ATI Web Meeting

July 1, 2014, 10:00 a.m. in LL-430

Presentation by Riny Ledgerwood and Marc Pastor

In Riny's portion of the presentation, she gave an overview of ATI goals and deadlines, as well as links to pertinent website information regarding ATI. This can be found in the slideshow.

She also made it clear that we are not to use the current available Roadmap for updating our scan results and exceptions. She and Marc Paster are nearing completion of a new Google Form that will collect this data from developers.

Riny also pointed out that the most important goals in this audit process are that we remain focused on accessibility improvements and not just on having 100% scores. She noted that the auditors place more importance on the campus having a functional process of ongoing and constructive dialogue, meaningful reporting procedures, and a sincere focus on improvement.

Marc Pastor's presentation addressed improved statistics of campus web scans and awareness, but he primarily focused on the new Google Form they will use to collect "Roadmap" data. Each user will access the form with his/her valid SDSU google login to access the roadmap form corresponding to each site s/he manages. Much of the form will be streamlined with common option checkboxes to collect data about failures and exceptions, and the results will automatically go into a compiled Google spreadsheet. Users will have the option of having their responses sent to them, as well as updating the results.

Some questions about the form:

Q: Can more than one person access this Google Form to update? Diana Osborn noted that many sites are managed by more than one person.

Q: (Suggestion) Adjust the form so that we can opt to have results sent to an additional person(s).

Q: Will everyone have read-only permissions to the entire compiled Google spreadsheet so they can look at other results?

Q: (Suggestion) Include checkboxes that help assess the priority of the web fixes that need to be made.

In response, Kent McKelvey discussed how the campus is trying to assess priority systemically based on set criteria but that there is not a specific recommendation at this time. Marc noted that there is a section in the questions that asks what type of site it is, which can help guide decisions about priority when recommendations are established.

In the last open comments segment of the meeting, Keith asked if color contrast would be enabled in scans since we are supposed to be compliant with WCAG 2.0. There was a concern that we would correct only the problems that were showing up sans color contrast testing, only to have to correct color problems later. Leigh also addressed this concern and asked if there was any discussion at higher levels of moving in a year or two to the WCAG 3.0 requirement since it is so different. Leigh also suggested making a cheat-sheet for dealing with typography to help people recognize how to fix their color contrast problems as well as implement design methods recommendations when starting projects. Leigh offered to discuss this idea more at the next meeting and start such a document/conversation.