

IT Web Services Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
November 10, 2016

Members Attending:

Anthony DeSantis
Margaret Fields
Brande Smith
Renato Squindo
Jeff Stevens
TJ Summerford
Wendy Williams

Invited Attendees:

Anne Allen
Jennifer Smith

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 PM.

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

Agenda Topic

- I. Review and discussion of the Web Policy Subcommittee's EIT Policy draft document – Brande Smith: Anne Allen and the subcommittee members worked very hard on this draft policy. We contacted Lisa Deal in Procurement for added input. The document was also presented to Dr. McCollough. [His comments weren't directed toward the document itself; rather concerns about communicating how to incorporate VPAT and the need for training.] The document was written to be all-encompassing, yet easy to understand, while maintaining the format of a traditional UFIT policy document. We've been tasked with an aggressive timeline due to being at risk until a policy is in effect. However, this is not dismissive of concerns that the document not be too rushed. In addition to this committee's vetting of the document, there's the possibility of additional edits and changes, once the document is presented to the CIO's Office, which may vet the document prior to presenting it to the Offices of the Provost and Vice Presidents. Committee, please look at this document with a detailed eye; please make suggestions on revisions as may be needed, please think through every word, and also please ensure it will be understood by non-IT persons. The definitions have been pulled together quickly, please comment freely.

[Committee members read the distributed hard copy of the document.]

Comments/Questions: How do the definitions usually work? They are references to the policy. Have live links ever been included in a policy document? Live links must be updated. Standard GC language is in use.

In regard to access to 3rd party implementations, (access to Amazon, Twitter, Tumblr, etc.), does this need to be addressed in this policy document? We can't dictate to 3rd party social media. Some universities have excluded social media, others have not. Other universities have used blanket statements to specify that the use of 3rd party sites cannot be enforced nor influenced nor included as instructional materials. Purchased products and free social media captioning. Social media is constantly evolving. Journalism and Public Relations courses may require use of social media. Currently, due to security and privacy issues, social media use is voluntary. Social media may fall under 'Business Processes'.

A 2 year timeline for implementation seems very ambitious. Timeline for 5-7 years implementation. It's a gargantuan task; 2 years just seems impossible. The policy is in response to the federal government. The draft is taken from EIT accessibility cases with universities and has followed the guidelines of these cases across U.S. and in England, as well as requirements from the Department of Justice. A 2 year timeline is too long. Projected implementation. Public-facing web pages. Controlled websites; Compass, ISIS, PPM and Canvas, much more difficult to implement; need a strategic plan. It's a lot of educated guessing, the public comment period has been extended. Law-makers are isolated from the burden of cost on institutions. From a legal standpoint, if implementation is possible in a shorter time, we should aim for that. No guarantees that the timeline is acceptable in terms of complaints/citations.

The 'Procurement' section seems more procedural than policy-oriented. This policy lacks teeth. It says what should be done, but there's no enforcement. Policy states requirements, (university employees must adhere to policy), but does not actively seek out those in non-compliance. Enforcement comes into effect when violations to the policy are noted. EIT Coordinator?

In the 'Purpose Statement', add verbiage utilizing the phrase 'universal design', because this is the phrase already in use in instructional design. Instructional materials should be stated as 'must be compliant'. A need for resources and training. Keep policy broad. Outward facing pages. Focus on inclusionary language, regarding web pages.

What about 'checker' tools? Will the university be purchasing new tools to ratify accessibility levels? Looking into an enterprise-wide crawler? "t4" has an accessibility checker. They are working to implement it in the way that UF has requested. They're currently doing a line by line inventory. The Canvas checker, UDOIT tells you what's wrong and makes suggestions for improvement. Design Tools Suite has a checker as well. Targeted accessibility training in conjunction with checker tools.

II. Action Items:

- a. Anthony DeSantis will update the current EIT Policy draft document with his comments, then email this version to Anne Allen.
- b. Anne Allen will upload this version of the document to an online folder by Monday, November 14. The committee will be able to access and comment on the document there.
- c. The Committee will have a 2 week timeline to comment/make suggested updates to the document, with a due date of December 1.
- d. The committee will then meet again on December 7 to review and discuss the final version of the Web Policy Subcommittee's EIT Policy draft document, during a "single topic meeting".

Meeting adjourned at 3:58 PM

Next meeting: Wednesday, December 7, 2016