

## 2020-2021 President Annual ATI Report Summary

### Contents

2020-2021 President Annual ATI Report Summary Instructions: .....	2
Due Date: November 15, 2021 .....	2
Submission: Email the report to the campus President and copy <a href="mailto:ati@calstate.edu">ati@calstate.edu</a> .....	2
ATI President Annual ATI Report Summary .....	2
Background .....	2
Progress and Remaining Effort in each ATI Priority area .....	3
Appendix A: President Annual ATI Report Summary Template.....	4
Progress and Remaining Effort in each ATI Priority area .....	4
<b>Overview of Progress for each ATI Priority Area: Web</b> .....	5
<b>Overview of Progress for each ATI Priority Area: Instructional Media(IM):</b> .....	8
<b>Overview of Progress for each ATI Priority Area: Procurement:</b> .....	11
Appendix B: Goals and Success Indicators for 21-22 .....	13
Appendix C: Status Levels with Evidence checklist .....	15

**2020-2021 President Annual ATI Report Summary Instructions:**

This guide provides a template (see Appendix A) outlining what to include in each section of the Progress and Remaining Effort Report. The 2020-2021 President Summary includes the web performance report. Please include the requested additional information about web performance in the Web section of the Progress and Remaining Effort template.

**Due Date:** November 15, 2021

**Submission:** Email the report to the campus President and copy [ati@calstate.edu](mailto:ati@calstate.edu)

**ATI President Annual ATI Report Summary****Background**

Coded Memo AA-2015-22 issued December 2, 2015 included requirements to address the systemwide audit findings from the audit completed in 2014 (Audit Report 14 -28). The Audit finding recommended that each campus submit a summary of accomplishments and remaining effort to inform the campus President as to the annual status of the Accessibility Technology Initiative (ATI) effort on the campus. This Audit recommendation was incorporated into Coded Memo AA-2015-22. The March 8, 2021 ATI Memo carries this requirement forward. The purpose of the President Annual Summary Report is to build and/or maintain executive support on the campus. This is in addition to the ATI Annual Reports.

Each campus formulates a yearly plan based on impact and campus capacity that includes the Success Indicators that will be addressed throughout the year. A yearly ATI Annual Report is submitted for each of the three Priority Areas: Web, Procurement, and Instructional Materials, which reports the detail on progress and evidence of that progress.

The President's Annual Report Summary provides executive highlights of the information on the ATI Annual Reports. The report includes a summary of accomplishments and areas that need improvement which informs the President as to the state of Accessible Technology Initiative on the campus.

Please use the template provided in Appendix A for the President Annual ATI Summary Report.

### **Progress and Remaining Effort in each ATI Priority Area**

The report is a summary of the milestones that have been met according to the yearly campus plan and implementation process in each ATI priority area. A comparison to the systemwide median status level is optional. The systemwide ATI Aggregate Report was distributed to Executive Sponsor Steering Committee members on 5/10/2021. The report summarizes each priority area based on the ATI Annual Report for all three sections of Web, Procurement, and IM.

The report should address the bulleted points below:

- Provide an overview of Progress for each ATI Priority Area; Web, Procurement, IM.
- Provide an overview of Remaining Effort for each ATI Priority Area; Web, Procurement, IM.
- Review the Goals and Success Indicators in each area, summarize the Remaining Effort in needed to reach the status level of Established.
  - Address the areas where processes, procedures and resources have yet to be put in place to integrate accessibility into the campus business processes in each priority area.
  - A priority area which has not met an overall level of Established would reflect the need for improvement or focus, and should be addressed in the Remaining Effort.

The goal of providing this information is to present an opportunity to share challenges (e.g., budget and staffing needs) with campus leadership.

## Appendix A: President Annual ATI Report Summary Template

Name of Campus: California State University, Sacramento

Reporting Year: 2020-2021

Submitted by: Mark Hendricks, Interim Vice President & Chief Information Officer

### Progress and Remaining Effort in each ATI Priority Area

Sacramento State has worked diligently this past year to advance the three ATI priority areas of Web, Instructional Materials (IM), and Procurement. During this reporting period, Information Resources and Technology (IRT) and contributing partners Library, Services for Students with Disabilities (SSWD), Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), University Communications, and Procurement worked together to meet ongoing pandemic demands for accessible technology for students, faculty and staff. Together with our partners, IRT has established ongoing advisory/governance groups for all three ATI priority areas that have enabled greater engagement across the campus and initiated a shift from technology-focused work to compliance and user experience-focused work.

At its heart, ATI is a major component of diversity, inclusion and equity work. ATI is not only about meeting status level goals on a maturity model; ATI is about creating an accessible environment where all students can be successful. The University Committee for Persons with Disabilities (UCPD) has worked with IRT, SSWD, Academic Affairs and Inclusive Excellence to revise this committee's charter to incorporate the ATI encoded memo. Integrating the ATI work into UCPD provides a comprehensive view of physical and technology digital equity needs at Sacramento State.

The table below summarizes the current state of Sacramento State ATI Goals and indicators, including the changes that are applied to the 21-22 reporting year with deprecated and new indicators included:

ATI Priority Area	Below Baseline	At Minimal Baseline	Above Baseline	Deprecated (20-21)	New (21-22)
Website	0	41	13	24	4
Instructional Materials	1	20	3	36	10
Procurement	0	3	25	21	6

Overall, Sacramento State meets or exceeds baseline; however, one strategic indicator in the area of Instructional Materials was determined to be below baseline and in need of improvement. This deficiency relates to planning and communication between the Instructional Materials sub group and the ATI Steering committee. While progress has been made in the area of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), additional faculty participation is necessary to achieve an appropriate level of maturity and representation. Discussions with Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee are planned for Winter/Spring.

### **(Campus) IRT Funding for ATI**

IRT has identified approximately \$1M in support for eight staff with accessibility responsibilities, and has developed a student team to address instructional materials remediation. Captioning costs increased by almost \$375k during the 20/21 academic year, but were covered by HEERF.

### **IRT Support for ATI 20/21**

<b>Support Description</b>	<b>Estimated Annual Support Costs</b>
8 Full and Partial ATI Support Staff	\$350,000
Student IM Remediation (HEERF funded in 20/21)	\$50,000
Captioning Support (HEERF funded in 20/21)	\$451,277
ATI Tools (Site Improve, Ally, etc.)	\$150,000
<b>Total IRT/Campus Support for ATI 20/21</b>	<b>\$1,001,277</b>

During the COVID hiring chill, 1 UDL Accessible Instructional Technology Consultant position was eliminated. Given the extraordinary effort necessary to address campus instructional materials remediation, IRT will request the restoration of this position during the 21/22 budget cal. Using HEERF funding, IRT was able to build a student team to address instructional materials remediation during 20/21. With the move to on-line, we experienced tremendous growth in the use of digital media and captioning services. It is anticipated this trend will continue through FY 21-22. With the end of the HEERF program, IRT is anticipating an unfunded captioning charge of approximately \$400k in 20-21.

### **Requested Funding Augmentation 21/22**

<b>Support Description</b>	<b>Estimated Annual Support Costs</b>
1 UDL Accessible Instructional Tech Consultant	\$75,000
Student IM Remediation (HEERF funded in 20/21)	\$50,000
Captioning Support (HEERF funded in 20/21)	\$350,000
<b>Total IRT/Campus Support for ATI 21/22</b>	<b>\$475,000</b>

### **Overview of Progress for each ATI Priority Area: Web**

#### **Summarize milestones met based on yearly plan:**

In July of 2021, Siteimprove, the university website accessibility checker, introduced a new dashboard system which allows the IRT Web & Mobile Services (WMS) team to curate the results to users' areas and scope automatically. Editors now have 24/7 access to their area's dashboard URL rather than bi-monthly lists. This allows the IRT WMS team to allocate their time to help with remediation rather than creating and emailing reports. The combined efforts of the WMS team and the dashboard system rank the CSUS website consistently over 90% accessible.

In the 19-20 reporting year, 637 compliance issues from Siteimprove were identified, reported and remediated through the web review processes. Despite a 9% rate of growth in the number of campus web pages, an average of 599 errors in any month of 20-21 shows a 6% improvement in accessibility.

The WMS team provided a workshop for building accessible PDF documents for campus web publishers, and made the recording available on the web publishers site. The workshop was recorded and attended by 26 of the 348 campus web publishers.

The Web Content Advisory Group (WCAG) was established. The WCAG is an administrative level leadership group with broad representation across campus. Bi-monthly meetings include accessibility updates and announcements. The charter for this group includes overseeing campus web accessibility compliance for respective areas.

Web Publisher training is required annually for all campus web publishers. The training includes 50% accessibility related content. 75 campus web publishers have completed the course during this reporting period. Web publishers that do not complete the training annually have their access disabled until the training has been completed.

Three WMS team members also completed the CO offered accessibility course provided by WebAIM.

### **Key Plans**

In AY21-22, IRT will continue to work on improving processes to conduct manual accessibility evaluations on campus-affiliated websites and applications (web or mobile). IRT plans to continue the accessibility scans using Siteimprove, and improve outreach to campus partners responsible for developing and maintaining the campus website. Regular training opportunities through the monthly Web Publisher meetings and one-on-one support to enhance awareness and knowledge of web accessibility best practices will also continue. AY21-22 also includes implementation of an annual audit process to evaluate auxiliary sites and content.

- Continuing to support the campus-wide use of WAVE, a web accessibility evaluation tool, and Siteimprove for administrative users.
- Updating the ICT process to evaluate submitted website designs.
- Increasing the regularity of accessibility scans for campus-affiliated websites and applications
- Improving outreach to campus partners responsible for developing and maintaining campus web or mobile content.
- Providing training opportunities to improve awareness and knowledge of digital accessibility best practices.
- Working with the Web Content Advisory Group, recommend updates to the Sac State Web Policy.
- Training a WMS staff member to assist in procurement approval.
- Updating the Web Content/Accessibility certification course in the coming year.

In the upcoming year, all faculty websites will be audited for accessibility compliance, and a plan will be created to monitor and correct websites on an annual basis.

The [Web Publisher information page](#) is the primary source of expertise in accessible design and development resources. The IRT WMS team performs continuous updates to this site and will update and maintain the certification course required to retain WCM access.

The WMS team will continue to make Accessibility a topic at the WCAG bi-monthly meetings. The new campus learning and certification curriculum for web publishers will also continue to emphasize WCAG 2.1 compliance and accessibility best practices.

**Remaining Effort:** Areas that are below Established (Not Started, Initiated and Defined)

As of 2020-21, all current ATI Web success indicators are now at the Established level or above.

## Web Performance Reporting

Automated Scans:

*Summarize continuing progress on implementing the campus web scanning process and remediating errors found during 2020/2021.*

- Conduct monthly automated scans using Siteimprove.
- An IRT WMS team staff member reviews the reports for severity, false positives and any issues that many need to be resolved at the template level.
- When issues are identified as being the responsibility of the content owner, content owners are contacted by email and given 5 days to correct a WCAG accessibility issue.
- If the remediation isn't completed in this timeframe, a WMS team member may remediate the content or remove the page(s).
- Siteimprove also helps with usability by identifying misspellings, broken links, etc. In 2019-2020, 637 compliance issues were identified, reported and remediated through this process. Despite a 9% rate of growth in the number of pages, an average of 599 errors in any month of 20-21 shows 6% positive progress.

*Summarize how the campus plans to address the remaining effort to implement the web accessibility scanning and remediation process:*

Accessibility awareness and training is part of mandatory training for content publishers/editors. The content is delivered via a Canvas course that emphasizes accessibility problem identification and best practices. Additionally, the CO's WebAIM training and webinar opportunities are shared on the IRT website on the IRT homepage, the Web Publishers web page, and the Universal Design for Learning web page.

Please list the staff and position title(s) dedicated to web accessibility and the related percent effort associated with their positions:

Position	Name	Percentage Effort
<a href="#">Accessible Technology Consultant</a>	Katie Beekman	100%
<a href="#">Universal Design for Learning Lead</a>	Corinne Rowland	100%
<a href="#">Accessible Technology Consultant</a>	Cryssel Vera	100%
<a href="#">Portal and LMS Coordinator</a>	Yuan Liu	25%
<a href="#">Visual Experience Designer</a>	Aaron Winters	25%

<a href="#">Web Developer</a>	Mark Konrad	25%
<a href="#">Web Accessibility Specialist</a>	Jennifer Sonne	100%
<a href="#">Web and Mobile Services Director</a>	Quinten Ochieng	25%

The Manual Evaluation Worksheet will be provided on CSYou along with instructions to be completed for the following home pages. Manual scans are located at:

<https://mysacstate.sharepoint.com/:f:/r/sites/ATICAARPreports/Shared%20Documents/General/ATI%20Final%20Reports/AY%202020-2021%20Annual%20Reports/Manual%20Scans?csf=1&web=1&e=DgJ1uQ>

- Campus Homepage
- 2020 course catalogue
- Financial Aid
- Career services
- Housing
- 1-2 Colleges
- Search Page to find employment opportunities (Careers)
- Chatbot
- Disability Services
- Admissions

*Summarize the remaining effort to implement an accessibility manual evaluation process in place across the campus:*

- IRT will continue to implement an improved accessibility evaluation process for the campus.
- The IRT WMS accessibility team members will document the plan and process for working directly with content owners to monitor and review all known Sac State web assets annually. This process will include manually testing external websites including Athletics, auxiliaries, the course catalog, faculty websites and official Sac State digital content hosted outside of the central campus web content management system (WCM).

Optional ATI Aggregate comparison: Not Applicable

#### **Overview of Progress for each ATI Priority Area: Instructional Media (IM):**

##### **Summarize milestones met based on yearly plan:**

The Universal Design for Learning (UDL) program, led by a team of staff and students, creates processes to measure the accessibility of course materials at the course level including inventory, workflows, document remediation, and training and support for faculty instructional material remediation and design. With the hiring of the UDL Lead position in Fall 2020, the UDL Program utilized an average of 6 student workers to complete campus document and Canvas content remediation requests. For the 20/21 academic year, remediation became a high priority. Members of the team provided additional technical and pedagogical



support to faculty as the campus moved to remote operations due to COVID-19. The added support load created logistical challenges that resulted in the delay of some campaigns related to increasing the accessibility of instructional materials.

The IRT Academic Technology Center (ATC) team partnered with the CTL on the Teach On!line Summer Camp faculty online teaching training, which included accessibility and UDL design topics. SSWD has refined their roles for Canvas course access for accommodation requests. The newly formed Accessible Technology (AT) collaboration group is comprised of members from SSWD, ATC, and the CTL.

Zoom contract changes has given the campus more storage capacity for cloud recordings (18.83TB). This enables cloud recording to be enabled on all faculty and staff accounts, and a cloud recording retention policy of 180 days has been recommended and will continue to be vetted with the campus community.

In the 20/21 AY, the newly introduced built-in Ally faculty Course Report was promoted as a tool for faculty to conduct a self-review regarding the accessibility of their Canvas course instructional materials.

Seventeen Learning Management System Technology Integrations (LTI) were reviewed and installed in Canvas in 2020/21. These requests for external app integrations were fully integrated into the ICT Request Process, and all information about the integration review has been stored within ServiceNow.

Two annual Commonlook licenses have been purchased for AY21-22 as campus reevaluated its use for PDF accessibility remediation in addition to the Adobe Acrobat Pro DC. Commonlook is PDF remediation software plug-in for MS Word and Powerpoint. IRT added 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendors to the PDF remediation service for complex documents, high-profile documents, or short notice requests to process.

The Library's work in the past year can be represented in the following statistics:

- Since July 1, 2020, the Library has employed a total of 47 student assistants to perform PDF remediation.
- 1,386 files have been remediated, along with an additional 585 pages of inaccessible transcription content.
- Remediated documents in the Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETD) collection average a score of 93% (excellent) according to the Ally tool in Canvas.

Library ETD remediation work involves tagging PDFs to indicate a document's structure and reading order so that it may be more easily read with screen readers and other assistive technologies. Of the Library's collection of 5,000+ electronic thesis and dissertations (ETD), the Library has reviewed and remediated 1,591 – close to a third of the collection. The Library is currently conducting an accessibility audit of the 2021 ETD Spring submission cycle to help to determine the effectiveness of our revised submission standards.

Beyond ETD remediation, the Library implemented several new technologies in the past year that improve accessibility for students with disabilities. They introduced a new item request service that allows library patrons to order items for home delivery, or left in secure lockers for pickup in a safe, accessible location outside of the Library building. This new request service greatly improves access to the Library collection for patrons who find

navigating the building difficult or inconvenient. Since its introduction last year, the Library has received 234 requests for mail delivery and 745 requests for locker pickup.

### **Key Plans**

In AY21/22, IRT will work with Academic Affairs, colleges and the Hornet Bookstore to evaluate and improve the current text book adoption process, as well as to advocate for widening the distribution of the timely adoption report to include the President, Provost, and Deans to increase visibility and compliance. A better understanding of the results of textbook adoption is needed. For example, percentage scores for textbook adoption rate for late-hire over the past years needs to be established, and benchmarks created so that progress in this area can be better understood. IRT will work on collecting the current [Textbook adoption rates](#), as reported by the Hornet Bookstore.

IRT will partner with Academic Affairs leadership to promote wider adoption of Canvas and to collaborate on campaigns related to increasing the accessibility of instructional materials. In addition, the UDL Program will continue to work with CTL and its related faculty learning communities (FLC's) to continue to promote UDL and accessibility best practices as faculty work to redesign their courses.

The IRT ATC team will develop a campus ATI Newsletter that will be produced once per semester. The CSUCO WebAIM Accessible Doc training and webinars will continue to be promoted across campus to support accessibility formatting skills training.

- With increased use of Mediasite and Panopto lecture capture systems and multimedia tools, the ATC expects an annual increase in captioned content.
- The ATI Steering Committee reconvened; several new members have been added; and multiple meetings have been scheduled.
- UDL Team plans include creating additional support materials on integrating publisher-based content or library-based content into courses.

The IRT Academic Technology group will track and report usage of both native Canvas tools and external integrations. With increased use in Mediasite/Panopto and new multimedia tools, the ATC expects an annual increase in captioned content.

The IRT Academic Technology group will continue to learn how to use Ally to better understand the state of accessible instructional materials within Canvas. Key plans in this area involve improving information gathering and reporting to identify the scope of accessibility issues and what support and training is needed to improve the number of accessible curricular materials.

The UDL Program is in the process of developing its course inventory, which includes instructional materials with low accessibility scores, action plans for resolving low scores, and remediation workflows. Within the UDL team, student assistants will continue their instructional materials remediation tasks with the established Remediation Program service model for campus faculty for courses during AY21-22. The UDL Program is currently establishing SLAs based on known data points and revisiting staffing needs each semester. The UDL program is balancing the time to create resources against usage of those materials in order to allocate resources appropriately.

The UDL team plans also include creating additional support materials on integrating publisher-based content or library-based content into courses. The team is planning to develop an Inclusive Syllabus campus initiative with key components around accessibility. The team remains committed to promoting accessible instructional material and document design. They are also in the process of developing a Captioning Process workflow and Captioning Prioritization Guideline document with the Instructional Materials working group members for faculty to use as they identify instructional materials that need captioning. The UDL team has continued to communicate and promote the use of built-in Microsoft PowerPoint templates as a consideration for accessibility formatting.

**Remaining Effort:** Areas that are below Established (Not Started, Initiated, Defined)

Goal	Goal Status	Key Plans
Campus IMAP committee has sufficient breadth, resources, and authority to effectively implement a comprehensive IMAP initiative.	Defined	The ATI Steering Committee reconvened last year, and multiple meetings have been held and scheduled. Several new members will be added to the committees and groups. Roles of the ATI and IMAP committees/groups will be clarified. The former Accessible Technology (AT) group is now merged into the IM working group and is comprised of members from SSWD, IRT AT, CTL and the Library. The IM working group will also work to include faculty from the curriculum review committee and other key academic representation.

Optional ATI Aggregate comparison: Not Applicable.

### **Overview of Progress for each ATI Priority Area: Procurement**

*Summarize milestones met based on yearly plan.*

In AY20/21, IRT and the Technology Procurement governance group incorporated the LMS Technology integrations (LTI) requests into the standard ICT Request form in ServiceNow. Questions that were previously completed on a separate Qualtrics survey prior to an ICT request are now included in the standard ICT request form itself. This has streamlined the process for Canvas integration requests, and two separate request forms no longer need to be submitted for integration requests.

The [Technology Procurement page](#) was completely redesigned in 2020/21 to provide thorough and up-to-date information on how the ICT Procurement process works at Sacramento State. Updates were made to make the content more concise and user-friendly; outdated information was removed; and new information including how project management reviews are incorporated into the request process was added. This Procurement page explains why the review process is needed and what steps are completed throughout the process.

A Technology Procurement Governance Committee was formed in 2020-21 with representatives from all divisions. The committee established an [IT Procurement Governance Charter](#) that provides a complete narrative on how technology procurement is managed on our campus.

University-wide emails were sent to the campus community through SacSend about the updates to the Technology Procurement page and the request form itself. An overview of the ICT Process was presented to the campus at the Business Partners Roundtable Meeting in February 2021. Our campus ICT Process was also presented at the 2021 Information Security Symposium in June 2021, and at the Cal State Tech Connect Conference in July 2021. ATI Steering Committee Meetings have continued to be held on a regular bi-annual basis.

The [EEAAP Form](#) (Equally Effective Alternative Access Plan) was simplified to be more user-friendly. An EEAAP is completed by the requesting department and the Accessible Technology Consultant when a high-impact product that will be used by a large number of employees, students, and/or the general public is not fully compliant, yet is the only viable product available and/or it best meets the department's business needs.

Individual and small group trainings were provided to requesters who indicated on the Qualtrics ICT requesters' survey that they would like more training. The annual Qualtrics survey that was previously developed with the Procurement Department and other campus stakeholders continued to be distributed to campus ICT requesters to collect formalized feedback on the ICT request process. The survey was sent to 233 current campus ICT requesters, and 85 people completed the survey.

Total ICT requests in AY20/21:	<b>1,484</b>
ICT requests reviewed AY20/21:	<b>464</b>

### Key Plans

In 2021/22, instructions on how to complete the ICT request form will be updated to reflect the Canvas integration questions and the additional workflow for ICT requests that require a review by the IRT Project Management Office (PMO).

Results from the annual Qualtrics survey indicated a number of requesters are interested in a training video or live training on the ICT Request Process previously developed with the Procurement Department and other campus stakeholders. A survey was distributed to campus ICT requesters to collect formalized feedback on the efficacy of provided trainings. Out of the 85 survey respondents, 37 indicated they would be interested in receiving further information on the process, and 26 indicated that a training video would be helpful. Individual and small group training will continue to be provided to requesters who would like more training, and an on-demand video overview of the ICT process will be posted on the Technology Procurement page. A member of the IRT Web Services team with knowledge of accessibility standards will be trained as a back-up ICT reviewer to ensure business continuity.

### Remaining Effort: Areas that are below Established (Not Started, Initiated, Defined)

As of 2020-21, all current ATI Procurement success indicators are now at the Established level or above.

Optional ATI Aggregate comparison: Not Applicable.

## Appendix B: Goals and Success Indicators for 21-22

### Goals and Success Indicators for 21-22

With the restructuring of the ATI Goals and Indicators in the recently updated ATI coded memo and distributed the update to CSU Presidents on March 8, 2021. The recommended focus of work in the upcoming year is to follow the Chancellor's Office ATI recommended 3-year plan to meet a baseline of Established status for all Year 1 identified indicators. IRT will lead the work in the Year 1 plan for AY21-22 represented in the table below.

Success Indicator #	Rationale	Success Indicator
<b>Document Accessibility/Web</b>		
W.1.11	<b>Year 1</b> These five indicators could be worked on together utilizing the WebAIM Accessibility Document Training the CO is providing in 2021/2022. These documents are in the public domain making these indicators high impact/high risk.	Develop a process to conduct manual accessibility evaluations on digital content: documents (word processor produced, spreadsheets, presentations, PDFs).
W.1.14		Develop a process to distribute evaluation results to campus members and vendors responsible for digital content maintenance.
W.2.5		Develop a process for digital content: documents (word processor produced, spreadsheets, presentations, PDFs) to meet Section 508 accessibility standards before the documents are published to the web.
W.3.6		Develop a process to verify that any changes made to existing digital content: documents (word processor produced, spreadsheets, presentations, PDFs) comply with Section 508 accessibility standards.
W.5.6		Develop a training process on accessibility for digital content: documents (word processor produced, spreadsheets, presentations, PDF), to include Section 508 standards and the campus monitoring process.
<b>Document Accessibility/IM</b>		

Success Indicator #	Rationale	Success Indicator
IM.6.7	<b>Year 1</b> These three indicators include the process for the Ally application and the companion processes for faculty and/or the remediation team. Many campuses have already done work in this area. High impact/high risk.	Develop a process to conduct regularly scheduled accessibility evaluations using automated tools and manual techniques to identify course content that requires remediation.
IM.5.13		Develop a process for creating, selecting, adopting, and remediating digital content: documents (word processor produced, spreadsheets, presentation software, PDF).
IM.6.8		Develop a process to prioritize and remediate inaccessible course content.
Communication		
IM.8.1	<b>Year 1</b> Build a better understanding of accessibility; stronger campus-wide buy-in. These indicators serve high impact/high risk areas - the better campus understands accessibility, the more support you will get for your projects.	Develop a formal communication campaign with executive support to increase knowledge of accessibility issues and responsibilities.
P5.10		Develop an ongoing general campus communication with executive support that promotes ICT procurement awareness. (Was 6.3)
W.6.2		Develop an ongoing general campus communication with executive support that promotes web accessibility awareness.
Plan		
IM.9.2	<b>Year 1</b> campuses affirm each year they have a plan. These indicators involve documenting the campus planning processes in both areas executive steering committee and subcommittee. Low cost/moderate effort.	Develop a process for the ATI Steering Committee to review, revise, and approve the updated ATI Instructional Materials Plan.
IM.9.3		Develop a process for the instructional materials subcommittee to inform the revision and coordinate the implementation of the Annual Instructional Materials Plan.
P.9.1		Develop a process for the ATI Steering Committee to review, revise and approve the updated ATI Procurement Plan.
P.9.2		Develop a process for the procurement subcommittee to inform the revision and coordinate the implementation of the Annual Procurement Plan.
W.7.5		Develop a process for the ATI Steering Committee to review, revise and approve the updated ATI Web Accessibility Plan.
W.7.6		Develop a process for the web accessibility subcommittee to inform the revision

Success Indicator #	Rationale	Success Indicator
		and coordinate the implementation of the annual ATI Web Accessibility Plan.
<b>Procurement</b>		
P.1.9	<b>Year 1</b> There are several document repositories that can assist campuses with documentation during the review process. This process should be integrated into the campus review process so reviewers know where to go for shared documentation. Low cost/low effort.	Develop a process to evaluate Section 508 compliance for campus adoptions of procurements made by multiple campuses or at the systemwide level (e.g., Master Enabling Agreements).
<b>Web</b>		
W.1.6	<b>Year 1</b> Most campuses have reported a status level of established or above. This indicator is especially important to be applied to high impact web pages. Campuses that have developed a process could share with those that don't. A robust manual evaluation process will help guard against "drive by" legal complaints.	Develop a process to conduct manual accessibility evaluations on campus-affiliated websites and applications (web or mobile).
<b>Total = 19</b>		

### Appendix C: Status Levels with Evidence Checklist

The table below is intended to provide guidance regarding the selection of an appropriate Status Level. For each Status Level, a description is provided that indicates how that Status Level would be manifested for different Success Indicator types. If the campus has undertaken several actions related to a Success Indicator, select a Status Level that best reflects overall progress. You may use this table as a reference while completing the report. For a non-table format of this data please refer to the end of this document under header Non-Table Status Levels list.



Status Level	Description for Procedures	Description for Documentation	Description for Resources
<b>Optimizing</b>	The campus has a mature practice. Additional procedures are in place to conduct regular administrative reviews of success indicators to gauge effectiveness and implement improvements.	<p>Documentation is continually revised to reflect the managed practice. Periodic administrative review of documentation is conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Documented administrative review</li> <li>✓ Documented milestones and measures of success.</li> <li>✓ Process documentation is stored in a campus electronic location and process has been communicated to the campus.</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include link to administrative review documentation</li> <li>✓ Include link to milestones and measures documentation or location of process document on internal drive</li> <li>✓ Include link to documentation or location of process document on internal drive</li> </ul>	<p>Resources have been both identified and allocated. Periodic administrative review of resource allocations is conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Review process and success criteria – review for process improvement</li> <li>✓ Identified measures of success and collected success data</li> <li>✓ ATI tasks have been added to campus job descriptions</li> <li>✓ New positions have been created as needed.</li> <li>✓ Budget allocated for ATI processes</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include job titles associated with the indicator</li> <li>✓ Include budget allocations or other resources associated with the indicator</li> </ul>
<b>Managed</b>	Campus has a mature practice. Additional procedures are	Documentation is complete and fully reflects the standard practice.	Resources have been both identified and allocated.



Status Level	Description for Procedures	Description for Documentation	Description for Resources
	in place to track and capture success indicators (milestones and measures of success).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Documented milestones and measures of success.</li> <li>✓ Process documentation is stored in a campus electronic location and process has been communicated to the campus.</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include link to milestones and measures documentation or location of process document on internal drive</li> <li>✓ Include link to documentation or location of process document on internal drive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Identified measures of success and collected success data</li> <li>✓ ATI tasks have been added to campus job descriptions</li> <li>✓ New positions have been created as needed.</li> <li>✓ Budget allocated for ATI processes</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include job titles associated with the indicator</li> <li>✓ Include budget allocations or other resources associated with the indicator</li> </ul>
<b>Established</b>	Campus has a standard practice. Procedures are consistent and formal.	<p>Documentation is complete and fully reflects the standard practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Process documentation is stored in a campus electronic location and process has been communicated to the campus.</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include link to documentation or location of process</li> </ul>	<p>Resources have been both identified and allocated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ ATI tasks have been added to campus job descriptions.</li> <li>✓ New positions have been created as needed.</li> <li>✓ Budget allocated for ATI processes</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include job titles associated with the indicator</li> </ul>

Status Level	Description for Procedures	Description for Documentation	Description for Resources
		document on internal drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include budget allocations or other resources associated with the indicator</li> </ul>
<b>Defined</b>	Campus has a common practice. Any procedures in place are consistent but informal.	<p>Documentation, if present, is in working draft form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Draft documentation is stored in a campus electronic location</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include link to documentation or location of process document on internal drive</li> <li>✓ If no documentation has been written then briefly describe the process.</li> </ul>	<p>Resources have been firmly identified but not yet allocated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Job descriptions/new positions that need ATI tasks added should be identified in campus plan</li> <li>✓ Budget allocations should be identified in campus plan</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Include identified job titles associated with the indicator</li> <li>✓ Include other identified resources associated with the indicator</li> </ul>
<b>Initiated</b>	Campus has an ad hoc or developing practice. Any procedures in place are generally ad hoc.	<p>Documentation is generally absent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Success Indicator should be identified in campus ATI Plan with proposed implementation plan</li> </ul> <p><b>ATI Annual Report Evidence Column</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Brief description of proposed implementation plan</li> </ul>	<p>Resources have been tentatively identified but not yet allocated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Identified resources should be included in the campus plan</li> </ul>

Status Level	Description for Procedures	Description for Documentation	Description for Resources
<b>Not Started</b>	No action has yet been taken.	No documentation has yet been generated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Success indicator should be identified in ATI campus Plan with reason stating why it is not started.</li> </ul>	No resources have yet been allocated.