

Web Accessibility Subcommittee Futures Planning

Prepared by:

Chad Champney, Office of the Secretary of State
Pamela Cress, University of Kansas
Alicia Etzel, Department of Administration
Anthony Fadale, State of Kansas ADA Coordinator
Leslie Fisher, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Duncan Friend, Department of Administration
Andrew Goodrick, Information Network of Kansas
Mary Grace, Department of Administration
Frances Grenier, Kansas Rehabilitation Services
Libby Peters, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Ray Petty, Great Plains ADA & IT Center
Sandy Sadowski, Legislative Administrative Services
Leslie Salazar-Bushell, Information Network of Kansas
DiAnna Wages, Information Network of Kansas
Deby Zimmerman, Department on Aging

I. Definition of the Issue

There are 49.7 million people who have some type of long -lasting condition or disability living in the United States ¹. This is approximately 16% of individuals age 5 and over who were not living in prisons, nursing homes, and other institutions. In the 65 and over age group, 64.17% reported a disability.

According to a Harris Poll ², adults with disabilities spend, on average, twice as much time online as non-disabled adults. Disabled individuals are also almost twice as likely (48% vs 27%) to report that the Internet has significantly improved the quality of their lives because they feel better informed, more connected to the world, and connected to people with similar interests. Thus, the World Wide Web is a virtual curb ramp for someone who may not be able to leave home easily or who lacks transportation.

Emerging trends such as increased use of webcasts and distance learning technologies, performance demands in special needs education (including No Child Left Behind), expanded opportunities for telework, and recently noted shortcomings in emergency preparedness regarding people with disabilities are some of the areas where accessibility is necessary. In critical situations where every minute is needed to make informed decisions, accessibility is essential. As Kansas looks at how to improve employment opportunities for people with disabilities, technology will play a critical role.

“The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and, if the government entities receive Federal funding, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, generally require that State and local governments provide qualified individuals with disabilities equal access to their programs, services, or activities unless doing so would fundamentally alter the nature of their programs, services, or activities or would impose an undue burden. Kansas reinforced this stipulation with the issuance of ITEC Policy 1210. The Kansas Web Accessibility Subcommittee (WAS) was chartered to bring together stakeholders to further the tasks of ensuring that all State of Kansas websites and web -based applications are fully accessible and usable to individuals regardless of varying abilities.

A nationwide study³ ranked Kansas 27th in terms of overall e-government and sharing in a three-way tie for 4th in overall information accessibility. However, an internal review of ten state of Kansas agency home pages found the most accessible page had 12 compliance errors and the least accessible had 42 errors (see Attachment A).

¹ US Census Bureau 2003 American Community Survey Summary ↵

² harrisinteractive.com ↵

³ [State and Federal e-Government in the United States](#), by Darrell M. West, Brown University ↵

II. Definition of the Audience

The WAS recognizes that the accessibility initiative needs to address issues experienced by the following audiences accessing content on the web:

1. Persons using mobile phones, PDAs, laptops, and other advanced technologies.
2. Persons using old browsers, computers, and/or operating systems. (According to recent statistics 10% of the Internet public are using IE v4 and older, Netscape v 4, and other older browsers.)
3. Persons using slow Internet connections.
4. Persons who are aging. This group has accessibility issues such as reduced mobility, reduced hand -eye coordination and low vision.
5. Young Internet users. This group may frequently access the Internet for an aging or disabled adult, but may not have a high level of reading comprehension.
6. Persons who do not fluently speak or understand English.
7. Persons with visual impairments - including persons who are legally blind, those with low vision, and those who are colorblind (approximately 3% of the population).
8. Persons with physical disabilities, such as those with impaired mobility. This group includes people who use assistive technology devices.

The level of effort required to support this WAS initiative will vary across the various stakeholder groups. A detailed Stakeholder Analysis was done to determine and define the various stakeholder groups, the level of effort that will be required of them, the nature and timing of the impact the effort will have on them, and the degree to which each stakeholder group will impact the success of the effort (see Attachment B). The proposal would offer enhanced accessibility and usability education, support, and leadership to these two types of internal audiences:

1. Web Implementors - The persons throughout the state responsible for design, development, and maintenance of the state's websites and web applications.
2. Stakeholders - The state's agencies, colleges, universities, and business partners who have websites or web-based applications.

III. Approach and Summary of Findings

During calendar year 2005, a reinvigorated subcommittee worked to define the mission, vision, goals, and objectives for a web accessibility initiative whereby all State of Kansas web services and content would become accessible to and usable by individuals regardless of ability. The subcommittee has developed a strategic plan containing three principle goals: education, support, and leadership, including objectives and suggestions for how to reach those objectives (see Attachment C). The subcommittee also identified a large, diverse stakeholder group that stands to benefit from accessibility improvements.

During this yearlong process, weaknesses have been identified including a lack of consistent agency participation in the work of the subcommittee and little serious investment in tools or personnel dedicated to improving the situation. These relevant facts have emerged during the strategic planning process:

1. Virtually every governmental agency has some form of web presence.
2. There is no current assessment of strengths and weaknesses of personnel who maintain Kansas' web presence, nor is there a position classification that encompasses all the skill sets required to develop and maintain an accessible web presence.
3. There are areas where web content is difficult to make accessible.
4. Training needs to be ongoing and readily available, but need not be in-person because distance learning is an advantage that accrues to accessible systems.
5. To accomplish the mission of serving all citizens of Kansas with an accessible web-based system, a commitment of technological and personnel resources will be necessary.
6. Policy and standards needed to sustain accessible web content and process need to be developed and adopted.
7. High-level leadership and support will be necessary since control over web resources is likely to remain dispersed among governmental agencies.
8. Kansas needs to monitor compliance on an ongoing basis using an enterprise solution that provides easily understood, actionable, compliance reports.
9. Key personnel from all agencies of state government are needed to accomplish this accessible E-government mission.
10. Other entities within the state that operate under similar accessibility requirements – such as counties, municipalities, and school districts – should be able to take advantage of training which the state develops for its own purposes.

IV. Gap Analysis

The WAS has accomplished a significant amount of work in spite of the fact that its members volunteer their time and expertise. These efforts have come about through collaboration between agency representatives, university staff, and disability advocates:

- Developing ITEC Policy 1210 regarding state agency website accessibility
- Developing and subsequently revising the Kansas Web Content Accessibility Guidelines – currently using Version 3
- Developing Implementation Guidance for the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines for the State of Kansas
- Providing training to over 200 state agency web developers
- Conducting two surveys of all state agencies to assess training needs and levels of compliance
- Making presentations at various events to increase awareness of Kansas' web accessibility initiative
- Attending presentations and reviewing features of four full scale Enterprise Solution Tools that assist in assessment and compliance monitoring of web sites
- Creating preliminary versions of a "Toolkit" CD for use by web developers
- Developing a guidance document for accessible PDF's and establishing a technical team to develop guidance "how to's" for creating accessible PDF's

While these accomplishments are considerable, by late 2004 it became clear to the subcommittee members that the needs of the state could not be met by a "volunteer -only" effort. After engaging in a yearlong effort to evaluate the current and future needs of the state regarding web accessibility and improved e-government, the WAS created this document to communicate the goals of the subcommittee and the resources needed to accomplish them. The most pressing gaps identified by the subcommittee are as follows:

- The committee needs to be reorganized to include strong sponsorship from the governor and IT leaders, clearly defined leadership responsibilities, broader representation of stakeholders, a consistent membership with clear goals and responsibilities, and administrative support for the committee's ongoing work.
- There is a need to monitor compliance with Policy 1210. A number of enterprise solutions are being marketed which would allow for automated evaluation and reporting on the accessibility of state agency websites.
- There is an ongoing need for training. In the future, a broader array of training options – including face-to-face, web-based and self-directed training – will be required to meet the needs of a diverse group of stakeholders (web developers, web content providers, vendors, etc.).
- There is a need for ongoing support for implementors. This would include offering technical assistance to web developers (e.g. on-line community of web developers and "help desk"), providing resources to verify accessibility, and developing better communications to inform web implementors of changes to the Accessibility Guidelines, Policy 1210, and other accessibility information.

- There is a need for a more robust and useful web presence to address some of the issues of training and support. Such a website is being conceived as a one-stop shop for information needed by the many stakeholders. The site could provide web developers with links to educational resources and IT-related news, announce training opportunities, and highlight agency sites that are models of accessibility.

The next section of this document presents information about the amount of full-time resources needed to not only maintain the status quo but to bring Kansas to a position of prominence in providing access to e-government for all its citizens. This information is based on the calculations shown in the Person Loading Chart in (Attachment D).

V. Proposed Action Steps

The following action steps are required to have a successful web accessibility program:

1. To ensure the education and support goals are met, the enterprise must allocate funds or reassign a full-time position (State Web Accessibility Specialist) dedicated to the development of a training program to assist agencies with technical aspects of web accessibility and usability. This individual must be able to develop, deliver, and maintain training on creating accessible web content; maintain a website containing a learning library on web accessibility and usability; develop web-based training materials for creating accessible web content; and provide support and guidance for utilizing the Enterprise Solution Tool to identify and resolve compliance errors. The program must provide web implementors with realistic examples and models that demonstrate how to make web content and services accessible and usable to individuals with varying abilities.
2. A second full-time position (State Web Accessibility Coordinator) needs to be funded to support and provide leadership of this effort. This person would promote the web accessibility initiative, communicate and maintain information on web accessibility issues with stakeholders, assist in compliance activities including the use of the Enterprise Solution Tool, and cooperate with the state ADA Coordinator, WAS, and other relevant agencies and organizations.
3. The WAS must be reorganized with a charter similar to that of the Security Committee. The subcommittee members would share responsibility for the goal areas of education, support and leadership and may be required to assist with some objectives. The state Web Accessibility Coordinator would be responsible to chair the WAS and report on its behalf to the ITEC and ITAB. The WAS membership should include persons who work in the accessibility arena along with agency/enterprise participation. (See Attachment D for specifics on responsibilities.)

VI. Summary of Resources Needed

In addition to funding two full -time positions, there will be soft costs incurred by all state agencies – predominantly staff time to attend training, and then time to apply the training to the agency’s websites and services. The person-loading chart (Attachment D) estimates the hours needed and how they will be distributed to plan and implement the Goals and Objectives outlined in Attachment C through the first implementation year. To be successful, the state Web Accessibility Specialist position will need to be ongoing, with a shift in the second to fifth years from development of training programs and materials to delivery of the training, evaluation of state websites, follow-up surveys, and web implementer support. An ongoing effort will be needed for continued planning, researching new trends, and maintaining policy and guidance documents.

A Sample Charter has been developed (see Attachment E) to identify the subcommittee’s new vision, mission, and responsibilities and to provide for the participation and representation needed to govern the effort.

VII. Business Case

The case for accessible information technology in Kansas’ government emanates from several sources:

1. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) expects all state and local government entities to provide nondiscriminatory access to services for people with disabilities. See: <http://www.ada.gov/websites2.htm>
2. Recent Assistive Technology Act Reauthorization amendments put priority on increasing access to needed devices for individuals with disabilities. This means that IT access will be even more important in the future because more people with disabilities will have the technology they need to access it. See: <http://www.resna.org/taproject/library/laws/pl108-364.pdf>
3. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998 expects individuals with disabilities to have access to, and use of information and data comparable to the access to, and use of, the information and data by members of the public who are not individuals with disabilities. While this applies to federal agencies, it clearly establishes a national expectation of nondiscrimination in IT and web - based services. See: <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/508/508law.html>
4. The Web Accessibility Initiative of the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) describe the benefits of accessible design in their article on the topic at (<http://www.w3.org/WAI/bcase/benefits.html>). The key areas of ROI are 1) Increased market share; 2) improved efficiency; 3) demonstrating social responsibility; and 4) reducing legal liability.
5. Under Kansas law 75-7203 - Article 72 on Information Technology provides that the information technology executive council (ITEC) adopt such policies, rules, and regulations as are necessary to implement, administer, and enforce the provisions of this act for all state agencies – including management methods,

coordination and planning, IT architecture, policies and procedures, new technologies, and “such other functions and duties as necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.” ITEC is thus statutorily responsible for Kansas’ IT system—which must also include compliance with applicable federal law. [<http://www.kslegislature.org/legsrv-statutes/getStatuteInfo.do>]

6. Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and No Child Left Behind laws mandate that all children be educated, including students with disabilities who are often affected by inaccessible IT. In a rural state like Kansas, distance learning is likely to become increasingly important in meeting the needs of Kansas’ students. Accessible IT will enable such services to be provided in a nondiscriminatory manner.
7. People with disabilities continue to be unemployed and underemployed at a vastly greater rate than the population at large. Having access to IT will expand employment opportunities both within government and in the private sector.
8. As information technology improves and expands, Kansas will be able to provide more services via e-Government, making it even more important that those services be made user - friendly and accessible to the widest possible audience.
9. Additional information on the Business Case for Accessible Web Technologies can be found at <http://www.w3.org/WAI/bcase/benefits.html>.

VIII. Conclusion

Although Kansas has made some strides in the area of providing accessible web services, the gap in making continuous improvements seems to be based in a lack of education and training for stakeholders and web implementors. This we see as the key for not only making existing web services accessible but keeping up with the challenges of changing technology. Training alone, however, is not adequate, because even trained web implementors continue to need support as technology evolves and as federal web accessibility initiatives change.

Leadership and continued monitoring for compliance are the other two key components to a successful state web accessibility effort. Leadership in the Executive Branch should champion efforts that embrace the ideals of accessibility and usability. State of Kansas leaders must embrace a vision of excellence in E -government. A commitment to the vision entails, as outlined in this document, the hiring or reassignment of dedicated staff to serve as trainers and coordinators. Combined successes on the part of State Leadership and the WAS will assure the accessibility and usability of state services and information to all state employees and the public now and in the future.

Attachments:

A. Web Accessibility and Usability Factors for Ten State Agency Websites

B. WAS Stakeholder Analysis

C. WAS Mission, Vision, Goals and Objectives

D. Person Loading Chart

E. Draft WAS Charter

Attachment A

Web Accessibility and Usability Factors for 10 State Agency Websites

This following summary shows the results of 10 State of Kansas websites that were checked for accessibility and other usability factors. This is not a comprehensive review as would need to be done for complete usability testing, however it does demonstrate the amount of work that needs to be done in education and support of agencies and on the part of the agencies' web implementors to make State of Kansas web spaces usable and accessible.

The websites that were reviewed were: The State of Kansas (Kansas.gov), and the following nine State of Kansas Departments of: Administration, Revenue, Social and Rehabilitation Services, Transportation, Health & Environment, Commerce, Education, Insurance and Aging. Of the agency home pages reviewed, the most accessible page had 12 compliance errors, and the least accessible had 42 errors. Errors included:

- input items with missing associated labels
- tables with missing headers
- missing skip navigation and noscript tags
- missing language declaration
- clear definition of links
- missing text version of multimedia
- tables with missing summaries
- page flicker
- lack of use of keyboard to access scripts or input boxes
- poor use of color or lack of high contrast.

In most cases these errors are fairly easy to repair or avoid when the web implementors have the knowledge, resources and training to design for accessibility and usability.

Of the sites reviewed, most seem to be embracing the use of Cascading Style Sheets (CSS) for presentation. This is an ideal approach to presenting accessible and usable content that can be accessed by people using screen reader software. But it doesn't address the needs of the portion of the viewing public (3 -5%) who have older computers loaded with older browsers that cannot be upgraded due to system limitations and the costs of upgrading equipment, and those that are using browsers that do not support CSS. People with disabilities (because of unemployment and low income) are more likely to own older technology.

There is a happy medium for creating attractive, usable, accessible web pages. It is largely a matter of providing the web implementer with the training and support to accomplish the WAS Vision.

Attachment B

WEB ACCESSIBILITY PLAN ROLLOUT

Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group	Description	Accessibility Plan Area	Nature and Timing of Impact	Impact Assessment	Criticality to Success of Plan	Amount of Effort Required to Change	Anticipated Concerns
<i>[General stakeholder category]</i>	<i>[Name of stakeholder being analyzed]</i>	<i>[Data such as a list of key leaders and corresponding contact information; size and location of the group; observations re: group culture]</i>	<i>[Project area impacting the group; may require more than one entry]</i>	<i>[Description of the anticipated impact that change will have on the group's systems, processes and/or organization]</i>	<i>[Level of impact expected for group; low, medium, or high]</i>	<i>[Degree to which this group will affect the success of the change process]</i>	<i>[The level of effort required in order for group to change; low, medium, or high]</i>	<i>[Key concerns and issues of the group related to the change process]</i>
NON-STATE	Outside Training Vendors	Members not yet identified. Could be individuals or companies.	Education	Training vendors will need to understand state's guidelines and relationships to other guidelines like 508. Could impact CBT, training materials - they will be required to assess differences and potentially accommodate.	Low	High	High, if training needs to be customized. Otherwise, medium.	How are state's guidelines different from existing courses, other standards? What is State's ongoing level of commitment to training? What sunk costs will I need to put in to developing training?
NON-IT	Internal Training Vendors	Only some members identified.	Education	May need to learn state guidelines and develop skills and knowledge necessary for training - could be big initial rush of attendees. Adds to list of other responsibilities.	Medium	High	Depends on capabilities and familiarity - Medium to High.	Additional workload - executives concerned with where funding is for this.
IT	Web App Developers	Not organized group; size unknown; don't know how to contact directly; not always IT; complex work, not a lot of people to talk about it with; wide range of knowledge and skills.	Education, Support, Leadership	They will be benchmarked, surveyed on training needs; Impact of training varies by skill level; impacted by time needed for scheduling training; held responsible for knowledge of web accessibility policies, guidelines, and implementation techniques; Their input needed on training delivery methods, knowledge required and curriculum; Need to be informed more about who audience is; Expected to understand support processes, know where to get updates; Potential involvement and representation in effort; Require ability to communicate with leadership that objectives have been accomplished; Expected to quantify results of work; Impact may be unknown in some areas due to lack of participation/representation on committee.	High	High	High - Varies by skill level, incentives, sponsorship.	Too much additional work; potentially overwhelmed; May not see added value. May need to do significant additional training to gain competence, not sure how to check/validate work, unclear expectations for those who work on Commercial Off-the-Shelf software (COTS) - predeveloped packages - because they are often difficult and costly to change and modifications are discouraged due to support costs and potential effects to stability of application.
IT	Non-Web App Developers	Staff who either mainly work on non-web apps and are confronted with web functionality additions, or who only do backend components of web apps.	Education	Will need to be aware of impact of work on front-end accessibility of applications, stay current on changes. If work is primarily on non-web apps, will be difficult to switch back and forth - might need followup resources more than others who do it daily.	Medium	High - like web app developers, they're part of the "chain" of product creation	High - if not familiar with requirements	Use principles only intermittently, not day-to-day, how to stay current, impact on workload/schedule. Generally similar to web app developers.
NON-IT	Web Content Developers	Same issues as web App developers. In addition have to put up the content the senior leadership wants.	Education, Support, Leadership	Similar issues to Web App Developers. Could place restrictions on flexibility of how content is presented, potentially causing conflict with management. May need to learn additional tech skills outside tools they're familiar with, or additional features of tools.	High - depends on skills.	High	Same as Web App Developers - varies.	Similar to Web App Developers - How do I check work, may require significant additional training, extra work not recognized.
IT	Web Content/App Developer Supervisors	Not organized group, size unknown, not sure how to contact.	Education, Support, Leadership	Issues with balancing workload of new applications with remediation and the added requirements of accessibility. Have to explain to managers upstream about issues, added time/resources necessary, etc. Also, required to have high-level understanding of work and skills required, potential impact on workload and estimates.	High	High	Medium	Cost of training (if any) and additional tools, level of effort required by staff, added workload, delays in product delivery, potential conflict over impact on presentation/format. Uncertain what requirements and expectations are re: COTS (packaged software).

Attachment B

WEB ACCESSIBILITY PLAN ROLLOUT

Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group	Description	Accessibility Plan Area	Nature and Timing of Impact	Impact Assessment	Criticality to Success of Plan	Amount of Effort Required to Change	Anticipated Concerns
NON-IT	Creators (often non-IT) of content destined for electronic distribution.	Not organized group. May not even have access to web server/publishing.	Education, Support	Need to learn techniques for creating documents in a manner that is accessible for uses upstream. Level of effort required could grow and method of presentation could be impacted - potentially at odds with legal or other requirements. Will need time for training and awareness of support processes.	High	High	High	Changes look of document (legal format, concerns). Time required (turnaround). How to get training, support, am I doing it right? Undue burden - don't see added value.
IT	Information Technology Managers in State Agencies	Fairly distinct group, having email or mail lists that include most.	Education, Leadership, Support	Could affect existing plans, (dates/resources), may add requirements for projects. Expanded responsibilities, expected to show leadership in this area, could affect PD's. Educated to weigh cost/benefit effectively. May be held accountable for adequate training and successful implementation. Will need to set up internal mechanisms to assess compliance.	High	High	Medium - depends on current level of effort	Cost? Time required? Value added? Impact on skills required in hiring process? Impact on COTS evaluation, procurement?
NON-IT	Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinators	There is a list of contacts; they wear many hats; they are not IT oriented for the most part.; Broad range of skills and leadership	Education, Leadership, Support	How do they assist in measuring results; what can they do to achieve compliance; What is compliance?; They will be held accountable; Not enough training on subject. How to empower upper management leadership? What is State ADA coordinator offering? What is agency ADA coordinator role? Court ordered access/DOJ Settlement require access	High	High	Medium	See "Nature and timing of impact".
IT	AccessKansas	INK Board members and Executive Director, INK Contract Vendor (KIC) supporting AccessKansas	Education, Support, Leadership	Need to stay current, help in providing education, could result in more work re: Webmaster's Resource Center, need help in relaying information to stakeholders, required to provide leadership.	Medium	High	Low	How much of our resources are required? What is expectation of scope of participation?
NON-IT	End users of State web pages and applications	Very large - undefined. Some program-specific communication methods may be in place.	Education, Support, Leadership	Responsibility to report issues and understand accessibility features.	Medium	High	Low	Where to report problems. What is resolution method? Where to get support, how do I educate myself.
NON-STATE	Application development vendors	Broad group whose members change depending on project. Often large projects, or COTS-related.	Education, Support, Leadership	May be working on or providing already developed software - not sure how/if to reengineer, or handle ongoing support issues. May not be familiar with web accessibility issues or remediation. Time is money - may impact estimates, costs, time for training. Not sure where to get final "verification" of compliance.	High - like web app developers.	High	High - may be lower if already familiar.	What are requirements - and are they Kansas-specific? What will impact on project timelines and level of effort be? Where can I get training and when? Will training benefit me elsewhere, on other projects? How do I tell if I've completed work correctly?
IT	DISC Bureau of Customer Services Small Agency Support Unit	Known members - provides technical support to as many as 40 small state agencies.	Education, Support, Leadership	May be looked to for guidance by small agencies they provide tech support to. Could be required to be intermediary with third parties (ADA coordinators, vendors, etc.) on issues. May be required to attend training or incorporate in work related to application development.	Medium	High	High - may be lower if already familiar.	Similar to vendors. What are requirements - and are they Kansas-specific? What will impact on project timelines and level of effort be? Where can I get training and when? Will training benefit me elsewhere, on other projects? How do I tell if I've completed work correctly? What is added value and cost (esp. re: small agency budgets)

Attachment B

WEB ACCESSIBILITY PLAN ROLLOUT

Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group	Description	Accessibility Plan Area	Nature and Timing of Impact	Impact Assessment	Criticality to Success of Plan	Amount of Effort Required to Change	Anticipated Concerns
NON-IT	Procurement Officers (agency)	Known members - roster likely available through Divisions of Purchases and Accounts and Reports (for smaller agencies).	Education, Support, Leadership	Training will take time. May extend/complicate RFP development, negotiations, and selection process. Additional responsibilities for them. Ranking criteria for vendors impacted.	High	High	High	Awareness needs to be built before procurement requests come to them. What are the choices available? They don't necessarily develop the RFP for all agencies, depending on \$ amount. How much extra work will be involved? Impact on deadlines and required lead time? Cost for training and staying current on rules? How do I tell if something's compliant?
NON-IT	Procurement Officers (central)	Known group.	Education, Support, Leadership	Same as above (agency procurement officers). Challenges from inconsistency in broader customer groups - for example, conflicting agency expectations on a multi-agency/statewide contract negotiation.	High	High	High	Similar to agency procurement officers.
NON-IT	Agency Public Information Officers	Known group.	Education, Support, Leadership	May be called upon to answer public or other inquiries on the topic. Could impact look and feel of both web/non-web communications. Need for education on things that are/aren't compliant. Understand/own/champion accessibility vision.	Medium	High	High	What is the message? (want to "get it right") What is expected of us - support, advocacy, answering inquiries? How will this impact my design and communication (brand)?
NON-IT	State agency officials	Known group.	Education, Support, Leadership	Understanding of need and amount of resources required by this. Understand costs, impact on business partner operations. Depending on how procurement authority is distributed in agencies, educated on agency responsibility for anyone with spending authority re: distributed purchasing authority and Web Accessibility.	High	High	Medium	What are costs, accountability exposure, risks - what if they fall short of goal? How does this impact agency mission/vision?
NON-IT	Governor's Office	Known group.	Education, Leadership, Support	Own and express vision, priorities, will need to hold agencies accountable, know where we are now and where we need to be at a high level. Understand what resources are required, and what are being expended - accountable for understanding status at a high level.	High	High	Medium	What are expectations, what do I need to do to help? What are resource requirements, potential costs/benefits?
NON-IT	Disability advocacy and support community (enumerate specific members/orgs)	School for the Deaf; School for the Blind; Disability Rights Center of Kansas; KCDC; Assistive Technology for Kansas; ADA Project; ADA Coordinators; Independent living centers; Attorneys; Kansas Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired (KABVI); Kansas Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (KCDHH)	Different groups could help depending on skill set	Similar concerns to those of ADA coordinators: Need adequate and clearly established feedback methods to make sure concerns of users are addressed; Effort will require their assistance in building public awareness, help in marketing and communication, help in emphasizing importance with other stakeholders.	Medium	High	Low	Same issues as end users, but also how to keep informed and monitor resolution of issues.
IT	Chief Information Technology Officers (CITO) (all branches)	Known group	Leadership, Education, Support	What impact does this have on vision and resources? Need to understand business case. Champion accessibility and make it an IT priority.	Medium	High	Depends on the issue	What personnel, technology, and planning strategies do to impact or enhance mission/vision? What are expectations of them? How do they deal with exemptions/approval, or unknowns/issues?

Attachment B

WEB ACCESSIBILITY PLAN ROLLOUT

Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Category	Stakeholder Group	Description	Accessibility Plan Area	Nature and Timing of Impact	Impact Assessment	Criticality to Success of Plan	Amount of Effort Required to Change	Anticipated Concerns
IT	Information Technology Advisory Board (ITAB)/Information Technology Executive Council (ITEC)	Central IT management leadership	Leadership	Similar to CITO, but at an agency level. Own policy and role/responsibilities in governance. Stay current on status, expected to provide advocacy, resources, leadership, feedback.	Medium	High	Same as IT managers and agency officials.	How does it impact my bottom line? What are expectations of me - my role in all this?
NON-IT	Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Coordinator	Central accessibility office	Education, Leadership, Support	How do we achieve compliance (delivery of services) while not negatively impacting resources available for other programs	High	High	Same as agency ADA Coordinators	Same issues as Agency ADA coordinators at a State level
IT	Kansas Information Technology Office (KITO)	CITA, PMO, CISO	Education, Leadership, Support	Impact of accessibility on State Architecture planning and adoption. SIM Plan impact. Agy 3yr IT/Mgmt Budget Plan impact. Security impact at all levels. PMO impact on projects 250K or greater.	Medium	High	Same as CITO/ITAB	What is business case for web accessibility? What is role in accountability and compliance? What is impact on policy maintenance and coordination - where to stay current on information and status of efforts.
LEGISLATIVE	Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT)	Known group - legislative committee made up of members from both houses. Meets periodically. Reviews IT project plans.	Leadership					
LEGISLATIVE	Information Systems (IS) Team	Actual implementation of IT in the Kansas Legislature						
LEGISLATIVE	Systems Review Team	The business side of the organization as it relates to oversight of technology used in the Legislature						
LEGISLATIVE	Legislative Coordinating Council (LCC)	Leadership						
JUDICIAL	Judicial	CITO - others? Need more definition of this group	Leadership, Education, Support	May be similar to other branches, not sure on relationship to county courts, etc.				
NON-IT	Division of Budget	Known element	Leadership, Education, Support	Budget requests impacted, "exceptional" (unplanned or very significant) requests may need to be worked around.	High	High	Low	Inadequate integration of needs into planning cycle. Are there alternative means with which you can fulfill requirements? Why is this important (not that it isn't, just need to understand business case). Where does this fit in agency priorities? the Governor's project priorities? How have you been getting by to-date?
REGENTS	Universities	Known, in general, but need more specifics - RITC?	Leadership, Education, Support	May impact different groups differently (teachers, students, administration, etc.).	High	High	Medium	May have to be "more" compliant due to Federal requirements of funding. Less control over "affiliated groups" than some other organizations.

Attachment C

WAS Mission, Vision, Goals and Objectives

Vision

All State of Kansas web services and content is fully accessible and usable.

Mission

To provide education, support, and leadership to implementors and consumers of State of Kansas web services and content.

Mission Theme: Education

Goal 1: Ensure Web Accessibility Implementors have attended basic training in proper development and assessment techniques, policies, and guidelines.

Objective A. Define knowledge/curriculum needed to develop accessible content.

Objective B. Assess/benchmark training needs and establish process to identify training needs on an ongoing basis.

Objective C. Identify, create, and implement training using methods appropriate to needs and audience.

Objective D. Institute assessment and support tools as needed to determine effectiveness of training effort.

Goal 2: Ensure awareness of all stakeholders on costs, benefits, responsibilities, and policies related to accessibility.

Objective A. Use stakeholder list to identify appropriate/best methods for building awareness with each audience, including: Cost/Benefit, Level of Effort, Policies, Responsibilities, Availability and nature of support, etc.

Objective B. Develop materials and process needed to create, communicate and maintain stakeholder awareness of key messages.

Objective C. Implement and maintain stakeholder communications.

Objective D. Develop and institute tools as needed to determine effectiveness of stakeholder communications.

Mission Theme: Support

Goal 3: Provide ongoing support for web implementors and stakeholders with web accessibility issues.

Objective A. Identify support needs for all web accessibility stakeholder groups.

Objective B. Develop and document clear support processes for each web accessibility stakeholder group, using common methods where feasible.

Objective C. Implement support processes for all stakeholder groups.

Objective D. Communicate support processes to all stakeholder groups.

Objective E. Institute assessment tools to determine effectiveness of support processes.

Goal 4: Maintain policies, guidelines, tools, and training materials accessible online via the WAS website.

Objective A. Define policies, guidelines, tools and timelines needed to support and update this initiative.

Objective B. Develop processes, roles, and responsibilities for ongoing support (including feedback mechanism).

Objective C. Update materials as defined in (A).

Goal 5: Support Web Accessibility Subcommittee logistics including meeting arrangements, notifications, agendas, minutes, and similar materials, including maintenance of WAS website.

Objective A. From re-charter of WAS, develop annual meeting schedules and all requirements for support.

Objective B. Determine WAS process, roles, and responsibilities, and identify and assign support resources.

Objective C. Develop tools to support committee processes and operations that can be used to measure accountability and participation on the WAS committee.

Goal 6. Develop and monitor performance measures across all objectives.

Objective A. Catalog measures from planning objectives and develop consolidated monitoring process and tools.

Objective B. Develop and implement methods for obtaining feedback from stakeholders.

Goal 7: Identify and monitor emerging web accessibility issues.

Objective A. Identify and catalog sources to monitor trends, changes, and issues in web accessibility. Automate information gathering and distribution where possible.

Objective B. Develop process, roles, and responsibilities for monitoring, communicating, and incorporating information about emerging web accessibility issues.

Mission Theme: Leadership

Goal 8: Promote visibility of web accessibility effort and champion success.

Objective A. Widely distribute WAS plan and brief stakeholder groups.

Objective B. Identify opportunities to promote this effort and actively engage in them.

Objective C. Develop/distribute annual report of committee activities, successes, impact.

Goal 9: Develop standard communications and channels for stakeholder groups.

Objective A. Support development of communication plan and identification of associated communication channels.

Objective B. Develop and implement measures to determine effectiveness of communication plan and activities.

Objective C. Actively support establishment of a webmasters group in Kansas.

Goal 10: Ensure accountability.

Objective A. Use information generated from tools and measures to identify accountability issues and take steps to resolve with team members and stakeholders.

Goal 11: Obtain resources necessary to deliver vision.

Objective A. Use information generated by accountability tools to measure effectiveness of resource allocations and to identify deficiencies/opportunities.

Objective B. Actively work with sponsors to obtain and maintain resources at levels required by work plan objectives.

Attachment D

Person Loading Chart

Summarized Goals listed in first column refer to the goals listed in Attachment C. The Education Team is a subgroup of the WAS members with technical expertise that may assist with development of educational materials for the targeted audiences. The Web Accessibility Coordinator would supervise the Web Accessibility Specialist. These are both new positions that are proposed in Section V of The WAS Futures Planning document. These positions would best be positioned within The Office of Diversity a department within The Department of Administration's Human Resource Services.

Activity	WAS Committee	Education Team	State ADA Coordinator	Web Accessibility Coordinator	Web Accessibility Specialist
Goal 1- Training	8 hrs	40 hrs	6 hrs	120 hrs	1040 hrs
Goal 2 – Stakeholder Awareness	8 hrs	8 hrs	2 hrs	480 hrs	120 hrs
Goal 3 – Technical Support	4 hrs	16 hrs		40 hrs	480 hrs
Goal 4 - Website	4 hrs	16 hrs		120 hrs	120 hrs
Goal 5 - WAS	52 hrs	6 hrs	12 hrs	120 hrs	48 hrs
Goal 6 - Performance	4 hrs		4 hrs	80 hrs	
Goal 7 – Emerging Trends	6 hrs			240 hrs	120 hrs
Goal 8 - Champion Effort	4 hrs	4 hrs	4 hrs	480 hrs	80 hrs
Goal 9 – Communication	4 hrs		12 hrs	120 hrs	24 hrs
Goal 10 - Compliance			4 hrs	240 hrs	40 hrs
Goal 11 - Resources	8 hrs		12 hrs	40 hrs	
Totals	104 hrs	90 hrs	56 hrs	2080 hrs	2072 hrs

Attachment E

Information Technology Policy xxxx – Web Accessibility Subcommittee Charter.

1.0 TITLE: Web Accessibility Subcommittee Charter

1.1 EFFECTIVE DATE: March xx, 2006

2.0 PURPOSE: To formally establish a Web Accessibility Subcommittee (WAS) of the Information Technology Advisory Board (ITAB) which shall report to the Chief Information Technology Officer, Executive Branch (CITO, Executive Branch) and the Information Technology Executive Council (ITEC).

3.0 ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED: All divisions, departments, agencies, boards and commissions of the state.

4.0 REFERENCES:

4.1 K.S.A. 1998 Supp. 75-7203 authorizes the ITEC to: Adopt information resource policies and procedures and provide direction and coordination for the application of the state's information technology resources for all state agencies.

5.0 DEFINITIONS:

5.1 Web Accessibility is an inclusive term to address the needed oversight and modifications required for enterprise web based services and functions to insure accessibility and usability by all Kansans.

5.2 Web based services refers to any and all services being offered to the public via an enterprise web site or web application.

6.0 POLICY:

6.1 The Web Accessibility Subcommittee shall:

6.1.1 Address web accessibility issues and provide policy, standards, guidelines, or procedural recommendations to the Chief Information Technology Officer, Executive Branch and the Information Technology Executive Council;

6.1.2 Review software tools for an enterprise wide solution for checking accessibility compliance and make recommendations to ITAB for the purchase of the recommended solution.

6.1.3 Review annually and modify as required the Web Accessibility Guidance document (ITEC Policy 1210) for advances in technology and/or any changes in the federal accessibility guidelines.

6.1.4 Survey agency stakeholders regarding skill levels and training needs for web implementors.

6.1.5 Develop and deliver training to enterprise web implementors.

6.1.6 Provide information and support to enterprise stakeholders and web implementors on web accessibility and usability technology resources.

6.1.7 Coordinate with the Kansas Information Consortium to plan web usability and accessibility awareness activities.

7.0 PROCEDURES:

7.1 The Chief Information Technology Officer, Executive Branch and each state cabinet department shall appoint as their representative to the WAS the person most qualified to discharge the intent of this charter. The WAS or the Chief Information Technology Officer, Executive Branch may seek representation from additional state agencies to serve as voting members.

7.2 The Chief Information Technology Officers of the Legislative and Judicial Branch, shall appoint a person as their representative to serve on the WAS.

7.3 The State ADA Coordinator shall serve on the subcommittee.

7.4 The Chief Information Technology Officer, Executive Branch, shall appoint/select two disability advocates from the private sector to serve on the Subcommittee.

7.5 Representatives from the Kansas Information Consortium shall be selected by their management to serve on the Subcommittee.

7.6 One or two representatives from the Regents shall be selected/appointed by the President of the Board of Regents.

7.6 Until such time as fully dedicated staff are assigned, the Subcommittee will be chaired by a person selected annually by the membership of the Subcommittee. The duties of the chair shall be to direct the work of the Subcommittee, plan and schedule meetings, and act as the group facilitator. The Subcommittee chair will also report to ITAB and ITEC on the activities of the Subcommittee.

7.7 A representative from the Kansas Diversity Network shall be selected by the Chair of that Network.

7.8 Additional web implementors will serve on the committee as representatives of their state agency or group.

8.0 RESPONSIBILITIES:

8.1 Heads of agencies, boards and commissions, will establish procedures for their organization's compliance with the requirements of this policy.

8.2 The Kansas Information Technology Office is responsible for the maintenance of this policy.

8.3 Each member of the ITAB shall carry out and support the duties and responsibilities of Board members as intended by this charter.

8.4 The Chief Information Technology Officer, Executive Branch is responsible for the maintenance of this policy.

9.0 CANCELLATION: None

10.0 CONTACT PERSON: