

What has changed?

- Focus
 - Civil rights, inclusion and diversity
 - Native accessibility, not accommodations
- Enforcement
 - Office of Civil Rights and Dept. of Justice
 - Audits in addition to lawsuits
- Risk Management
 - Clear and detailed guidance from the courts
- Standards
 - WCAG 2.0 AA

Draft Policy - Purpose

- This policy establishes standards for Electronic Information Technology (EIT) accessibility in compliance with applicable local, state and federal regulations and laws. The University of Florida is committed to providing equal access to its services, programs, and activities for all users. An accessible EIT environment enhances usability for everyone.

Draft Policy Scope

- This policy establishes standards for electronic information technology (EIT) accessibility in compliance with applicable local, state and federal regulations and laws. The University of Florida is committed to providing equal access to its services, programs, and activities for all users. An accessible EIT environment enhances usability for everyone.

Draft Policy - Standard

- Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 AA
 - www.w3.org – the source
 - www.wuhcag.com – Cliff's Notes

WCAG 2.0 Principles

- **Perceivable**
 - Information and user interface components must be presentable to users in ways they can perceive.
- **Operable**
 - User interface components and navigation must be operable.
- **Understandable**
 - Information and the operation of user interface must be understandable.
- **Robust**
 - Content must be robust enough that it can be interpreted reliably by a wide variety of user agents, including assistive technologies.

Perceivable

- **Guideline 1.1:** Provide text alternatives for any non-text content so that it can be changed into other forms people need, such as large print, braille, speech, symbols or simpler language.
- **Guideline 1.2:** Time-based media: Provide alternatives for time-based media.
- **Guideline 1.3:** Create content that can be presented in different ways (for example simpler layout) without losing information or structure.
- **Guideline 1.4:** Make it easier for users to see and hear content including separating foreground from background.

Operable

- **Guideline 2.1:** Make all functionality available from a keyboard.
- **Guideline 2.2:** Provide users enough time to read and use content.
- **Guideline 2.3:** Do not design content in a way that is known to cause seizures.
- **Guideline 2.4:** Provide ways to help users navigate, find content, and determine where they are

Understandable

- **Guideline 3.1:** Make text content readable and understandable.
- **Guideline 3.2:** Make web pages appear and operate in predictable ways.
- **Guideline 3.3:** Help users avoid and correct mistakes.

Robust

- **Guideline 4.1:** Maximize compatibility with current and future user agents, including assistive technologies.

UF Draft Policy Guidelines

- Web Pages & Applications
- Controlled Web Pages and Applications
- Business Processes, Software and Applications
- Instructional Materials
- Procurement
- Undue Burden and Non-availability

Federal Court Mandated Actions

AZ, CA, CO, FL, KY, MA, LA, OH, MD, MT, NY, NJ, PA, SC, VA, WI

- **EIT Accessibility Policy** - *draft pending adoption*
- **EIT Accessibility Officer** - *interim appointed*
- **Enterprise EIT accessibility tool for assessments and reports** - SiteImprove, *acquisition in process*
- **Training** - *training.it.ufl.edu, program being added*
- **Digital file conversion** - SensusAccess, *acquisition in process*
- **Procurement compliance with standards and policy**
- **EIT accessibility web portal** - *accessibility.ufl.edu, redesign in process!*
- **Create a standing governance committee** - *Task force chair names, members being appointed*
- **Evaluate EIT accessibility services**

Resources and Tools

- SiteImprove
- SensusAccess
- BookEye Scanners - libraries

Biggest Risks?

- Outward facing website
- Educational materials
- Essential Processes

Higher Education EIT Accessibility

Lawsuits, Complaints, Audits, Settlements

- Atlantic Cape CC
- Arizona State
- California CCs
- Capella University
- Case Western Reserve
- Finlandia University
- Florida State
- Harvard
- Louisiana Tech
- Los Angeles CC
- MIT
- McNeese State U
- Mesa CC
- Miami University
- Mt. Hood CC
- New York University
- Northwestern
- Ohio State
- Pace University
- Princeton
- Penn State
- Reed College
- SC Technical College System
- U of California Berkeley
- University of Cincinnati
- U of CO
- U of KY
- U of MD
- U of MT
- U of Phoenix
- U of VA
- Youngstown State
- Reed College

Consequences of Non-compliance

- Audits and lawsuits
- Disruptive to business processes
- Grants and federal funding
- Costly both financially and to institutional reputation
- Invasive federal monitoring and enforcement

