tallied. This data was not stored, but instead was regenerated on a daily basis.

Plans for 2008/2009

For 2008/2009, we plan to continue automated evaluation of sites using AccMonitor and the Juno application. In June 2008, we began storing daily historical compliance information on all scanned sites. This information can be used to track changes in compliance over time.

We plan to develop manual evaluation procedures and to begin conducting manual evaluations on selected sites during 2008/2009.

Barriers to completion

Time/personnel constraints on manual evaluation.

Observations/discoveries

We didn't record any numerical data for first year report, making quantitative year-to-year comparisons impossible.

9. Roles and Responsibilities

- ✅Please identify the responsible parties and their roles associated with the above processes.

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

Established roles and responsibilities for all ATI processes.

1) Auditing and monitoring processes

   a) Web Application Development is tasked with monitoring and auditing sites using AccMonitor

2) Accountability and documentation procedures

   a) Site owners are responsible for remediating their sites

   b) The ATI Coordinator is responsible for documenting site compliance

3) New websites and content

   a) Web Services has provided accessible Web templates to campus

b) A Web Review process is used to insure that all new procured sites are ATI compliant before launch

4) Exceptions to accessible administrative Web content

a) The ATI Web Committee is responsible for approving exceptions for administrative Web content

5) Critical administrative Web sites

a) The ATI Web Committee is responsible for approving the list of critical administrative Web sites

6) Training Plan

a) The ATI Coordinator is responsible for developing and implementing the ATI Training Plan

7) Communication Plan

a) The ATI Web Committee is responsible for approving the Communication Plan

b) The ATI Coordinator is responsible for developing and implementing the Communication Plan

8) Evaluation process

a) Web Application Development is responsible for maintaining evaluation data

b) The ATI Coordinator is responsible for developing and implementing new evaluation processes

Plans for 2008/2009

We plan to hire an ATI Support position to assist with communicating with content contributors, implementing the training plan, and assisting with evaluation processes.

We also plan to continue to identify site owners responsible for maintaining compliance of individual sites.

Barriers to completion

Time/personnel constraints. Upcoming hire will alleviate this.

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.

Response

Accomplished in 2007/2008

In 2007/2008 our milestones included evaluating and remediating the top 50 Web sites on campus, which we accomplished on schedule. We also developed procedures and software tools for automated evaluation of Web sites. New Web sites were evaluated for compliance with Section 508, via a process for 3rd party vendors and internal evaluation of sites developed in-house. Web Services developed accessible Web page templates and provided them for use to campus departments.

A key component to implementing ATI was establishing a clear campus-wide Web Governance structure to provide guidance and avenues of responsibility for Web sites across campus. This was put in place late in 2007.

Other milestones included selecting an enterprise WCMS for use by campus and hiring an ATI Coordinator. In June of 2007, Hannon Hill Cascade server was selected. Procurement was completed in March 2008, on schedule. An ATI Coordinator was hired in May 2008.

Plans for 2008/2009

Milestones for 2008/2009 include defining the list of critical sites, developing an ATI training and support plan, developing and implementing procedures for Web site remediation, developing processes for manual evaluation, hiring an ATI support position, piloting the new campus WCMS, beginning the rollout of the WCMS to campus, and meeting the May 15, 2009 milestone for remediating critical Web sites.

As of the time of this report, the list of critical sites has been defined, and the ATI support position has been posted.

Barriers to completion

Planning has been hampered in the past by a lack of dedicated personnel to deal with ATI issues. The hiring of the ATI Coordinator and the ATI Support positions will provide us with the ability to do better planning and to provide better support to campus for the implementation of ATI.