

## **Academic Senate Reports to the LRCCD Board of Trustees Respectfully submitted by the Academic Senate Presidents October 20, 2021 (ConferZoom)**

### **District Academic Senate (DAS) President, Julie Oliver, Reports:**

- The **Los Rios Ethnic Studies Faculty Council** has been working hard since being formed by the District Academic Senate in December 2020. The council has advocated for full-time ethnic studies faculty hiring, the formation of ethnic studies departments, and the development of the core ethnic studies curriculum. All three of these items are happening at each college-faculty are being hired, departments are being formed, and the core curriculum is being implemented. Additionally, the council has been updating all the ethnic studies courses to meet all five of the CSU Area F core competency requirements, and the council expects that all the courses will be approved upon submission this fall for CSU Area F approval. Finally, we are pleased to announce that FLC professor and council co-chair Tamara Cheshire has been appointed to the state task force being formed to work on implementing the new Title 5 ethnic studies requirement for the California community college system. Wonderful news to have a Los Rios faculty member on this important state work group. Congratulations to Tamara for her appointment and to the entire Los Rios Ethnic Studies Faculty Council for all their hard work. [Final 2020-2021 report from the council shared as an attachment.]
- The **District Accessibility Plan Implementation Committee (DAPIC)** presented their work to the District Academic Senate on September 21, 2021. The full report has been shared as a separate document. Please take the time to review the full report as it contains critical information which needs to be considered and acted upon by the district. The District Academic Senate supports the continued work of the DAPIC to address their proposed next steps and goals for 2021-2022.
- The District Academic Senate had a first reading on the proposed formation of a LRCCD Equivalency Committee. The draft Regulation 5123 language was reviewed which outlines the structure of a new district level, faculty coordinated, equivalency committee. This item will return to the District Academic Senate in November for a second reading.

For information about academic senate activities at the district, college, or local level please use the following links:

- [District Academic Senate \(DAS\)](#)
- [ARC Academic Senate](#)
- [CRC Academic Senate](#)

*California Title 5 §53200 "10+1" 1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites 2. Degree and certificate requirements 3. Grading policies 4. Educational program development 5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success 6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles 7. Faculty roles and involvement in the accreditation process 8. Policies for faculty professional development activities 9. Processes for program review 10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development 11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.*

- [FLC Academic Senate](#)
- [SCC Academic Senate](#)
- [Academic Senate of California Community Colleges \(ASCCC\)](#)

### **ARC Academic Senate President, Alisa Shubb, Reports:**

- We proudly share our unanimously supported statement of support for Afghan students on special immigrant visas which was also translated into Dari & Pashto: *The ARC Academic Senate offers its strong support for our Afghan students who may fear persecution for families or themselves in this time. Recognizing that the crisis in Afghanistan poses a threat to the safety of some of our students and their families, the ARC Academic Senate supports faculty giving flexibility for students to navigate their options for more privacy in the class environment. We understand that students experiencing acute trauma need understanding, compassion, and resources. We support our faculty in negotiating deadlines and responsibilities with care for students under acute trauma. We support options for Afghan students to receive individual and group counseling tailored to the trauma of persecution. We advocate for the College to work tirelessly to identify students who may not have been able to reach the United States, and for the resources they and their families need for safe arrival back to Sacramento.*
- Our Program Paths Committee completed their work of having all program roadmaps live (as opposed to pdfs) on the ARC website: <https://arc.losrios.edu/academics/program-roadmaps>
- In partnership with our Vice President of Instruction Frank Kobayashi, we revamped the faculty hiring prioritization process to a) look specifically at how positions help address disproportionately impacted students, b) include more data-based criteria in the application overall, c) align the deans' and Senators' ranking process, and d) provide faculty documented resources for steps departments can take now to promote an equitable hiring process including specific suggestions for highlighting equity in the job descriptions.
- We have been working on a joint Library/Bookstore project to increase textbook access and cost transparency for students.
- We have been reviewing ARC's ISER, the district Strategic Plan Reaffirmation report, the Equity Training Workgroup Report, the draft Los Rios Regulation 5123 Equivalency, reviewing the ASCCC Anti-Racism paper adopted Fall 2020, and addressing academic & professional impacts as relates to mask and vaccine requirements.

### **CRC Academic Senate President, Scott Crosier, Reports:**

- Our Social Responsibility Senate Sub-Committee has brought to our attention the limited access that our students have to the WEAVE Confidential Advocate. There is one individual in this position, serving the entire district. Our students who are in violent and abusive environments are the most vulnerable and have the greatest need for support and assistance. Our senate is advocating for an additional WEAVE Confidential Advocate position at Los Rios. Our efforts are beginning locally, but will surely resonate across the district.
- Our campus is buzzing with excitement over the opportunity for Fall and Spring hiring. The CRC Academic Senate is hosting a Faculty Prioritization Presentation Workshop on October 29th. This workshop will provide department chairs and other interested faculty to present their reasoning for hiring requests and solicit feedback from their peers on perfecting their presentations.
- Our senate has had several discussions on equity training proposals, including the work of the district wide Equity Training Workgroup.

## **FLC Academic Senate President, Eric Wada, Reports:**

- We have reviewed and approved our college's ISER.
- We are in the process of working on our Faculty Hiring Prioritization recommendations.
- The LRCFT proposal to include an equity requirement in college service was reviewed.
- We remain engaged and interested in discussions about how centralizing Financial Aid and Admissions and Records may impact faculty and students.
- We are reviewing the proposed change to the District Equivalency Review process.
- We are compiling feedback on the proposed change to the District Strategic Plan Reaffirmation and Review process.

## **SCC Academic Senate President, Lori Petite, Reports:**

- Proposed Centralization of Financial Aid and Admissions & Records: The SCC Academic Senate respectfully requests the Board's attention to the issue of centralization without consultation which was the subject of a spring Resolution passed by our senate, as well as the subject of numerous public comments at the May BOT meeting. During that meeting, President Ortiz directed our district administration to halt the proposed centralization of Financial Aid and Admissions & Records services until data was provided to the Board, including data that supported equity claims made, and data that support centralizations as the solution to these equity issues, without introducing new equity impacts. To date, this senate is unaware of the requested data being provided to the Board and respectfully requests communication from the Board on this matter as processes for institutional planning are a 10+1 issue, the DESSC is a primary stakeholder in core matriculation areas, and District appears to be moving forward with the announced centralization plans.
- Strategic Planning Processes: SCC faculty appreciate the significance of the strategic planning processes for our colleges and the district. We respectfully request that the traditionally robust process of vetting through our constituent groups not be truncated. As our organization continues to respond to change, challenge, and opportunities, it is imperative that the input of all constituent groups is broad and deep enough for the collective voices to be heard. Time is a critical variable in the ability of constituent groups to be engaged and weigh in effectively.
- Ethnic Studies Department: SCC is proud to announce the creation of a formal Ethnic Studies Department at SCC. Faculty teaching in this program for decades without formal department status are especially thrilled to see this important dream realized. It is an historic moment at SCC and we anticipate the many ways our students will be positively impacted. We look forward to welcoming a new full-time faculty member into this department later this year.
- Open for Anti-Racism (OFAR) Professional Development: Six SCC faculty members from the Math and English departments submitted a competitive application and were accepted as a team for the year-long OFAR professional development. Supported by our New Faculty Academy Coordinator Debra Crumpton, our SCC Academic Senate, and our college administration, many of these faculty members serve in professional development capacities at SCC, providing an opportunity to have an even greater reach across our college as we continue our equity and anti-racist movement.
- National Community College Hispanic Council (NCCHC) Annual Leadership Symposium: SCC served as an institutional co-host for the September Leadership Symposium. Math faculty, Karla Rojas, and STEM SESI program director, Martin Ramirez, were presenters on the topic of *It's SESI Time: As a Collective, Anything is Possible*. Professor Karla Rojas has been instrumental in the STEM SESI Professional Learning Community and across our college in bringing greater attention to equity-focused and culturally responsive instruction.

- SCC Land Acknowledgement: SCC's Academic Senate recently hosted Nia Gregory, Director of Education for the Wilton Rancheria, as we completed the vetting process for the SCC land acknowledgement. It was an honor to have her join us and we look forward to honoring the people of the Maidu, Miwok, Nisenan, and Patwin tribes of our greater area through the formal adoption of this land acknowledgment and the continued relationship with tribal representatives we have fostered as a result.

## Los Rios CCD Academic Senate Call to Action

Approved Tuesday November 17, 2020

The four Los Rios Colleges and the District Academic Senate support the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Fall 2019 Plenary Resolution "[Support Infusing Anti-Racism/No Hate Education in Community Colleges](#)". Specifically, to the following Resolved statements from that resolution:

- denounce racism for its negative psychological, social, educational, and economic effects on human development throughout the lifespan;
- take steps to not only strive for a greater knowledge about and the celebration of diversity but also to support deeper training that reveals the inherent racism embedded in societal institutions in the United States, including the educational system, and asks individuals to examine their personal role in the support of racist structures and the commitment to work to dismantle structural racism; and
- infuse Anti- Racism/No Hate Education in all its activities and professional development opportunities to the degree that doing so is feasible.

To achieve this, our Academic Senates are committed to:

1. Include a discussion of anti-racism/no-hate education on agendas. Remembering that we do not have to have an answer to start a conversation.
2. Prioritize culturally responsive curricular redesign with our curriculum committees.
3. Acknowledge, without assigning blame, that the structure of our colleges houses the biases and prejudices of their founding times. Those biases have privileged some and disadvantaged others, particularly African American and LatinX communities.
4. Prioritize the evaluation of hiring and evaluation processes with an equity lens.
5. Request services from the ASCCC about any of these topics if needed.
6. Evaluate our academic senates and find the voices among our faculties missing in governance. Find ways to empower those voices.
7. Work with our administrations, classified professional colleagues, and students to find constructive ways students can express themselves about structural and historical biases that exist.

## **Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Faculty Council** **Spring 2021 Accomplishments & Future Directions Report**

In January of 2021, the LRCCD Ethnic Studies Faculty Council was formed to complete the following tasks/goals:

### ***Immediate Goals - This goal was met!***

**Goal #1** - Evaluate existing CRC and SCC ETHNS approved courses against CSU Area F requirements BY FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 2021 and send forward through curriculum process any existing CRC and SCC ETHNS approved courses for CSU Area F approval.

Members of the council were asked at the end of fall semester to review the following courses against the CSU competencies to determine which courses meet at least 3 of the 5 competencies. Council decided all CRC and SCC ETHNS courses will be submitted 'as is' by articulation officers at CRC and SCC for CSU Area F approval.

#### **CRC ETHNS Courses**

300 Introduction to Ethnic Studies  
320 The African American Experience  
330 The Asian American Experience in America  
340 Chicanos/Mexican Americans in the US  
344 The Latino Experience in America

#### **SCC ETHNS Courses**

300 Introduction to Ethnic Studies  
320 The African American Experience  
330 The Asian American Experience in America  
340 Chicanos/Mexican Americans in the US  
341 Sociology & Psychology of Mexicans & Latinos US  
350 Introduction to Native American Studies  
351 Native American Culture & Impact of Federal Policy

Additional agreement was that all the courses could be improved with more appropriate language and strengthening of CORs in regard to CSU competencies. These improvements would be a long-term project taking place over spring semester.

### ***Long-Term Goals***

**Goal #2** - Evaluate proposed cross-listed courses to meet the CSU requirements, meeting DCCC and local curriculum committee timeline requirements.

- A resolution was approved to not accept cross listed courses at this time and was forwarded to DAS for support

**Goal #3** - Create proposals for the future of ethnic studies programs, degrees, and courses in the district.

- A resolution was approved to create Ethnic Studies Departments at all four colleges on March 16, 2021 and was supported by the DAS on April 20, 2021
  - Folsom Lake College established an Ethnic Studies Department April 14, 2021
  - Sacramento City College's Academic Senate has supported the development of an Ethnic Studies Department and formation is in process; completion estimated Fall 2021

- American River College’s Academic Senate has supported the development of an Ethnic Studies Department and formation is in process; completion estimated Fall 2021
- Cosumnes River College’s Academic Senate has supported the development of an Ethnic Studies Department and formation is in process; completion estimated Fall 2021
- All Ethnic Studies core introduction courses have been revised/written and submitted to curriculum at all four campuses (ETHNS 300, 320, 330, 340 and 350)
- Program and degree work is in process; waiting on C-ID and TMC development

**Goal #4** - Be a consultative body for ethnic studies discipline input on equivalency decisions for hiring.

- Equivalency decisions for hiring is being researched

**Actions Taken by the District Ethnic Studies Faculty Council**

**January 2021 – some of this information is repeated from Immediate Goals – Goal #1**

Determination and appointment of the Los Rios Ethnic Studies Faculty Council chair

Established Chair: Keith Heningburg SCC & Co-Chair Tamara Cheshire FLC

Logistical support: Surangi Frazier SCC

Original Membership includes:

Keith Heningburg, SCC; Surangi Frazier, SCC

Tami Cheshire, FLC; Victoire Chochezi, FLC

Nyenbeku George, CRC; Alex Peshkoff, CRC

Ricardo Canton, ARC; Neue Leung ARC

Juana Esty, CRC AO Representative

Renee Medina, SCC Curriculum Chair Representative

Members of the council were asked at the end of fall semester to review the following courses against the CSU competencies to determine which courses meet at least 3 of the 5 competencies. Council decided all CRC and SCC ETHNS courses will be submitted ‘as is’ by articulation officers at CRC and SCC for CSU Area F approval.

**CRC ETHNS Courses**

- 300 Introduction to Ethnic Studies
- 320 The African American Experience
- 330 The Asian American Experience in America
- 340 Chicanos/Mexican Americans in the US
- 344 The Latino Experience in America

**SCC ETHNS Courses**

- 300 Introduction to Ethnic Studies
- 320 The African American Experience
- 330 The Asian American Experience in America
- 340 Chicanos/Mexican Americans in the US
- 341 Sociology & Psychology of Mexicans & Latinos US
- 350 Introduction to Native American Studies
- 351 Native American Culture & Impact of Federal Policy

Additional agreement was that all the courses could be improved with more appropriate language and strengthening of CORs in regard to CSU competencies. These improvements would be a long term project taking place over spring semester.

### **February 2021**

Request to the DAS to add Adjunct Faculty Representation to the Los Rios ES Council.

Work on a curriculum flowchart in order to add the Council to the committees that review curriculum and create a template to use to submit curriculum to the Council began.

ES Council approved putting forward Folsom Lake College's ETHNS 300 for CSU Area F review.

Created Standing Agenda Items - ES Curriculum, Programs, Certificates, Degrees

### **March 2021**

We welcomed our two new members of the Council as Adjunct representatives: Malika Hollinside and Walter Kawamoto.

#### First Chair's Report Summary

- Academic Senate presidents from all four colleges support the District Council and the development of local advisory groups as well as Ethnic Studies Department development with full time faculty hires and even suggested 'cohort' hires of up to 4 faculty for each college.
- Each college local advisory group is separate and independent but connected to the District Council because we as representatives are setting up and leading these local level advisory groups that are temporary until Ethnic Studies Departments are established.
- The Academic Senate presidents informed us that if the local groups were to be under the academic senates, as a sub-committee, they will have the most voice, power, standing, agency and influence on college decisions.
- The local advisory groups would be examining curriculum before it comes to us.
- Chair and Co-Chair attended the C-ID meeting. At the meeting, faculty attendees were extremely frustrated because 10-15+ years ago a Social Justice TMC/ADT was pushed through instead of Ethnic Studies and Ethnic Studies experts/professors have been fighting to keep Ethnic Studies at the CC's all this time. In addition, the recent law has made it even more difficult because CC's are trying to take advantage and subvert Ethnic Studies faculty even more. We are grateful that our district is offering support.
- At the state level, there will be an Ethnic Studies C-ID, TMC, and ADT formed.

Resolution to develop Ethnic Studies Departments at all four colleges was approved and sent to DAS 3/16/21

Curriculum Process Flow Chart approved 3/16/21

Template to review courses approved 3/16/21

### **April 2021**

#### Chair's Report Summary

- The District Academic Senate asked for minor revisions for the Ethnic Studies Department Resolution. The revisions were submitted to the DAS.
- All courses from CRC & SCC that were submitted for Area F approval were denied. The ETHNS 300 course submitted by FLC was approved and we can use it as a template. We can submit the courses again in December. They are going to do retroactive approvals back to the fall 2021 for students who took the class before approval.
- Council is working on the course revisions. Area F reviewers are looking for content (SLO's and Course Topic areas) to match Area F, word for word.
  - Update discipline list to include Interdisciplinary Studies, delete Anthropology & Psychology.
  - Update book lists. Book list cannot be older than 7 years. Please put [Classic] next to any book title that is older than 7 years. Many Ethnic Studies books will be older books because publishing companies have not published more recent textbooks.
- Folsom Lake College established an Ethnic Studies Department April 14, 2021
- SCC Academic Senate just supported the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department.

Ethnic Studies Flex Workshop scheduled for Fall semester Flex week on Thursday August 19, 2021 - 11:15am-12:30pm was approved

Ethnic Studies Video – Malika Hollinside will begin work on the video this summer

### **May 2021**

#### Chair's Report Summary

- DAS approved our Ethnic Studies Department resolution on 4/20/21!
- ASCCC Plenary Resolutions Report shared with Council
- New June 1st *Re-submission* deadline for Area F approval, not for new courses
- Curriculum Timeline and Calendar need to be established so we know upcoming deadlines
- Finish reviewing and revising the curriculum to submit to the curriculum committees before the end of this semester (before May 19th)
- No summer meetings will take place

Ethnic Studies Definition adopted from the ASCCC approved and placed on website

Flex Workshop Series approved will be worked on in the fall

Resolution regarding cross-listed courses approved 5/4/21

Update existing webpage with information, no additional Canvas page



## **Future Directions - 2021-2022**

### **Future Council Meeting Dates: (\*Please note these have been corrected)**

Tuesday August 31<sup>st</sup> 2-4pm (This is the second week of classes to check in)

Tuesday Sept. 7<sup>th</sup> 2-4pm (To make sure we have curriculum in and ready to meet deadlines)

Tuesday Sept. 21<sup>st</sup> 2-4pm

Tuesday Oct. 5<sup>th</sup> 2-4pm

Tuesday Oct. 19<sup>th</sup> 2-4pm

Tuesday Nov. 2<sup>nd</sup> 2-4pm

Tuesday Nov. 16<sup>th</sup> 2-4pm

Tuesday Nov. 30<sup>th</sup> 2-4pm (instead of having a December meeting)

### **Goals - Fall 2021**

Flex Workshop & Flex Series about Ethnic Studies to inform the District

Debut of Ethnic Studies Video

Complete the establishment of Ethnic Studies departments at all four colleges

Revise and submit curriculum as needed to meet local curriculum and Area F requirements prior to internal (September) and external (December) deadlines; titles need to be changed through collaboration process so they all match and coincide with TMC proposals

Develop an Ethnic Studies Program and submit to curriculum committees at all four colleges

Research hiring, minimum qualifications and equivalency procedures for Ethnic Studies faculty

Request full time Ethnic Studies positions from Academic Senates at all four colleges

### **Goals - Spring 2022**

Flex Series continued

Follow up with curriculum

Follow up with program creation

Work on establishing the Ethnic Studies AD-T

Work on hiring full time Ethnic Studies Faculty

Revisit Purpose of the Council

## **Supporting Documents**

### **Ethnic Studies Defined**

*The District ES Council adopted on May 4th, 2021 the same definition of Ethnic Studies as outlined and approved by the ASCCC Resolution 9.07 Defining Ethnic Studies and its Four Core Disciplines in their April 2021 Plenary*

Ethnic Studies is defined as an interdisciplinary and comparative study of race, ethnicity, and culture in the United States, with specific emphasis on four historically defined racialized core groups—Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and Latina and Latino Americans—and that Ethnic Studies is offered through Ethnic Studies departments and programs, with disciplines focusing on the four autonomous core groups—including Chicana/o Studies, Latina/o Studies, La Raza Studies, African American Studies, Black Studies, Africana Studies, Native American Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian American Studies, Pacific Islander Studies, Filipino American Studies, and Central American Studies—each having distinct epistemologies, theories, and methodologies that center a critical Ethnic Studies lens. (Approved Resolution 9.07, ASCCC Spring 2021 Plenary Session)

### **Resolutions**

#### **Resolution Establishing Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Departments Approved 3/16/21 by the ES Council and 4/20/21 by the DAS**

Whereas, the Los Rios Community College District is committed to student success, equity, and diversity; and equitable education requires making significant connections with students and providing diverse learning experiences to meet diverse needs; and

Whereas, California Assembly Bill 1460, commencing with students graduating in the 2024–25 academic year, instructs “the California State University to require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one 3-unit course in Ethnic Studies...”; and

Whereas, the proposed California Assembly Bill 1040, commencing with the 2022–23 academic year, requires “each community college district to offer courses in Ethnic Studies at each of its campuses. The bill would require that the units earned by students for successful completion of these courses would be eligible for transfer and, if applicable, would meet Ethnic Studies graduation requirements at the California State University”; and

Whereas, the proposed California Assembly Bill 1040, commencing with the 2024–25 academic year, requires “each community college district to require the completion of at least one course in Ethnic Studies of at least 3 units as a requirement for a student to obtain an associate degree for transfer”; and

Whereas, the proposed California Assembly Bill 1040 stipulates, “Because this bill would impose new duties on community college districts, it would constitute a state-mandated local program. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement”; and

Whereas, only Sacramento City College and Cosumnes River College currently offer Ethnic Studies courses, and no Los Rios Community College campus has an Ethnic Studies department;

Resolved, that the Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Council recommends and requests to the District Academic Senate (DAS), advocating for the establishment of Ethnic Studies departments at each college in the district.

Resolved, that the Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Council recommends and requests to the District Academic Senate (DAS), support advocating for a budget for each Ethnic Studies department to include FTE, a department chair, at least two full-time Ethnic Studies faculty hires, and part-time hires.

Resolved, that the Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Council will serve as a resource to guide the four colleges in developing Ethnic Studies departments that will meet the demands of AB 1460 and the proposed AB 1040, and continue the district's commitment to student success, equity, and diversity.

## References

[Los Rios Community College District Equity and Diversity Statement](#)

[California Assembly Bill No. 1460](#)

[California Assembly Bill No. 1040](#)

Dee, Thomas and Penner, Emily. "The Causal Effects of Cultural Relevance: Evidence from an Ethnic Studies Curriculum," *American Educational Research Journal* 54(1) (2017).

## Resolution Regarding Cross listed Courses - Approved May 4, 2021 by the ES Council

Whereas, Ethnic Studies is the critical and interdisciplinary study of race, ethnicity, and indigeneity with a focus on the experience and perspectives of the four core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Chicana & Latina Americans in the United States (AB 1460 Legislation & CSU Area F Requirements). Ethnic Studies offers students the opportunity to study the historical development and social significance of race and ethnicity in the United States and develop skills and knowledge necessary for success in an increasingly diverse environment and;

Whereas, California Assembly Bill 1460, commencing with students graduating in the 2024–25 academic year, instructs “the California State University to require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one 3-unit course in ethnic studies...”; and the proposed California Assembly Bill 1040, commencing with the 2022–23 academic year, requires “each community college district to offer courses in Ethnic Studies at each of its campuses. The bill would require that the units earned by students for successful completion of these courses would be eligible for transfer and, if applicable, would meet Ethnic Studies graduation requirements at the California State University” and;

Whereas, at the Fall 2020 ASCCC Plenary Session, delegates passed two resolutions—9.04 and 9.05—in support of an Ethnic Studies graduation requirement. The resolutions call for the ASCCC to work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to support an Ethnic Studies graduation requirement while signaling strong support for *Ethnic Studies as an essential curriculum*. Currently, Title 5 §55063, which contains the minimum requirements for the associate degree, does not include Ethnic Studies as a separate category or area, though the California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee is discussing revisions and expects to put forth draft language in spring 2021 and;

Whereas, the Los Rios Community College District is committed to student success, equity, and diversity; and equitable education requires making significant connections with students and providing diverse learning experiences to meet student needs. Ethnic Studies courses contribute to the campus climate and larger community by focusing on teaching about the voices and lived experiences of BIPOC, supporting equity and diversity and;

Whereas, the Los Rios Community College District serves approximately 75,000 students annually. Because Ethnic Studies is a CSU transfer requirement (Area F) and is being considered for a competency and graduation requirement through Title V revision, there would be a critical and urgent need to offer multiple sections of Ethnic Studies courses to meet student needs and;

Whereas, the five core competencies of Ethnic Studies are distinctive to the field of Ethnic Studies and;

Whereas, Ethnic Studies curriculum provides students the opportunity to “apply theory and knowledge produced by Native American, African American, Asian American, and/or Latina and Latino American communities to describe the critical events, histories, cultures, intellectual traditions, contributions, lived-experiences and social struggles of those groups with a particular emphasis on agency and group-affirmation” (Area F) and;

Whereas, Ethnic Studies curriculum provides students the opportunity to “analyze and articulate concepts such as race and racism, racialization, ethnicity, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, self-determination, liberation, decolonization, sovereignty, imperialism, settler colonialism, and anti-racism” (Area F) and;

Whereas, Ethnic Studies curriculum provides students with an opportunity to “critically analyze the intersection of race and

racism as they relate to class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, tribal citizenship, sovereignty, language, and/or age in Native American, African American, Asian American, and/or Latina and Latino American communities” (Area F) and;

Whereas, Ethnic Studies provides students with the opportunity to “critically review how struggle, resistance, racial and social justice, solidarity, and liberation, as experienced and enacted by Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and/or Latina and Latino Americans are relevant to current and structural issues such as communal, national, international, and transnational politics as, for example, in immigration, reparations, settler-colonialism, multiculturalism, language policies” (Area F) and;

Whereas, Ethnic studies provides students with the opportunity to “describe and actively engage with anti-racist and anti-colonial issues and the practices and movements in Native American, African American, Asian American and/or Latina and Latino communities and a just and equitable society” (Area F) and;

Whereas, Ethnic Studies core courses through the Transfer Model Curriculum have yet to be established through DIG and C-ID and;

Whereas, it is the purview of Ethnic Studies departments to determine and write courses that will transfer within the major discipline area and;

Whereas, Ethnic Studies faculty have the right and responsibility to write and schedule core courses that will transfer within the major and;

Whereas, it is the purview of Ethnic Studies departments to develop a degree program and establish an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) with core Ethnic Studies courses and;

Whereas, the California Community College Ethnic Studies Faculty Council, the statewide body guiding discussion around the implementation of AB 1460, recommends that campuses do not cross-list courses not created by Ethnic Studies faculty;

Be it resolved that the Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Council will not approve cross-list courses until core courses have been established and approved to meet Area F requirements and;

Be it resolved that upon having received Area F approval for the aforementioned core Ethnic Studies courses in LRCCD, the Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Council will not accept for curriculum review and CSU approval for Area F, cross-listed courses from other academic departments that do not meet Area F requirements, and;

Be it resolved that the Los Rios Community College District Ethnic Studies Council will consider including non-Ethnic Studies courses as electives in our degree programs.



**LOS RIOS**  
**COMMUNITY**  
COLLEGE DISTRICT

District Accessibility Plan Implementation Committee

2020-2021 Year-End Report

Sept. 15, 2021

Co-Chairs: Torence Powell, Kandace Knudson

## Committee Membership

### Faculty Co-Chair (DAS Member)

Kandace Knudson SCC DE Coordinator

Faculty

ARC

Leslie Reeves, Universal Design for Learning Coordinator

CRC

Pat Crandley DE Coordinator (@ SCC 2021-22)

Jena Trench OCDC & Biology Professor

FLC

Daniel Hale Physics/Astronomy Professor

Morgan Murphy, DE Coordinator

SCC

Janelle Pettler CIS Professor

Brian Pogue Instructional Development Coordinator

### DSPS Faculty (two representatives)

Scott Hamilton CRC

Toni Newman SCC

### LRCFT Faculty (two representatives)

Veronica Lopez ARC Nutrition Professor

Katie Carbary SCC Psychology Professor

### College Classified (4)

Mike Warner Student Personnel Assistant, DSP&S, ARC

Lauri Nicolosi Educational Media Design Specialist, Counseling, CRC

Christy Pimental Student Personnel Assistant, DSP&S, FLC

Stacy Bernstein Instructional Assistant Computer Lab, SCC

### College Administration (4)

ARC

Nick Daily Interim Dean Equity/Inclusion

CRC

Tadael Emiru Associate VP, Equity, Innovation, and Institutional Effectiveness

## FLC

Matt Wright Dean Athletics, Kinesiology, and Distance Education

## SCC

Kirk Sosa, Dean IT

## District

Torence Powell, (co-chair), Associate Vice Chancellor of Instruction

Tamara Armstrong, Associate Vice Chancellor of IT

Ken Cooper, Information Technology Analyst

## Table of Contents

Committee Membership	2
Summary and Goals for this report	5
Initial goals of DAPIC and key results	5
Summary of DAPIC Work Fall 2020- Spring 2021	6
DAPIC (Strategic-Level) Committee Observations and Recommendations	6
Proposed Next Steps	7
Background/Context: LRCCD Accessibility Plan	8
Appendix A	9
Table of Contents	10
Appendix B	16
District Accessibility Plan Implementation Committee Scope of Work Required to Meet Accessibility Standards	16
Responsibilities Table of Contents	16
Appendix C	25
DAPIC Report: Training	25
Appendix D	28
Workload Impact Themes from DAPIC Workgroup 5	28
Appendix D1: Department Chair Feedback	32
Appendix D2: Faculty Workload Estimates to Meet Accessibility Standards	53
Appendix E: Catalog of All Recommendations	56
DAPIC Final Reports: Recommendations	56
Additional Considerations and Detailed Committee Member Comments on Scope of Accessibility Work	65
Appendix F Captioning Project Pilot Summary and Next Steps Fall 2021	68
Appendix G Accessible Files Team Pilot Process and Next Steps Draft	69



## Summary and Goals for this report

This report summarizes the work completed during the first year of the District Accessibility Plan Implementation Committee (DAPIC), formed in Spring of 2020 in response to the 2019 Accessibility Plan drafted by the LRCCD districtwide Accessibility Task Force.

The DAPIC work summarized here suggests processes and responsibilities for the creation and curation of accessible instructional materials in order to ensure that our learning environments are accessible to all and compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and other relevant California and federal government laws. As the CCCCCO explains in its 2018 [“Information and Communication Technology and Instructional Material Accessibility Standard,”](#) “ensuring equal access to equally effective instructional materials and ICT is the responsibility of all CCC administrators, faculty, and staff.” Accordingly, this committee is developing distributed responsibilities for this work.

Although created with a one-year timeline, it is the intention of the DAPIC to continue its work as long as necessary in order to ensure that the LRCCD is able to sustainably support the creation and maintenance of accessible instructional materials as part of its routine functions. Because ensuring the accessibility of instructional materials requires advanced, specialized knowledge and the systematic implementation of processes and training for not just faculty but also classified professionals and administrators, it is the expectation of the DAPIC that this report and the committee’s ongoing work will inform current and future planning processes at the colleges and district. Such planning must immediately address the need for new infrastructural support personnel who perform the specialized accessibility work outlined in this report.

Changing the practices at the district and its colleges to ensure that accessibility is a priority must include a shift in culture so that the people of the LRCCD embrace accessibility as a shared responsibility.

## Initial goals of DAPIC and key results

DAPIC was charged in Spring of 2020 to “work to better understand the scope of the work required to create and remediate ICT, with a specific focus on instruction materials. The committee will also identify the types of resources needed.”

The committee’s five initial goals and key results:

1. Inventory the scope of work required to meet accessibility standards and guidelines.

The work required to ensure the accessibility of ICT is broad and excessive, requiring specialized accessibility expertise.

2. Identify areas that faculty should be responsible to meet accessibility standards.

Faculty—with appropriate training—will be able to create accessible materials in most cases and will need support from accessibility specialists at their campus and district.

3. Identify needed training resources for faculty to meet accessibility standards and guidelines.

Training for faculty should be facilitated, recurrent, and part of a wrap-around accessibility support mechanism for all LRCCD employees.

4. Identify areas of higher-level ICT accessibility issues that should not be completed by faculty.

Ensuring accessible ICT requires high-level, specialized knowledge that should be provided by continuing, institutionalized campus and district resources and personnel, dedicated to ICT accessibility.

5. Identify the workload impacts required to meet accessibility standards and guidelines.

The wholesale shift to a culture of accessibility at LRCCD will require a significant and distributed workload, supported by campus and district specialists and new processes to be developed and refined over the next several years.

## Summary of DAPIC Work Fall 2020- Spring 2021

In response to the five tasks outlined above in the original DAPIC charge, the committee created five corresponding work groups. Work groups completed their assigned tasks with the help of the larger committee. See the Appendices A-D for the completed Scope of Work, Proposed Faculty and Specialist Responsibilities, Training Objectives, and Workload Implications.

Additionally, work groups provided overall recommendations, which are included in the Recommendations section in the end of the document.

## DAPIC (Strategic-Level) Committee Observations and Recommendations

### Culture Change

- We need a culture change: Considering accessibility as a “burden” places emotional load onto our LRCCD community members who have disabilities, visible or otherwise. Changes are needed in the culture to shift the perception of the term “accessibility” as a shared responsibility, not a burden.
- There is incentive to ignore accessibility because the ever-changing accessibility tools and standards that faculty (and others) are expected to apply to course materials creates conflicting information and significant additional workload.

### Faculty Workload

- No amount of training will effectively address all the workload issues related to accessibility. Resources including additional staffing will be necessary.
- The workload associated with accessibility is not evenly distributed among disciplines, therefore it can be expected that some faculty areas will need more specialist support than others.

## Legal Guidance

- The 2019 Accessibility Plan and board policies R-2731 and P-7136 should be vetted and updated by the new LRCCD counsel with appropriate consultation as needed from CCC Accessibility Center and DAPIC.

## DSPS and DE Team Collaborations

- Campus Distance Education and DSPS teams need to work collaboratively and seamlessly with faculty in both the provision of 504 accommodations for students and 508 accessibility in the digital environment so that students easily receive services and access they need.

## Support for All at LRCCD

- Wrap-around support for all Los Rios employees, housed on the College campuses and including accessibility specialists, should be established and institutionalized into routine district and campus processes.

## Long-term Accessibility Leadership

- Recommend continued, long-term DAPIC work to lead changes in culture and practice to prioritize accessibility for the benefit of all
  - Accessibility experts across district *are* DAPIC, and they are poised to guide these changes mentioned here

## Proposed Next Steps

### Fall 2021

- Solicit approval for DAPIC long-term work
- Re-convene in Fall 2021 with continued appointments and new committee members as needed and agreed upon by DAS/LRCCD
- Construct DAPIC goals and timeline
  - Proposed Goals 2021-2022
    - Create subcommittees/work groups to address non-instructional materials
    - Develop training plan
    - Refine captioning and develop other related document and multimedia processes, identifying long-term budget sources such as direct access to Distance Education Captioning and Transcription (and leveraging HEERF \$ where appropriate)
    - Develop recommendations for building wrap-around Support for All, including support for non-instructional personnel such as classified professionals and administrators where appropriate
    - Develop long-term plan for DAPIC 2022-2023, (leveraging HEERF \$ where appropriate)

## Background/Context: LRCCD Accessibility Plan

The LRCCD Accessibility Task Force was created in response to a [2017 California State Auditor report](#) that audited four California Community Colleges, including American River College. The audit found that the colleges they examined “do not have processes to monitor whether they comply with accessibility standards for instructional materials”:

*None of the three community colleges we reviewed are monitoring their performance in responding to requests from students with disabilities for course materials in accessible media formats (alternate media) . . . These colleges also do not have processes to monitor whether they comply with accessibility standards for instructional materials, nor has the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges (Chancellor’s Office) provided guidance to the colleges in either of these areas because it has focused its guidance in other areas and has limited staffing. As a result, the colleges cannot demonstrate that they are meeting students’ requests for accessible materials within a reasonable time frame. When students do not have equal access to instructional materials and their requests for an alternate format are not addressed promptly, they do not have equal educational opportunities.*

In response to the findings, the LRCCD implemented Blackboard Ally software to help convert instructional materials in Canvas to multiple, accessible formats. It also created the Accessibility Taskforce, which—via the work of a consultant—culminated in the aforementioned Accessibility Implementation Plan as well as related updates to Board accessibility policies and regulations [7136](#) and [8321](#). While the Accessibility Implementation Plan was collaboratively developed with accessibility as its primary goal, its resource needs were left to be determined and filled. DAPIC work addresses those needs.



# LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

## Appendix A

### Outcome 1: Scope of work

#### District Accessibility Plan Implementation Committee

#### Scope of Work Required to Meet Accessibility Standards

#### Problem Statement

LRCCD offers almost 10,000 course sections containing over 760,000 ICT content items, the majority of which require remediation in order to be compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Remediating existing course materials has been documented to be extremely time-intensive and presents faculty workload issues not addressed in the LRCFT contract. Remediating existing digital course materials to ensure accessibility also requires expertise in fields such as Assistive Technology, Information Technology, and Instructional Design.

Most importantly, accessible digital content means creating an inclusive educational environment where all students can succeed.

#### Goal

The goal of this document is to define and inventory the scope of work required to meet accessibility standards for all course digital content.

#### Inventory and Tasks

To ensure our information and communication technology (ICT), or digital content, is accessible and usable by individuals with differing abilities, including students, and District colleagues, we have identified the following elements and what is needed to make them accessible. Instructors will need accessibility training to learn what needs to be accomplished to make the following ICT items accessible and then training to gain the ability to use specific tools to check for accessibility.

## Table of Contents

### Canvas Content and Assessments

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
<p>All Canvas pages and assessments that have been added, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pages</li> <li>● Assignments</li> <li>● Discussions</li> <li>● Quizzes</li> <li>● Surveys</li> <li>● Announcements</li> </ul>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li> <li>● Meaningful alternative text for images</li> <li>● Appropriate color contrast between text and background colors</li> <li>● Appropriate color usage, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>● Meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>● Ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>● Accessible tables with headers</li> <li>● Appropriate text sizing is used</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create and add Canvas content and assessments with universal design principles in mind.</li> <li>2. Use the Canvas Accessibility Checker or PopeTech to check each page and assessment.</li> <li>3. Make suggested remediations.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> </ol> <p>Note: The Ally tool can also be used to check for and help provide alternative text for images and assess color contrast of images on Canvas pages. The Ally tool cannot improve color contrast issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Introduction to Teaching with Canvas:</b> create content and assessments in Canvas and effectively use the Rich Content Editor in Canvas  <a href="#">@ONE Intro to Teaching with Canvas</a></li> <li>● <b>Introduction to Web Accessibility:</b> a foundational understanding of what web accessibility means <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="#">@ONE Self-Paced Accessibility in Canvas</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">@ONE Creating Accessible Course Content</a></li> <li>○ <a href="#">Los Rios Accessible Course Creation Academy</a></li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Canvas Accessibility Checker or PopeTech Training:</b> use the accessibility tools that are available to check and remediate Canvas content</li> </ul>

## Microsoft Documents: Word, Excel, and PowerPoint<sup>1</sup>

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
<p>All Microsoft Documents that are added into Canvas or distributed via email or other electronic means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Word</li> <li>● Excel</li> <li>● PowerPoint</li> </ul>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li> <li>● Provide meaningful alternative text for images</li> <li>● Ensure appropriate color contrast between text and background colors (4:1)</li> <li>● Appropriate color use, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>● Use meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>● Use ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>● Tables are accessible with defined row/column headers</li> <li>● Use appropriate text sizes</li> <li>● Document title is included</li> <li>● PowerPoint content is ordered correctly on each slide</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Microsoft documents with universal design principles in mind.</li> <li>2. Run the Microsoft Accessibility Checker on each document.</li> <li>3. Make suggested remediations.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Accessible Microsoft Word and PowerPoint Training</b> - Create documents with accessibility in mind and use the checker to remediate any issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">@ONE Self-Paced Microsoft Word Accessibility</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">@ONE Self-Paced PowerPoint Accessibility</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">@ONE Creating Accessible Course Content</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">Los Rios Accessible Course Creation Academy</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">Understanding Document Accessibility (OER resource)</a></li> </ul>

---

<sup>1</sup> Other Office Software, Apache Open Office, LibreOffice, and other equivalent office software packages, are also included in the Outcomes Needed column.

## Google Documents: Docs, Sheets, and Slides

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
<p>All Google files that are linked to from within Canvas or distributed via email or other electronic means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Docs</li> <li>● Sheets</li> <li>● Slides</li> </ul>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li> <li>● Provide meaningful alternative text for images</li> <li>● Appropriate color contrast between text and background colors (4:1)</li> <li>● Appropriate color use, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>● Use meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>● Use ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>● Tables are accessible with defined column/row headers</li> <li>● Use appropriate text sizes</li> <li>● Document title is included</li> <li>● Slides content is ordered correctly on each slide</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Google files with universal design principles in mind.</li> <li>2. Run the Grackle Accessibility Checker on each file.</li> <li>3. Make suggested remediations.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> </ol>	<p><b>How to use Grackle -</b> Create Google files with accessibility in mind and use Grackle to remediate any issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">@ONE Creating Accessible Course Content</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">Los Rios Accessible Course Creation Academy</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">Understanding Document Accessibility</a> (OER resource)</li> </ul>



## Adobe PDFs

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
<p>PDFs added into Canvas or distributed via email or other electronic means</p>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li> <li>● Meaningful alternative text for images</li> <li>● Appropriate color contrast between text and background colors</li> <li>● Appropriate color use, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>● Meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>● Ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>● Accessible tables with headers</li> <li>● Appropriate text size</li> <li>● Document title is included</li> </ul>	<p>If PDF is created by from a document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create the original file (ex: Word document) with universal design principles in mind.</li> <li>2. Run an Accessibility Checker on the original file. Ex: Microsoft Accessibility Checker is used for a Word document.</li> <li>3. Make suggested remediations to the original file.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> <li>6. Convert original file to PDF.</li> <li>7. Run Adobe Accessibility Check on the PDF. This step requires the Pro version of Adobe Acrobat.</li> <li>8. Make suggested remediations, including adding and editing tags and setting a logical reading order. <i>This step requires advanced technology knowledge of Acrobat Pro.</i></li> </ol> <p>If PDF is NOT created from an existing document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use Ally in Canvas to check/remediate PDFs. There is no guarantee that this tool will result in a high-quality accessible PDF - results will vary.</li> <li>2. Use Adobe Accessibility Check in Adobe Acrobat Pro, <a href="#">CCC Document Converter</a>, or other OCR software to remediate issues not fixed with Ally. <i>This step requires advanced tech knowledge and specialized software.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The use of Canvas Pages or Word documents should be encouraged over the use of PDFs, which can be very challenging to remediate.</p> <p>Scanning documents to PDF format is not recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">@ONE Self-Paced PDF Accessibility</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">Los Rios Accessible Course Creation Academy</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">Understanding Document Accessibility (OER resource)</a></li> </ul>

## Multimedia: Audio and Video

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
<p>Multimedia added to Canvas courses or shared via email or other electronic means, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Videos created by faculty with tools like screencast-o-matic and Canvas Studio</li> <li>● Non-instructor owned videos</li> <li>● Audio created by faculty</li> <li>● Non-instructor owned audio files</li> </ul>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● High quality closed captioning or subtitling are in place for all video files, made by humans, NOT by automated processes.</li> <li>● Complete text transcriptions accompany all audio files.</li> </ul>	<p>Faculty owned/created multimedia: If videos and audio are hosted at <a href="#">3CMedia</a>, requests for free high-quality video captioning and text transcripts of audio files should be requested.</p> <p>If videos are hosted on YouTube, Canvas Studio, or other locations, auto-captions should be checked for accuracy. Any errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc should be fixed.</p> <p>Non-instructor owned videos: (SCC) Coordinated through local DE, materials are delivered to an outside vendor so that compliant captioning can be generated. This service is paid for through the state DECT grant. Procedures for payment, as well as return and embedding of captioned videos depends upon the original source materials. Public YouTube videos are the easiest to work with, while others (Vimeo, news organization websites, etc.) are more involved processes. Once captions are returned, local DE team works with the instructor to provide these materials. These new captioned videos do not replace existing, embedded content, but rather are provided in addition to for those that need it. A similar process would be needed for 3rd party audio files if the publisher does not provide a transcript.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <a href="#">@ONE Creating Accessible Course Content</a></li> <li>● <a href="#">Los Rios Accessible Course Creation Academy</a></li> </ul>

## OER, Publisher Content, Software, and Canvas LTI Tools

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
<p>Third-party digital course content adopted by faculty and used by students in online or face-to-face courses sources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OER Textbooks</li> <li>● Publisher ebooks (ex: Cengage or Pearson)</li> <li>● Software (ex: MyMathLab)</li> <li>● Canvas LTI Tools (ex: FlipGrid, NetTutor, Proctorio)</li> <li>● Non-canvas apps (Instagram, Quizlet, etc...)</li> </ul>	Materials are Section 508 compliant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request that the OER author or publisher complete a <a href="#">Section 508 Voluntary Product Accessibility Template</a>.</li> <li>2. Evaluate the accessibility compliance level of the product by reviewing the checklist for accessibility barriers reported by the vendor. <i>*Accessibility expertise is required</i></li> <li>3. If the vendor reports that the product has accessibility barriers, an equally effective alternative access plan (EEAAP) must be developed. Faculty will work with DSPS and other accessibility experts to craft this plan.</li> </ol>	None

## External Web Sites

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
Any websites shared with students by instructors	Websites are Section 508 compliant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Run a web accessibility checker like <a href="#">WAVE</a> (Web Accessibility Evaluation Tool) to assess web pages</li> <li>2. Websites that are shared with students should ultimately meet WCAG 2.1 AA standards. This is very rare, so besides running a tool like WAVE, some basic testing is needed.</li> <li>3. <a href="#">Basic Accessibility Testing</a> for faculty.</li> </ol>	Faculty do not need to check for accessibility in this much detail: <a href="#">Web Accessibility Checklist</a> compiled by California. <a href="#">Community Colleges Accessibility Center</a> . We can develop a tool like the Basic Accessibility Testing document and add more detail.

## Appendix B

Outcomes 2 and 4: Faculty responsibilities (in green); Specialist responsibilities (in yellow)

### District Accessibility Plan Implementation Committee Scope of Work Required to Meet Accessibility Standards

#### Proposed Faculty and Specialist Responsibilities

#### Responsibilities Table of Contents

Canvas Content and Assessments

Microsoft Documents: Word, Excel, and PowerPoint

Google Documents: Docs, Sheets, and Slides

Adobe PDFs

Multimedia, Audio, and Video

OER & Publisher Content

External Web Sites

#### Canvas Content and Assessments

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
All Canvas pages and assessments that have been added, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pages</li><li>• Assignments</li><li>• Discussions</li><li>• Quizzes</li><li>• Surveys</li><li>• Announcements</li></ul>	Materials are Section 508 compliant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li><li>• Meaningful alternative text for images - See specialist note to the right.</li><li>• Appropriate color contrast</li></ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Create and add Canvas content and assessments with universal design principles in mind.</li><li>2. Use the Canvas Accessibility Checker or PopeTech to check each page and assessment.</li></ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Faculty<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Headings</li><li>○ Alt-text for basic images</li><li>○ Proper use of color (with training)</li><li>○ Meaningful hyperlink text</li><li>○ Use of Lists tools</li></ul></li><li>• Specialist<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Alt-text or written descriptions for complex images (graphs, works of art, diagrams, etc)</li></ul></li></ul>

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• between text and background colors</li> <li>• Appropriate color usage, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>• Meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>• Ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>• Accessible tables with headers</li> <li>• Appropriate text sizing is used</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Make suggested remediations.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> </ol> <p>Note: The Ally tool can also be used to check for and help provide alternative text for images and assess color contrast of images on Canvas pages. The Ally tool cannot improve color contrast issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tables (Initially - Training can address need)</li> </ul>

Microsoft Documents: Word, Excel, and PowerPoint

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
<p>All Microsoft Documents that are added into Canvas or distributed via email or other electronic means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word</li> <li>• Excel</li> <li>• PowerPoint</li> </ul>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li> <li>• Provide meaningful alternative text for images - See Specialist note to the right.</li> <li>• Ensure appropriate color contrast between text</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Microsoft documents with universal design principles in mind.</li> <li>2. Run the Microsoft Accessibility Checker on each document.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Headings</li> <li>○ Alt-text for basic images</li> <li>○ Proper use of color (with training)</li> <li>○ Meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>○ Use of Lists tools</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Specialist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alt-text or written descriptions for complex images (graphs, works of art, diagrams, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discipline specific will be helpful</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Training
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• and background colors (4:1)</li> <li>• Appropriate color use, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>• Use meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>• Use ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>• Tables are accessible with defined row/column headers</li> <li>• Use appropriate text sizes</li> <li>• Document title is included</li> <li>• PowerPoint content is ordered correctly on each slide</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Make suggested remediations.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tables (Initially - Training can address need)</li> <li>○ Proper use of color and text sizing if visually complex documents being created</li> <li>○ PowerPoint reading order (Initially - training can help address)</li> <li>○ Additional specialist - Math or Equation editors (MathType, LaTeX, ChemType, etc)</li> </ul>

Google Documents: Docs, Sheets, and Slides

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
All Google files that are linked to from within Canvas or distributed via email or other electronic means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Docs</li> </ul>	Materials are Section 508 compliant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li> <li>• Provide meaningful alternative text</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Google files with universal design principles in mind.</li> <li>2. Run the Grackle Accessibility</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Headings</li> <li>○ Alt-text for basic images</li> <li>○ Proper use of color (with training)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheets</li> <li>• Slides</li> </ul>	<p>for images - See Specialist note to the right.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure appropriate color contrast between text and background colors (4:1)</li> <li>• Appropriate color use, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>• Use meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>• Use ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>• Tables are accessible with defined row/column headers</li> <li>• Use appropriate text sizes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document title is included</li> <li>• PowerPoint content is ordered correctly on each slide</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Checker on each file.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Make suggested remediations.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>○ Use of Lists tools</li> <li>• Specialist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alt-text or written descriptions for complex images (graphs, works of art, diagrams, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Discipline specific will be helpful</li> <li>○ Tables (Initially - Training can address need)</li> <li>○ Proper use of color and text sizing if visually complex documents being created</li> <li>○ PowerPoint reading order (Initially - training can help address)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Adobe PDFs

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
<p>PDFs added into Canvas or distributed via email or other electronic means</p>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heading styles are used with correct heading structure</li> <li>• Meaningful alternative text for images</li> <li>• Appropriate color contrast between text and background colors</li> <li>• Appropriate color use, i.e. color is not used to relay crucial information</li> <li>• Meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>• Ordered and unordered lists created with the list tool</li> <li>• Accessible tables with headers</li> <li>• Appropriate text size</li> <li>• Document title is included</li> </ul>	<p>If PDF is created by from a document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create the original file (ex: Word document) with universal design principles in mind.</li> <li>2. Run an Accessibility Checker on the original file. Ex: Microsoft Accessibility Checker is used for a Word document.</li> <li>3. Make suggested remediations to the original file.</li> <li>4. Review for inaccessible elements not found by the checker.</li> <li>5. Remediate any additional problems.</li> <li>6. Convert original file to PDF.</li> <li>7. Run Adobe Accessibility Check on the PDF. This step requires the Pro version of Adobe Acrobat.</li> <li>8. Make suggested remediations, including adding and editing tags and setting a logical reading order. <i>This step requires advanced technology knowledge of Acrobat Pro.</i></li> </ol> <p>If PDF is NOT created from an existing document:</p>	<p>For New, Faculty-created PDFs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Headings</li> <li>○ Alt-text for basic images</li> <li>○ Proper use of color (with training)</li> <li>○ Meaningful hyperlink text</li> <li>○ Use of Lists tools</li> <li>○ <b>Note:</b> Given that newly created PDF's are most often generated using standard Word processing software, these conventions are the same as address in the sections above</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Specialist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Alt-text or written descriptions for complex images (graphs, works of art, diagrams, etc)</li> <li>○ Tables (Initially - Training can address need)</li> <li>○ Reading order (training can address)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For Legacy Content</p> <p>Given both the volume of content that exists, and lack of familiarity with PDF editing processes, and the reported need for specialist support (67% of surveyed faculty say minimal or extensive support</p>



ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use Ally in Canvas to check/remediate PDFs. There is no guarantee that this tool will result in a high-quality accessible PDF - results will vary.</li> <li>2. Use Adobe Accessibility Check in Adobe Acrobat Pro, <a href="#">CCC Document Converter</a>, or other OCR software to remediate issues not fixed with Ally. <i>This step requires advanced tech knowledge and specialized software.</i></li> </ol>	<p>is needed), as well as recommendations from DAPIC Work Group 4, we recommend that this task be handled via specialists.</p>

**Multimedia: Audio and Video**

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
<p>Multimedia added to Canvas courses or shared via email or other electronic means, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Videos created by faculty with tools like screencast-o-matic</li> </ul>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality closed captioning or subtitling are in place for all video files, made by humans, NOT by automated processes.</li> <li>• Complete text transcriptions accompany all audio files.</li> </ul>	<p>Faculty owned/created multimedia:</p> <p>If videos and audio are hosted at <a href="#">3CMedia</a>, requests for free high-quality video captioning and text transcripts of audio files should be requested.</p> <p>If videos are hosted on YouTube, Canvas Studio, or other locations, auto-captions should be checked for accuracy. Any errors in spelling, punctuation,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Request auto-captions via video-hosting service of choice (3Cmedia, Studio, YouTube)</li> <li>○ Edit for accuracy videos that are both <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Less than 5 minutes</li> <li>▪ Time sensitive (daily updates or announcements)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Specialist</li> </ul>

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
<p>and Canvas Studio</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-instructor owned videos</li> <li>• Audio created by faculty</li> <li>• Non-instructor owned audio files</li> </ul>		<p>capitalization, etc should be fixed.</p> <p>Non-instructor owned videos: (SCC) Coordinated through local DE, materials are delivered to an outside vendor so that compliant captioning can be generated. This service is paid for through the state DECT grant. Procedures for payment, as well as return and embedding of captioned videos depends upon the original source materials. Public YouTube videos are the easiest to work with, while others (Vimeo, news organization websites, etc.) are more involved processes. Once captions are returned, local DE team works with the instructor to provide these materials. These new captioned videos do not replace existing, embedded content, but rather are provided in addition to for those that need it. A similar process would be needed for 3rd party audio files if the publisher does not provide a transcript.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Editing auto-generated videos to ensure accuracy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Note: Discipline specific would increase accuracy</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Further, Per Work Group 4: "A specialist should complete captioning for videos and transcription for audio files. This includes videos produced by faculty for use with students, and other instructional videos produced by third parties. This subcommittee further suggests that the specialists who are responsible for video captioning should not be dependent on variable grant funding."</p>

OER, Publisher Content, Software, and Canvas LTI Tools

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
<p>Third-party digital course content adopted by faculty and used by students in online or face-to-face courses sources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OER Textbooks</li> <li>• Publisher ebooks (ex: Cengage or Pearson)</li> <li>• Software (ex: MyMathLab)</li> <li>• Canvas LTI Tools (ex: FlipGrid, NetTutor, Proctorio)</li> <li>• Non-canvas apps (Instagram, Quizlet, etc...)</li> </ul>	<p>Materials are Section 508 compliant</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request that the OER author or publisher complete a <a href="#">Section 508 Voluntary Product Accessibility Template</a>.</li> <li>2. Evaluate the accessibility compliance level of the product by reviewing the checklist for accessibility barriers reported by the vendor. <i>*Accessibility expertise is required</i></li> <li>3. If the vendor reports that the product has accessibility barriers, an equally effective alternative access plan (EEAAP) must be developed. Faculty will work with DSPS and other accessibility experts to craft this plan.</li> </ol>	<p>Given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of expertise needed to perform this task</li> <li>• The request for support from the faculty survey (76% reporting minimal or extensive support needed or “not sure”)</li> <li>• Work Group 4’s recommendation</li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that the vetting of these products be handled by a specialist.</p>

## External Web Sites

ICT Item(s)	Outcomes Needed for 100% Accessibility	Processes Needed	Responsibility
Any websites shared with students by instructors	Websites are Section 508 compliant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Run a web accessibility checker like <a href="#">WAVE</a> (Web Accessibility Evaluation Tool) to assess web pages</li> <li>2. Websites that are shared with students should ultimately meet WCAG 2.1 AA standards. This is very rare, so besides running a tool like WAVE, some basic testing is needed.</li> <li>3. <a href="#">Basic Accessibility Testing</a> for faculty.</li> </ol>	<p>Given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of expertise needed to interpret WAVE Reports for websites</li> <li>• The request for support from the faculty survey (80% reporting minimal or extensive support needed or “not sure”)</li> <li>• Work Group 4’s recommendation</li> <li>• The following statement provided by DAPIC Work Group 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Faculty do not need to check for accessibility in this much detail: <a href="#">Web Accessibility Checklist</a> compiled by California. <a href="#">Community Colleges Accessibility Center</a>. We can develop a tool like the Basic Accessibility Testing document and add more detail.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>It is recommended that accessibility checks of websites used within classes be performed by a specialist</p>

## Appendix C

### Outcome 3: Training

#### DAPIC Report: Training

##### Recommendations

The recommendations of this group are centered around the Los Rios Strategic Plan goal of Equity in addition to compliance with Section 508 of the Americans with Disabilities Act. In particular, these recommendations ensure that all populations will have the access, support, and opportunities to succeed. Furthermore, these recommendations call upon Los Rios to foster innovation in accessibility services to support and invest in change that increases the effectiveness of our programs and the successful outcomes of our students. Accessibility training and support will provide the tools for Los Rios employees to apply universal design for learning to create an inclusive and equitable experience for our students. By ensuring that all Los Rios employees understand how to produce or choose accessible materials, this will align our entire organization with the Equity strategic goal and Section 508 compliance.

Our recommendations are as follows:

- A competency based, facilitated, and recurring accessibility compliance training program for Los Rios employees
- Hiring and training of facilitators and specialists
- Establishment of a wrap-around support network for Los Rios employees

##### District Training

Our recommendation of a competency based, facilitated, and recurring training program for Los Rios employees stems from the ever-changing technology landscape. With the technologies constantly evolving, so must the training and tools Los Rios uses to improve accessibility, and thus equity, in our district. We envision a standardized District-wide training accompanied by local specialist support. A standardized training will increase the effectiveness and productivity of faculty and staff, especially those who teach at multiple campuses. This provides Los Rios with the ability to respond to the evolution in tech tools and accessibility standards. This training will clarify the differences between faculty accessibility responsibilities and specialist accessibility responsibilities.

##### Wrap-around Support Services

We acknowledge that Los Rios employees cannot be expected to know everything about creating accessible content. Therefore, training is only one component of our recommendations. To create inclusive, equitable content that is in compliance with Section 508, significant wrap-around support services are necessary at all levels of the organization. In our opinion, accessibility specialists and trained facilitators are essential to the ongoing success of the training component; this has already been demonstrated successfully with the Los Rios FastTrack OEI Rubric Academy. A coordinated system of accessibility support services will

provide a standardization of the process through which faculty and staff at all campuses seek out and receive accessibility support. Los Rios currently does not have the support that is required to meet our equity and accessibility needs within the District and should provide trained specialists and facilitators in order to meet our equity Strategic Plan goal and align the organization to 508 compliance.

## Training Objectives

The objectives below are based on the [Scope of Work](#) produced by DAPIC Group 1. The format of these objectives support the recommendation for a competency-based training model.

1. Demonstrate how universal design for learning can create an inclusive, equitable learning experience.
2. Distinguish between local, state, and federal accessibility regulations; recognize how they apply to your work creating content
3. Identify the responsibilities of faculty and specialists in the creation of accessible course content.
4. Create accessible Canvas Content by applying the following core concepts:
  - a. Headings
  - b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning
  - d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
5. Create accessible MS Office Documents, PowerPoint Presentations and Excel spreadsheets by applying the following core concepts:
  - a. Headings
  - b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning
  - d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
6. Create accessible Google Documents, Slides and Sheets by applying the following core concepts:
  - a. Headings
  - b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning
  - d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
7. Create accessible PDFs by applying the following core concepts:
  - a. Headings
  - b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning

- d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
8. Utilize the following built-in accessibility checkers:
    - a. Grackle Docs
    - b. MS Office Accessibility Checker
    - c. Canvas RCE Accessibility Checker and other recommended accessibility checkers
  9. Demonstrate how to request automatic captions and edit those captions for time-sensitive videos and videos less than 5 minutes in length.

## Training Format

DAPIC recommends that Los Rios accessibility training follows a modular, competency-based format. Additionally, individuals may request to opt-out of training for a limited time period provided they are able to demonstrate competency in that given area. Since technology and accessibility standards evolve over time, we recommend that competency is renewed on an established cycle (similar to recurring District training for hiring, equity representatives, and sexual harassment).

In order to meet the diverse needs of Los Rios employees, the competency-based training modules could be available in a variety of formats:

1. Facilitated asynchronous online modules
2. Facilitated on-campus workshop series
3. Supplemented by on-campus drop-in support (aka “open labs”)

## Potential Training Modules

This module structure is aligned with the objectives listed above.

- Objectives 1-3: What is Accessibility?
- Objective 4 & 8: Accessible Canvas Content
- Objective 5 & 8: Accessible Document Design - MS Office
- Objective 6 & 8: Accessible Document Design - Google
- Objective 7: Accessible Document Design - PDFs
- Objective 9: Accessible Video & Captions

## Appendix D

### Outcome 5: Workload Impacts

#### Workload Impact Themes from DAPIC Workgroup 5

These themes related to making electronic course materials accessible were identified based on several sources of information collected by the DAPIC in 2020-2021. This includes comments from the confidential all-faculty DAPIC survey (Fall 2020), the department chairs accessibility feedback forum (Spring 2021), and meetings with individual faculty and groups who are knowledgeable and involved with accessibility and universal design (2020-2021). Note that these themes are **not** ranked in order of importance.

##### Theme 1:

###### **There are substantial ongoing workload issues associated with performing accessibility work.**

This ongoing workload will persist even if faculty are trained to implement accessibility standards themselves, and even after older documents have been remediated. Some faculty have already spent substantial uncompensated time performing accessibility work, and additional time correcting issues and errors that arose because faculty are not accessibility experts. The most common type of comment focuses on the sentiment that accessibility is not part of faculty's regular job and requires many hours of extra work. Faculty noted that they were not hired as accessibility experts, that this is not in their job description, and that the required accessibility work is a large and unreasonable time commitment for instructional faculty. Some faculty, part-time instructional faculty in particular, noted that they are being expected to do this work for free in addition to their regular teaching responsibilities.

##### Theme 2:

###### **Training itself is a workload issue.**

One-time training, and a need for ongoing training, goes beyond what would typically be considered appropriate for a FLEX obligation. Requiring the time spent in training to count toward full-time faculty's service requirement creates an additional workload concern, because this reduces the time available for other college service that is necessary for equity work and the basic functioning of college committees and programs. In addition, part-time faculty do not have FLEX or service obligations, so this training can't be accommodated as part of their workload. Many faculty have noted that they have already completed extensive accessibility training, and do not feel that additional mandatory time spent in being re-trained is necessary or appropriate.



### Theme 3\*:

#### **The workload associated with accessibility is not evenly distributed among academic disciplines or faculty work areas.**

Some disciplines and areas are impacted more, or impacted differently, than others. \*A follow up feedback forum was done to collect additional information about discipline-specific accessibility workload issues from department chairs. This is Appendix D1.

### Theme 4:

#### **There are workload equity issues with assigning faculty to do certain types of accessibility work.**

One example is editing auto-generated captions. These must be edited for accuracy, but the accent or dialect of the speaker affects the accuracy of auto-generated captions, requiring more editing for some than for others. When faculty who speak “standard American English” start with more accurate auto-generated captions, it will take less time to edit these, creating an unfair and disproportionate workload burden for faculty who speak other dialects. Another example is that some faculty with disabilities might not be able to easily access inaccessible formats, and so cannot do the work of making them accessible.

### Theme 5:

#### **Additional workload is created by navigating conflicting expectations and changing tools that give different recommendations about accessibility issues and how to remediate them.**

For example, faculty report being given conflicting information at different times and in different training sessions about what is required in terms of alt-text, captions, fonts, and more. Part-time faculty who teach in other districts have indicated that accessibility training and requirements are not consistent. This is a workload issue because it requires the additional time associated with tracking and implementing conflicting standards. In some cases, unclear or conflicting standards have required faculty to make multiple different versions of an accessible document, doubling their workload. Learning to use multiple tools is an area of potential concern as well.

### Theme 6:

#### **Important documents and announcements for students are frequently provided to faculty in an inaccessible format, creating additional workload for faculty.**

Often, college or district groups share fliers, announcements, instructions for completing college or district tasks, and other student-directed information with faculty, asking that they “post this information for students.” These electronic documents are rarely accessible, and this requires faculty to perform additional work in order to make the announcements and documents accessible for posting. This issue affects not only instructional faculty but all employees who regularly communicate directly with groups of students.

## Theme 7:

**Workload impacts have created pressure for faculty to reduce or eliminate certain course materials that have higher accessibility burden, such as instructor-produced videos and free Open Educational Resources.**

Because of the workload associated with making course materials accessible, some faculty now make decisions about course materials based on how long it would take them to make the items accessible, and not what is educationally the best choice for the students. Because accessible publisher materials often have not been created with equity in mind, professors who wish to use equity-minded instructional content need to make most materials themselves. In addition, because Open Educational Resources are free to students, publisher assistance is not available in making those materials accessible. This creates a higher burden of workload in making equity-focused and free course materials accessible, and the lack of support in mitigating this workload creates pressure to choose course materials that may not be the most equity-minded, or that pass on high costs to students.

## Theme 8:

**Faculty suggestions for reducing this workload emphasize reducing workload through outsourcing most of the work and providing better accessibility software.**

The number one faculty request is for clerical support, such as an accessibility office or program that would do this accessibility work for us. A second suggestion is for the district or college to provide better software to facilitate the accessibility work that faculty are asked to complete themselves. Training is also requested, however, it is clear from faculty comments that no amount of training will effectively address the workload issues related to accessibility.

## Theme 9:

**The current demand for accessibility support and training is placed on faculty coordinators, and the necessary workload for accessibility support is unsustainable and cannot be accommodated within existing faculty coordinator positions.**

Faculty coordinators, such as DSPS, DE, and Instructional Design coordinators, often experienced extra workload associated with providing accessibility training and/or assistance beyond what is realistic. Some faculty coordinators are asked to provide accessibility related assistance that goes beyond their job description. These faculty have put in many extra hours of accessibility-related work during the transition to online teaching, which remains uncompensated. Going forward, it will not be possible to support the goal of 508 compliance for all classes using current coordinator positions. In addition, faculty coordinators whose job focus includes accessibility work do not have the time to support all faculty in making course materials accessible. For example, the coordinators involved in aligning courses with the OEI rubric regularly spend 40 hours per instructor's section of a course on accessibility review. This does not include the work done by the instructional faculty member, or the work done by other specialists. In addition, for courses in certain disciplines or document-heavy courses, fast-track coordinators spend additional time on accessibility review -- they estimate this can take 60-100 hours for a single instructor's course section.

Theme 10:

**The requirement that electronic resources be made accessible creates additional workload for online and hybrid classes.in particular.**

This means that there is generally a higher workload associated with teaching online, compared with teaching face to face, because online classes naturally have more online documents, materials, and course resources. This increased workload is a disincentive for faculty to teach online and hybrid classes. Steps to equalize the workload associated with teaching different course formats might be appropriate to consider.

## Appendix D1: Department Chair Feedback

### COMM Studies/Senate

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Our department does online public speaking courses that include synchronous sessions for public speaking. We do not know what accessibility requirements are needed for this. (Assuming we'd have to have a sign language interpreter if we have a hearing-impaired student in the course? Are zoom captions sufficient?)

We are currently having to caption numerous videos in our online courses because we have been told that auto-captions are insufficient.

We are having to modify both student and textbook publisher PowerPoint presentations to add alt text, sufficient contrast, remove multiple repetitive copyright messages, etc.

We still do not have a good grasp of how to make certain .pdf files accessible.

Since most of our department teaches both online and on-ground, we have noticed SIGNIFICANT increased workload regarding accessibility in the online environment.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

I wasn't able to attach the screen shot from my Fall 19 Public Speaking Course (wherein I built my course.). But I spent 688 hours on that course that semester. I would estimate that AT LEAST 100 hours was spent on upskilling in accessibility and making my course more accessible.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

For a district that is so keen to develop online courses and programs, Los Rios is woefully out of touch with the incredible learning curve and time commitment required to make courses fully accessible. I fear this will drive instructors away from the online environment.

---

### Communication

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

As faculty we have spent many, many hours creating materials for online instruction. As Chair of the department, I have spent many, many hours creating multiple schedules with multiple contingency plans for online, hybrid, and on ground modalities. Colleagues have also expressed that email hours are at least double what they used to be.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

80 hours (2 weeks, full time)

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## Radio, TV, Film Production (RTVF)

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Our discipline is founded on the creation of and analysis of media content. Our audio classes deal with sound files and students have to listen as well as use meters to find audio issues to correct, or music beats to create soundtracks or soundscapes. The classes focused on speaking on camera or in the radio lab have large components dealing with vocal control and/or reading scripts or off teleprompters. All of our production classes have hands on components utilizing equipment to record sound or video images. Students manipulate equipment to properly frame images and hold focus on images. Our TV classes create programs where students communicate via speaking into headsets to alert the crew to the next steps being taken. Floor Directors communicate to the on air talent utilizing hand signals so their voices are not picked up by the microphones during production. Editors manipulate both video and sound to accomplish various tasks like pacing, strengthening actor's performances, color correction, audio correction, and mixing sound tracks. Students work at times in smaller lab spaces in close proximity to one another. Our theory classes involve the analysis of media with discussion of color theory, sound design, or shot composition. - The description above is what we do in our classes, finding ways to teach color theory or how to operate in the tv studio for a student with significant vision loss would be a hardship to the faculty. Adjusting content for a student with significant hearing loss in the Radio Workshop class would be a tremendous additional amount of work for the instructor. Students unable to operate a computer unassisted create a challenge in our computer lab where when a class is fully enrolled there are no extra seats and there is not enough space at times to put extra bodies in the rows without blocking the path for other students. In this instance I don't think it's reasonable to expect the instructor to have to manipulate the mouse and keyboard for the student during class while also trying to teach to the entire lab.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

It is my belief that arts and CTE instructors need a lot of support in this area. First, in just understanding how we may need to break a concept down (like seeing an image is out of focus if you have poor vision and EVERYTHING is out of focus). Second, it is my belief we need support

when creating accessible media - if I'm providing a description of an image for a class and I'm talking about framing - how much do I have to write for that image. The expression a picture is worth a thousand words comes to mind. There are so many intricate details someone may pick up on within the image. I also think students should have a realistic idea of what their prospects for success in a particular area are. I had a student many years ago with multiple accommodations. I had to get incredibly creative to meet them. I don't believe when they left our department they would be employable with the number of accommodations they would need to work in tv or on a film set professionally. I support their right to study what they wanted, but I also wonder if in the grand scheme of things using all their financial aid (BOG fee waiver) up on classes that may never lead to a career was the best strategy.

---

## Nutrition

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Our faculty has spent an enormous amount of time ensuring that our course materials are accessible. In addition to ensuring that the required textbook and software are accessible, we've had to caption our own video lectures, and added alt tag descriptions for all images in our own user content in Canvas. In addition, any new content that we've created (documents, presentation, etc) is organized in sections that are manageable and accessible by a screen reader. I know that some of us have thought of only providing links to websites that are accessible but it's too overwhelming to have to start checking every website for this. One of the things that we haven't been able to figure out is how to make scanned PDF articles accessible to a screen reader. What makes this task of creating accessible content more difficult is that we don't really have a good understanding of how the technology that our physically and sensory-impaired students use works. The other challenge is that due to the pandemic, we have tried to learn new programs to help us improve online teaching and student engagement, such as PlayPosit, Quizlet, Kahoot, EdPuzzle, but some of us do not end up using it in our classes because it already requires a lot of time and effort to create the new content, but on top of that we also have to make sure that it's all accessible. It just feels like there is a lot of pressure on faculty to make our course materials accessible with little support from the college.

In terms of classroom management in face-to-face classes, it would be ideal if the DSPS office could contact faculty prior to the start of the semester to let us know of any physically- or sensory-impaired students in our classroom. Our classes are usually full, and some classrooms are more spacious than others, so if we were to know ahead of time what the needs of the students are, for example, we need to accommodate interpreters in the front of the classroom, then we can plan for that. Also, this would give us a chance to learn more about different ways to adapt our lectures to meet students' needs. For example, after having a visually impaired student, I know now that I need to verbally describe a picture that's on a slide, that I need to provide more detail and avoid using colors in these descriptions. Improved communication between student resources and faculty would really benefit students and lessen the stress on faculty.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## Nutrition

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Ensuring cc in my lecture recordings and video announcements is cumbersome, but doable. Making sure every aspect of my Canvas course is meeting all of our students' needs seems unachievable to do my lack of understanding of how each page needs to be formatted. However, asking us to take additional "training" on top of everything else that needs to be done seems unrealistic. Pay someone to go into our class and do it for us. Someone who KNOWS WHAT THEY ARE DOING. There are folks who go to school for this type of thing. It would be a waste of everyone's time to have us do it wrong then get "trained" again to possibly correct any accommodation errors. Invest in our infrastructure and students to do it correctly and meaningfully the first time without wearing down the faculty.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Thanks for asking!

---

## Business and Computer Science Division, Computer Information Science Department

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

The CIS department is responsible to teach many disciplines that present specific challenges to accessibility. The content of most CIS courses involve the use of GUI (graphical user interface) tools, web pages and operating systems. Many CIS courses relate to industry certifications, such courses utilize media training and instructional content supplied by vendors. In short, a large portion of the conformance to accessibility standards is industry dependent. Furthermore, applications, operating systems and web applications are often revised and necessitate new instructor authored teaching materials that have short (as short as one semester) useable lifespan.

As such, the CIS department has challenges that are different from those of more academic departments such as English, history, nutrition, mathematics, psychology and etc.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

162

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Colleague 1: it takes 3 hours to plan and produce 1 hour of instructional material. Accessibility doubles this amount of time, meaning that 3 extra hours are needed to conform to accessibility standards for each hour of lecture material. A 3-unit class has 54 lecture hours, a total of 162 hours are needed to add accessibility if all lecture material is instructor authored.

Colleague 2: 100 hours to learn about what qualifies as accessible, 200 hours to research creative commons text material and quality-control (including accessibility) such material. 60 hours of instructor authored video, and the ratio of prep time, including scripting and closed captioning, is 12:1 (12 minutes of prep time to 1 minute of viewable video time). 60 hours amount fo 720 hours of prep time. Plus the time to prepare counter-cheat exam questions by embedded program code in images.

Department cochair: it is also important to understand many CIS courses are considered CTE courses. As such, curricula are to be reviewed every two years due to rapid developments in related industries. In order to best serve our students, course materials are continually being revised and created by instructors.

On behalf of the CIS department at ARC, I would like to emphasize that the Los Rios district is diverse in terms of disciplines, faculty, and students. As such, the amount of resources needed to meet accessibility standard can vary significantly from one discipline to another.

If the current plan is to allocate a one-time compensation for accessibility related workload, it will lead to a deep chasm of inequity between disciplines where content can be reused for years versus disciplines where content shelf life is as short as a semester.

It is far more equitable is the district is to provide accessibility related resources so that instructors of all disciplines can focus on content matter because instructors are subject matter experts, not experts of accessibility, closed captioning or other accessibility related skills such as signing or real-time captioning.

---

## CIS

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

It has always been a huge concern to me because it increases the costs of development and innovation in the classroom; this is coming from someone who taught web design for years. Faculty striving for compliance need to overcome a couple of hurdles to successfully grapple with this task:



- 1) they need to understand what specific tasks they need to complete to create compliant digital artifacts. This is tough when the standards seem to change from moment to moment (although in all fairness, that seems to have calmed down recently).
- 2) they then need to actually implement the design changes. This is a pain for someone who teaches programming and a herculean task for someone who has no experience doing this.

I see the question below about number of hours per semester. The answer is it depends. I can easily spend a day setting up a new assignment or modifying my Canvas page. I can also spend an hour because I've decided the plans, I had were too hard to implement.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Accessibility is extremely important, but realize it imposes a burden on innovation and updating in the classroom. Sadly, this burden disproportionately impacts faculty innovators and leaders - folks who like to try out new stuff. Anything which could be done to reduce this frictional cost would be welcome by faculty.

---

## Computer Information Science

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

CIS Faculty have been working diligently to assure all materials are accessible, including Canvas design and materials, as well as appropriate materials for their classes: textbook presentations, hand-outs, etc.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

I would estimate 40 hours per class minimum

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

More training is needed for faculty. More support to help faculty convert documents and content would also be appropriate.

---

## CE - BUSTEC

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

The BUSTEC department is trying to get all of our courses OEI approved. There isn't enough time or FTE to do so. Also, because the course needs to be OEI approved per instructor it makes it difficult with adjunct who may not always be teaching the course.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

40

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## Math and Statistics

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Entering math equations is difficult to make them accessible. Even with Math Type, it reads the LaTeX language and not the equation. Also, the accessibility checker dings you if you use more than 120 characters. But some formulas or math statements require way more than 120 characters to have them demonstrated properly in Canvas page.

Images are a pain. Inputting images of a graph or situation cannot be described properly. Either due to the fact that explaining it gives away the question we may be testing or assessing, or trying to describe the required image in the character limit can be impossible.

Most mathematical documents are not accessible. Thus sharing worksheets, textbook pages, or other documentation are impossible to convert and it is difficult, impossible, and/or time consuming to reconstruct to be accessible in Canvas.

Some functions don't allow for math type, for example quizzes. This requires math faculty to use upload document function for quick submissions more often than multiple-choice, fill-in, etc. This can require issues for students who have accessibility issues with uploading documents due to lack of resources or lack of knowledge. This requires faculty to spend a significant amount of time trying to find alternative applets or constructing training tools for students on how to submit their work, and taking time away from actual instruction.

Math language is difficult to automatically translate using the captioning tools (meaning it is less than 85% accurate like other non-STEM subjects). Extra time and attention to detail is required to go through each video and check.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

125

38

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## Mathematics & Statistics

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Equations in Canvas is of the utmost importance - the built-in equation editor in Canvas does not have proper alt-text but MathType plug-in does. MathType costs money per license so would be an additional investment and would also require some training.

Accessibility of Google Sheets/Excel for use in Statistics or other math courses (not all math faculty use this, but some do).

Accessibility of R software (an open-source software for students - we can offer students a choice of either R or Google Sheets for statistics).

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

It depends on the faculty member and their comfort with technology. I would say on average 30-40 hours per semester to make things accessible.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

I believe we should have release time for a faculty member or two each semester to develop online materials that are accessible, or to support other instructors in making things accessible. Or a devoted classified staff member. It is difficult to both create content when teaching an online course and also teach the course and have effective contact with students. Building course content needs to be accounted for in terms of FTE and scheduling.

---

## Mathematics

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

At least two thirds of the discipline is symbolic (abstract) and graphical (visual). The only tools available for creating the notations used take many times longer than simply writing it out by hand. There is no option that is even close. As far as the graphical aspects of most courses go, sometimes the entire point is to make observations and draw conclusions from graphs. To make graphics accessible, you must complete these descriptions for the students, thus taking away our ability to have students meet the outcomes.

If a student does have a visual disability, we work closely with DSP&S services to make provisions for the particular student.

Further compounding the problems is that we must collect written work much of the time since software packages are similarly limiting to our students as well. File formats vary significantly between computer systems which guarantees that the grading process for faculty is similarly challenged.

The time involved in creating assignments, assessment, etc. electronically is far more than ever before in an in-class environment. Literally "hours vs. minutes" in many cases. (This applies to grading, as well.)

One more big item is our inability to determine if the student is actually doing the work. In a writing class, the student submits the writing sample and a plagiarism check can be made. In a math class, students also have full access to a wide variety of modern tools that can actually do some sophisticated computations. We faculty must grade their handwritten work with no ability to determine if they may have received help. Confirmed cheating cases are up significantly and suspected cheating is "off the charts."

With regards to accessibility, this is probably a bit more than you were asking for...

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

Minimum of 100 hours to get close in many courses.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

This answer to the number of hours needed to make materials accessible varies significantly among faculty. Those that use software supported textbooks may have quite a bit less time to make additional materials 'accessible' but the cost to students is likely \$100 or more. "Not very accessible anymore."

There are cost free sources for some subjects but they also typically have far fewer problems to choose from.

Critical thinking is a key part of what we are tasked to teach and most support software is good for "lower to middle level" thinking. True problem solving is not typically multiple choice.

Creating the the materials needed to simultaneously reach students from a wide variety of backgrounds and abilities is already a task that is nearly impossible. Adding accessibility "for all" is not sustainable. Students are always changing. We depend on trained experts (DSP&S) to help us fill in the gaps when previously unknown circumstances arise. That is what they are for and who we gladly depend on.

---

## Speech-Language Pathology Assistant (SLPA)/HEED

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

It takes a lot of TIME to make all aspects of our courses accessible. In this online environment, we are creating videos (to demonstrate equipment/materials), creating recorded Power Point presentations for asynchronous lecture, and having to create accessible documents and retrofitting documents. It takes hours and hours to do all of this work.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

I do not know the specific answer to this question. I do know when COVID struck in 03/20 (during the remainder of the spring 2020 term) and during fall 2020, I worked EVERY SINGLE weekend on top of my M-F general work.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

I am exhausted - truly - not complaining, just exhausted.

---

## English

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

There has been a significant amount of work for everyone to make intro classes like ENGWR 300 accessible for students not well-skilled in online instruction. The sheer man-hours required to make a single class fully accessible, let alone 5-7 classes, has been prohibitive for most instructors.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

20-30

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## Journalism

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

The biggest issue is just the amount of time it takes to make every PowerPoint or written lecture or video accessible. I use a lot of PowerPoints and it has taken a lot of time to bring them up to accessibility standards. While written lectures are a little easier to make accessible, videos are another concern due to closed captioning issues

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

I spent at least 80 hours last summer working exclusively on updating material to be accessible--and I continued to work on it throughout the semester.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## ART

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Studio classes in the Art Department tend to be very hands on. The move to online has made it necessary to create numerous online demonstrations of materials and processes in order for our classes to function properly. Transcribing and captioning demos takes a considerable amount of time. Depending on the class there can be up to one or two demos per weekly lesson. In addition we use many images of art work for each lesson. Adding alt text to each image can be incredibly time consuming when each lesson contains 25 to 50 images.

Our Art History classes use at least as many images per lesson also. For these classes it gets a bit tricky when adding alt text to images for people with low vision. Often times quizzes and tests are based on image identification and description. There is a fine line between adding descriptions and giving away information that the student should be providing for the quiz/test answer. This takes a lot of agility and double checking on the part of our professors. These classes also utilize taped or live lectures which need to be captioned/transcribed.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

It really varies depending on the class but an estimate would be 70 hours per class.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

It would be helpful if Los Rios invested in an automatic captioning program/software such as otter.ai

---

## Early Childhood Education

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

We have found that during the pandemic, we cannot have students do in-person child observations and so we have been using photos, illustrations, and film clips/videos. It is quite time

intensive to search for and select appropriate film clips/videos, let alone provide descriptive labels and design new assignments around the film clips/videos.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

Having been through the OEI process and having a pretty good understanding of the workload to provide accessibility to students, I would say several hundred hours.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Thanks.

---

## ECE/FCS Department

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Some of the things that increases the departmental workload: 1. Converting multiple physical lab courses online labs (hours and hours of work and coordination) and now creating a reopening version (different pedagogy), and then hopefully soon a full physical lab (with any precautions). 2. Working with two different Deans for coordination of CTE and division (to be clear, the solution is not to throw our program into a CTE division since our programs do not fit neatly there). 3. Coordination with the CDC on lab opening for practicum/clinical lab coordination 4. Multiple budgets: Perkins, Strong Workforce, & (multiple) Grants. 5. New program development (ECE Apprenticeship & Elementary Education Dual Enrollment) 6. New grant locating and development. 7. Advisory Committee Meetings 8. Multiple course schedule revisions (likely experienced by all on campus). 8. Working with special populations and cohorts (Formerly Homeless Youth, Refugees, Student Parents, etc.) 9. Coordinating curriculum and courses in alignment with Commission on Teacher Credentialing for alignment with Child Development Permit, Pre-Credential Program, Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE). 9. Permit advising and signing off of on students who have completed the requirements for their CTC Permit. 10. Hire and coordinate peer supplemental support (ECE Peer Educators) including timesheets and training. 11. Outreach and CTE events. 12. Teach Classes with new pedagogy

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Regarding Accessibility: Depends on the course. For a conversion of a practicum lab which has never been converted it is immense (many weekly hours including the additional time). Some of our more experienced online faculty embed accessibility in their course design but the quick move to online may not have compromised some of this or may not have allowed for all to do this to fidelity.

---

## History

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Here are collective responses from colleagues:

Since I was already teaching online, one thing I've had to do is update all of my lectures on WORD, all of my pages, all of my images, and all of my assignments to make them accessible (adding headings, getting rid of underlining, changing to bulleting or numeral sequencing, adding the right description to the images, embedding more hyperlinks, etc.). This probably takes an additional 1-2 hours a week. Once it's been done for every lesson of every class, then it's just a matter of checking the links (up to 30 minutes a week).

Teaching in the asynchronous format makes group work difficult. Students tend to resent their peers for over/under involvement while working together at different times on a particular assignment. Also, simulations and certain discussions are not easily modifiable. I get the sense that other instructors have tended to do less group work online as students seem to view it as something almost alien to online instruction.

Making material accessible online in the new online format requires a lot of hours upfront. I spent hours recording lectures to Camtasia, editing them down to save students lengthy viewing times, and uploading subtitles through YouTube. Creating Modules on Canvas that chunk information appropriately takes hours of time as well.

Making audio-visual materials accessible in the online format is very time consuming. It has doubled the preparation time. For example, preparing a Power Point slide presentation now takes at least twice as long to publish and share with students. In History, we value currency in our discipline. We need to regularly revise and replace lectures. The work needs to be re-done every semester, even when we are teaching the same courses again.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

Here are collective responses from colleagues: I spend at least one-two hours a week looking for accessible videos. I may have a good YouTube clip of a quality PBS video (or the like), but the captions might not be any good. Then I must go on the hunt for another source such as Films on Demand, Kanopy, or find another video that may not be as good or concise, but that has closed captioning. Preparing materials online the first time is a herculean effort. For every hour of instruction, I would estimate that it took me about twice that to make the material available. Of course, once it's created an instructor can rely on it for future classes, however checking discussion posts to ensure student learning and engagement still involves more time spent than what might normally take place in a live classroom setting. Preparing documents to be posted in Canvas is very time consuming. Once a document is prepared, running an accessibility program adds a significant amount of time to the process for preparation. If a document includes lots of images, I've spent twice as much time I spent creating the document adding alternative text and titles and chart



headings. We need a straightforward program with accessibility features built-in to develop our handouts and syllabi. This will ensure that documents are created in an accessible format. Whenever I turn a lecture into a video, that adds another two-three hours to the unit that week to choose the appropriate slides from my on-ground lectures, write a script, tape it on Studio (multiple attempts), and update the captions. This is for a 10–15-minute video, not a whole hour lecture. That would take much more time. When I send out a video message to my students, that can add an hour of writing it (or collecting thoughts), taping the video on Studio, and checking captions. If I was to have a short video lecture every week (as they'd like), a weekly video intro or recap, all accessible videos, and accessible old/new content, I can see it adding 6-10 hours a week for which I'm not getting paid (in addition to grading). This doesn't include researching or writing content, updating content, updating assignments, etc. Captioning is the biggest time-suck. I read, several places, that captioning takes 40 hours for every 10 hours of content. We really need a captioning service. And not one part-time employee trying to do it all. I know that Studio can create auto-captions, but going through every line of captions and fixing them takes, well, a full work week for 10 hours. Add the captioning time to creating proper headings, alt text for images, headers for tables, and you've got probably 50 - 60 hours of work for 10 hours of content. Then, add in deleting old files so they don't show up in the Accessibility Reports: another 10 or more hours (if you can find them all). One colleague devoted over 250-hours to recording and publishing their lectures for one class, one semester.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Here are collective responses from colleagues:

As an adjunct, I am so thankful to have had the opportunity to teach online and for the resources that the college has provided to help instructors make the transition. I've benefited greatly from the ITC and the Online Training Institute. Still, teaching online is a great deal of work and, in my opinion, it's not quite as dynamic or effective as face-to-face instruction where students can interact in real time with the instructor or their peers. As technology progresses, perhaps it will become more dynamic, but instructors can also expect more work learning and adapting to the new methods/technologies above and beyond what might normally be required in a more traditional classroom setting.

My home computer's software is equipped with a version of Microsoft Office that includes an accessibility checker. When I make changes to the original document on my personal computer, a "green" accessibility score is generated when I upload the documents in Canvas. Using the feature in Canvas where we can drag and drop documents and make recommended changes is far more time consuming. If faculty are teaching online, the district should provide us with a computer equipped with the most up-to-date accessibility programs. Part-time and full-time colleagues should all be properly equipped to serve our students.

Sierra College has hired someone to do nothing but caption videos. They are backlogged for weeks (probably months at this point). I haven't even tried. What we also need is for someone who can take YouTube videos and change the captions they have to make them accessible for our students.

## Sociology

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Making documents accessible, pages in Canvas (headers and images), transcription for videos, and readings that are appropriately accessible. Ally is a helpful tool but it is not great for converting readings that have images and quotes in source material and can take a lot of labor to clean.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

40 hours or more although it depends on how much work has already been done on a course and how many changes a faculty member is making (new videos, articles, lectures etc.).

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Student workers would be helpful here.

---

## Occupational Therapy Asst. (SCC-SAH)

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

We are a small department with 2 FT and 7 adjuncts who work FT during the day, teach in the evening. 1 FT (coordinator/chair) is fully knowledgeable in techniques for accessibility development. All faculty know this is a requirement, however, most would need significant support. The coordinator/chair already has a heavy workload (50% for coord/chair of an externally accredited CTE program with continuous needs beyond the allotted time, even stated so by our accrediting body, along with a 50% teaching load. To lead an accessibility project cannot be done without significant release time. In addition, the majority of instruction occurs through the adjuncts who all have varying degrees of online teaching skills. Some are still developing the nuances of Canvas, far from able to perform new tech skills without training and support. The other FT faculty also doesn't have full training in these skills. Regardless, her schedule is filled with trying to place students in clinics in order to graduate. We have two cohorts graduating late because of Covid and lack of clinical sites available to due pandemic issues. We did not enroll a new cohort this year because of it, even though we have 3 cohorts in the queue on the waitlist. Further, we are still trying to simply catch up from the impact of the closure/pandemic. We have to get caught up somehow before we can even consider moving forward into new territory. There are 15 courses that need accessibility work, some with heavy need, others lighter. I perceive the work, but may be wrong, from heaviest to least, to be: closed-captioning and audio file transcription; PDF accessibility corrections headers, etc.); transcription of graphic images (eg, infographics) to provide accessible text, and alternate texts for images.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## ESL L&L

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

English as a Second Language is instructing students who do NOT know English, so slow enunciation, repetition, exaggerated pronunciations all need to happen -- this will be difficult with masks on, especially in our lower levels. I'm not sure how to do this safely but clearly for these students.

Otherwise, I don't understand the question. Do you mean for online learning? Proper subtitles are a HUGE time-sink, as is knowing how to properly format images, links, etc. Yes, I took OTLA but it was not ingrained and review or set of reminders would be very helpful.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

I spend at least 10 hours a week, extra, trying to make my videos, documents, and canvas etc. are accessible, and I know I still need to do better. I'm also quite internet/computer literate, so I imagine other faculty are spending more time, or zero because it is overwhelming.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

We're not trained for this, it is exhausting when students are not "real" online students (they only are online because they have to be), so helpful reminders/canvas guides are necessary.

---

## Business

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

My department is over 90% online for the Fall. Faculty spend enormous time building libraries of videos from outside resources as well as "lectures" they build themselves. Also, much of the OER materials our department uses have accessibility issues.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

Not sure, but I have gotten faculty feedback that it requires significant effort.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

### Anthropology/BSS

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

The main issue that's specific to anthropology has to do with captioning classic ethnographic films. Many of these have discipline specific terminology and otherwise adequate captioning services make too many errors.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

### Political Science

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

The shift to make everything accessible to all should not be placed solely upon the Faculty. I would propose the creation of a specific office tasked with this responsibility. Aid and oversight.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

Too many.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

No.

---

### Biology

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Editing auto captions for videos containing large amounts of biological terminology is very cumbersome. Faculty in the biology department also use many labeled images in their PowerPoint documents. If the publisher does not offer accessible slides, it is very time-consuming to make all image labels accessible.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

For one 0.2 FTE anatomy and physiology (BIOL 431) lecture section only, I spend 10+ hours per week editing auto captions.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

---

## Psychology

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Most of our accessibility workload is fairly standard such as: converting Word or pdf documents to accessible formats, captioning self-recorded and online videos, and creating pages in Canvas. Workload that is above-and-beyond a "typical" course are those for Biopsychology (PSYC 312) and Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (PSYC 330). Please see below for the main areas of accessibility concern and workload that is specific to PSYC 330:

Issues with making equations accessible - Special software (e.g. MathType) is necessary to make equations written on assignments accessible. Access to this software is not available to the instructor. We have been told that a limited number of versions of the software is available for the FLC math department and is installed on only a few computers for their department. Access to MathType on those computers has not been available with remote instruction and may not be available to our instructor(s) even upon return to campus.

CVD-OEI District Team making updates - The CVC-OEI district team has worked to update some documents for PSYC 330 but when they do so the instructor loses the ability to edit them.

Graphs and Tables - To make graphs and tables accessible alt text needs to be added that describes the graph or table in enough detail that someone with a visual impairment can understand what is being presented. This makes it challenging to assess one of the C-ID course SLOs for MATH-110 courses which is to "Interpret data displayed in tables and graphically." Once enough alt text is included in order to meet the accessibility requirement, the SLO is in large part already met without the student needing to do any additional interpretation.

Issues with students being able to see images, Canvas isn't compatible with all browsers. -- If students don't use the correct browser, they can't see some images and equations. This includes not being able to see formulas and graphs.

Typing math symbols and equations is time-consuming -- Because of the equations and symbols used in statistics, making PSYC-330 accessible is very time-consuming. All symbols, numbers, and equations have to be entered using an equation editor. For example, even a symbol like "SS" has to be typed with an equation editor. Unlike text that can be copied and pasted from any document into Canvas, equations have to be created with the specific equation editor for the program that is

being used. For example, an equation created in Microsoft Word cannot be copied directly into Canvas, it has to be recreated using the equation editor in Canvas. In addition, equation editors often become updated and become incompatible with older versions so everything has to be recreated.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

5-8 hours per week for a typical psychology course; 10-15 hours per week for PSYC 312 and PSYC 330

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

We need support. Instructors cannot meet accessibility needs with their current level of training and time/workload demands.

---

## Psychology, BSS, ARC

Please share the details of any specific accessibility workload impacts that affect your department or area. Include as much information as possible, so we will be able to understand correctly. \*

Upon consulting with my colleagues from Psychology (both experienced online instructors and relatively new ones), the following were some of the important details we would like to share about how accessibility impacts our workload.

Sadly, it seems like accessibility is now driving pedagogy and delivery. There are things some of us would love to do in our online classes that, quite frankly, we are unable to since we don't have time or the support to make them accessible. At times, we are found in the position of accepting the YouTube "captioning" as having to be "good enough." In some institutions, there is an entire department DEDICATED to doing this for faculty and students. In these contexts, pedagogical choices and accessibility do not become an issue of "either/or". Obviously, any time there is a new course to prep, we need to make sure any documents used are fully accessible. This is especially challenging with PDFs found online that are complex to convert to word because of boxes and other graphics. Ditto for labeling all images in a new course prep. With course content that changes on a yearly basis, this "new prep" work becomes the "unpaid summer project" every year.

- 1) Zoom and Canvas Studio transcripts are about 75-80% accurate. So, reviewing those is an ongoing necessity. Revision time ranges from 20-30 minutes for each 30 minutes of content. Thankfully, some of these recordings can be reused in future semesters. However, the weekly video messages (sometimes 2-3 video messages a week per course) have to be done every week and every semester so the messages are current and relevant to that semester. These take an additional 20 minutes each to be revised.
- 2) Each of the Google Docs hand-outs need to be checked for ADA compliance (screen reader friendly, for instance). This often requires reformatting of file (Title, Subtitle, Headings) so the entire file is not just Normal Text.

- 3) Images, graphs, tables from textbook and other materials (especially from Open Source) need to be reformatted or, if uploaded on Canvas as an image, relevant alternate text provided. As someone who uses free, open-resources in my courses, this has added an additional weekly hour (depending on complexity of table or graphs) to add alternate text descriptions.
- 4) Relevant podcasts are not always accompanied by transcripts. This has required that many of us directly contact the podcast makers to request transcripts. Most often than not (with a few exceptions such as NPR and PBS, for instance), transcripts are not available, and we are left in the position to not use that powerful podcast OR produce the transcripts ourselves. Transcribing podcasts add an additional 45-70 minutes per week per 30-min podcast.

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

When creating content, maybe 70% of our time is spent doing accessibility stuff. Overall, in terms of hours, it really varies depending on how much new content is being created as well as which course is being taught. Some have reported 192 hours (new online course) during the semester (12 hours a week) for each 3-unit course while others have reported 48-50 hours per semester (not including the materials that can be re-used in subsequent semesters) to make sure all materials are fully accessible.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?

Sadly, this has been an ongoing issue for decades. This is not the first time our department had discussed the different levels of support provided to instructor if we are teaching a class on-campus versus online. In fact, just to get my colleagues to share their perspectives with me so I could fill out this survey involved a lot of effort on my part since the morale is down and, sadly, many stated "we've already expressed this numerous times", or "why do we even have to be surveyed... Isn't it obvious from many prior conversations / surveys that online instructors do not have much support on many things, including making content accessible?" and so on. 😞

I would like to add the following to my other Accessibility Survey submitted today. This came to me after I had submitted, and I think it's important to share with you since it involves a lab course as well.

3.0 Unit Lecture Class

Total: ~11-14 hours/week per 3-unit lecture class

Zoom Closed Captioning

It takes ~3\*the time/length of the lecture to edit and fix the closed captioning

May have 2-3 hours of audio files each week. That means ~9 hours/week just to do the CC after the videos have been created. Especially with biopsych as the auto-captioning does not always work well with scientific terms.

Audio announcements 10 minutes \*2-3/week = 30 minutes of announcements = 90 minutes for CC

Online video clips – verifying they are compliant (~30-60 minutes/week) If the videos are not compliant it is significantly more time as I have to drop using those videos and find other videos or try to make them compliant myself.

PPT files – making accessible with graphs, pictures, charts, etc. (~15 minutes if they are text heavy to 2 hours if they are graphic heavy)

Word documents – reformatting to have header structure, accessible tables, etc. (~30 minutes/week)

10.5 hours / week on closed captioning

Other accessibility tasks: 1.0-3.5 hours/week

1.0 Unit Lab class:

Total: ~12-18+ hours/week per 1-unit lab class (and that would still not be fully compliant for both students with visual or auditory challenges)

Lab practical exams – 100's of pictures that need to be labeled. Always adding more pictures. (~2 hours/week for first 6 weeks)

(Optional) How many hours per semester do you estimate that a typical faculty member in your department currently spends -- or would need to spend -- to make all the materials for one course fully accessible? If you have no idea, please leave this blank.

(Optional) Is there anything else we should know?



## Appendix D2: Faculty Workload Estimates to Meet Accessibility Standards

Ensuring the accessibility of online course materials will have an impact on faculty workload. The estimates below detail the amount of time it will take faculty to complete certain tasks to help guarantee the accessibility of *new* materials. The estimates do not apply to the remediation of existing materials. The completion time of the tasks below will vary depending on the length and complexity of the material. Estimates also assume that faculty have had basic accessibility training.

### Canvas Content and Assessments

All Canvas content should be accessible, including Pages, Assignments, Discussions, Quizzes, Surveys, and Announcements. Instructor use of the Pope Tech Accessibility Guide or Canvas Accessibility Checker will help with the tasks below.

The approximate times are for an instructor to perform these tasks on **one** Canvas page. The amount of time will vary depending on the length and complexity of the Canvas page.

Task	Approximate Time to Complete Task
Use proper Heading structure	1-5 minutes
Include appropriate alternate text for basic images	1-2 minutes <i>per image</i>
Choose font colors with appropriate contrast between text and background colors	Using the Pope Tech tool to help with this task will take 1-3 minutes.
Do not use color to relay information	0
Provide meaningful link text for hyperlinks	1-2 minutes per hyperlink
Use unordered and ordered list formatting where appropriate	1 minute per list
Identify the row and column headings of simple data tables	Using Pope Tech to help with this task should take 1-3 minutes <i>per table</i> .

## Microsoft (Word, Excel, and PowerPoint) and Google (Docs, Sheets, and Slides)

All Microsoft and Google files that instructors use in their courses should be accessible. Use of the Microsoft Accessibility Checker tool or the Grackle Suite Accessibility Checker tool (for Google files) will help instructors with the tasks below.

The approximate times are for an instructor to perform these tasks on **one** document. The amount of time will vary depending on the length and complexity of the document.

Task	Approximate Time to Complete Task
Use proper Heading structure	1-5 minutes
Include appropriate alternate text for basic images	1-2 minutes <i>per image</i>
Choose font colors with appropriate contrast between text and background colors	Using an accessibility checker tool to help with this task will take 1-3 minutes
Do not use color to relay information	0
Provide meaningful link text for hyperlinks	1-2 minutes per hyperlink
Use unordered and ordered list formatting where appropriate	1 minute per list
Identify the row and column headings of simple data tables	Using an Accessibility Checker tool to help with this task should take 1-3 minutes per table
Microsoft PowerPoint and Google Slides: ensure that content is ordered correctly on each slide	Using an Accessibility Checker to help with this task should take about 1-5 minutes per slide

## Adobe PDFs

The creation of Adobe PDFs is not recommended if a Canvas Page, Word document, or Google doc can be used instead. Faculty can make these types of documents accessible with Pope Tech, the Microsoft Accessibility Checker, and the Grackle Accessibility Suite, whereas the creation of a fully accessible PDF will require expert level accessibility knowledge and software that many faculty do not have access to, such as Adobe Acrobat Pro.

## Multimedia: Video

There are two paths that faculty can take to ensure high-quality captions on the videos used in their courses: request and update auto-captions or request high-quality captions and upload them to Canvas Studio or 3CMedia.

### Instructor Requests and Fixes Auto-Captions

Task	Approximate Time to Complete Task
Request auto-captions of instructor-created videos that are uploaded to Canvas Studio or 3CMedia	2 minutes per video
Check and fix auto-captions for accuracy	Manually fixing auto-captions takes about 3x as long as the length of the video. For example, a 5 minute video would take an instructor approximately 15 minutes to check and fix auto-captions.

### Instructor Requests and Uploads High-Quality Captions (SCC Pilot Captioning Project)

Task	Approximate Time to Complete Task
Identify and organize the list of videos that need to be captioned	Time will vary depending on the number of videos that need to be captioned and how organized the video library is. This could take anywhere from 10 minutes to 2+ hours.
Submit the web page addresses of instructor or third-party videos (typically 3CMedia or YouTube) that need to be captioned to the captioning team	4 minutes per video
Upload instructor-created videos to a cloud drive (ex: Google drive or Dropbox) and submit the link to these videos to the captioning team	4 minutes per video
Receive caption files from the captioning team and upload them to videos located in Canvas Studio or 3CMedia	5 minutes per video

## Appendix E: Catalog of All Recommendations

### DAPIC Final Reports: Recommendations

#### Individual Committee Member Recommendations

I finally gave myself some time to look over the 40-page document with the department chair survey results and it's very enlightening to see things from their perspective. Being a part of the population that needs accessible material in order to succeed in classes (and in life), I guess over the years I've had some tunnel vision on this so I'm thankful that I'm seeing the process now and can list a few recommendations. These include:

- I would highly recommend that each of the colleges (perhaps in conjunction with the campus' DSPS, perhaps not) hire at least one point person to be responsible for checking content's accessibility – either for being a sounding board or for auditing purposes, with that person/people being able to hire a pool of temporary classified employees at will for the inevitable amount of heavy work this would involve (much like we do at DSPS for interpreters).
- In addition to the point person or people from the first bullet point, faculty could be given annual reviews (much like the student surveys every semester?) to ensure that their materials continue to be accessible, even as data becomes outdated and needs to be refreshed. I'm not sure how well this would work for tenured or non-tenured faculty (similarities or differences).
- I'm wondering if our committee can be more of a standing committee that can continue to discuss issues in a perpetual manner, rather than periodically. This could be useful, especially consulting for fields that are ever-changing (i.e., CIS).
- A few of the responses touched on the potential for cheating, which is obviously a legitimate concern, but I'm not sure that it's within the purview of our committee?
- Not a recommendation as such, but I really loved Andrea Garvey's responses with detailed answers about the workload considerations.
- In general, we need to disavow the notion that automated captioning and vague image descriptions are 'good enough', who's the judge of that? I'm sensitive to the time required for this, but I can't help feeling like my (and others') accessibility is such a burden in general. I was particularly concerned about one response that went into detail about a prior student who would 'never' be able to find adequate work because of their disabilities. I don't know how we can add that to a document, though, like a lot of other things in life. Forgive me this one, I'm ranting. 😊

#### DAPIC Group One Recommendations

##### Purpose of the DAPIC Report:

- That it serve as a model plan for Los Rios for many years to come and updates are built in - every three years

### Outcomes we would like to see:

- Approach faculty in a way so that accessibility does not seem to be a complicated barrier, but something we can all manage if we work together - a shared responsibility
- Provide faculty with a clear list of accessibility-related tasks for which they are responsible
- Provide faculty with a clear list of accessibility-related tasks where they can expect help from accessibility experts
- Hire accessibility experts, who serve as mentors, to help faculty ensure the accessibility of their course materials
  - As a result, relieve some of the accessibility-related workload from Distance Education and Instructional Development Coordinators with the hiring of additional help
- Create a variety of training options (self-paced, facilitated online, face-to-face, etc) to address the different levels of accessibility knowledge that faculty will need to create accessible course materials **and/or** create a centralized District accessibility training that will cover all of the accessibility-related tasks for which faculty are responsible

### DAPIC Group Two Recommendations

#### Creating New Content

When it comes to creating new course content, whether it be in Canvas using the Rich Content Editor (RCE), Microsoft Word, or Google Docs, results from the survey indicate faculty are comfortable handling the following elements, provided they have received adequate training:

- Styled headings
- Alt-text for basic images
- Proper use of color
- Meaningful hyperlink text
- Use of list tools (bulleted and numbered)

They indicated that specialist assistance would be needed for the following elements:

- Alt-text or written descripts for complex images (graphs, works of art, diagrams, etc.)
- Tables (though training can assist with this)
- Use of color and text sizing if visually complex documents are being created
- PowerPoint reading order
- Use of math or equation editors such as MathType and LaTeX

#### Mitigating Existing (Legacy) content

Given both the volume of legacy content that exists, the lack of familiarity with PDF editing, and the reported need for specialist support on certain items above, we recommend that the remediation of existing documents be handled via an accessibility specialist team. This sentiment is echoed the report from DAPIC Workgroup 4.

## Multimedia – Captioning and Transcripts

Creating accessible captions and transcripts for multimedia materials is a laborious and time-consuming process. Results of the survey indicate that faculty agree with this assessment and find it appropriate to have specialists in charge of creating captions and transcripts and editing of auto-generated captions that they may be using. Workgroup 4 agrees with this sentiment via a statement that reads, “A specialist should complete captioning for videos and transcription for audio files. This includes videos produced by faculty for use with students, and other instructional videos produced by third parties. This subcommittee further suggests that the specialists who are responsible for video captioning should not be dependent on variable grant funding.”

Faculty indicate that they are able to handle submitting requests for auto-generated captions on their own via either 3CMedia or Canvas Studio. They also seem to indicate they can edit their own captions when those videos are less than 5-minutes in length or are of a time sensitive nature such as daily updates or announcements. Should they choose to seek assistance with this task, the captioning teams services should be made available.

Though not addressed via the survey, it should be noted that minimal training will be needed for faculty to be able to identify improperly captioned videos (i.e. those that are auto-generated). Both training time and workload demands of this additional element are negligible.

## OER, Publisher Content, Software, and Canvas LTI Tools, and External Websites

Faculty rely heavily upon course content created by others. This includes Open Education Resources, Publisher Materials, and Internet websites. Additionally, they rely upon specialized software, and Canvas integration tools (LTIs). These elements need to be accessible, but it requires expertise to determine whether these elements meet minimum standards.

Given the level of expertise needed to perform this task and the fact that the vast majority (76%) of faculty requested support in this area, it is recommended that the vetting of these products and content be handled by a specialist.

## DAPIC Group Three Recommendations

### General Recommendations:

- A competency based, facilitated, and recurring accessibility compliance training program for Los Rios employees
- Hiring and training of Universal Design for Learning Coordinators and accessibility specialists
- Establishment of a wrap-around support network for Los Rios employees, housed on the College campuses, that includes UDL Coordinators and accessibility specialists

### Wrap-around support

To create inclusive, equitable content that is in compliance with Section 508, significant wrap-around support services are necessary at all levels of the organization. In our opinion,

accessibility specialists and trained facilitators are essential to the ongoing success of the training component; this has already been demonstrated successfully with the Los Rios FastTrack OEI Rubric Academy. A coordinated system of accessibility support services will provide a standardization of the process through which faculty and staff at all campuses seek out and receive accessibility support. Los Rios currently does not have the support that is required to meet our equity and accessibility needs within the District and should provide trained specialists and facilitators in order to meet our equity Strategic Plan goal and align the organization to 508 compliance.

## Training Recommendations

### Training Format

- Accessibility training follows a **modular, competency-based format**.
- Option to **opt-out** of training for a limited time period provided they are able to demonstrate competency in that given area.
- Competency should be **renewed** on an established cycle (similar to recurring District training for hiring, equity representatives, and sexual harassment).
- Competency based training modules could be available in a **variety of formats**:
  - Facilitated asynchronous online modules
  - Facilitated on-campus workshop series
  - Supplemented by on-campus drop-in support (aka “open labs”)
- Training objectives and assessments should be reviewed on an established cycle to ensure they meet current accessibility standards.

### Training Objectives

The objectives below are based on the [Scope of Work](#) produced by DAPIC Group 1. The format of these objectives support the recommendation for a competency-based training model.

1. Demonstrate how universal design for learning can create an inclusive, equitable learning experience.
2. Distinguish between local, state, and federal accessibility regulations; recognize how they apply to your work creating content
3. Identify the responsibilities of faculty and specialists in the creation of accessible course content.
4. Create accessible Canvas Content by applying the following core concepts:
  - a. Headings
  - b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning
  - d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
5. Create accessible MS Office Documents, PowerPoint Presentations and Excel spreadsheets by applying the following core concepts:
  - a. Headings

- b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning
  - d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
6. Create accessible Google Documents, Slides and Sheets by applying the following core concepts:
- a. Headings
  - b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning
  - d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
7. Create accessible PDFs by applying the following core concepts:
- a. Headings
  - b. Alt text for basic images
  - c. Color and Meaning
  - d. Naming hyperlinks
  - e. Lists
  - f. Simple Tables
8. Utilize the following built-in accessibility checkers:
- a. Grackle Docs
  - b. MS Office Accessibility Checker
  - c. Canvas RCE Accessibility Checker and other recommended accessibility checkers
9. Demonstrate how to request automatic captions and edit those captions for time-sensitive videos and videos less than 5 minutes in length.



## Group Four Recommendations

### Overall Recommendations

- The colleges should create job descriptions for specialist staff (Accessibility Specialists) that do not rely on temporary funding sources. The Accessibility Specialist positions should require appropriate expertise in legal accessibility requirements and universal design knowledge. These positions should be filled as soon as possible, because staff to complete accessibility work are essential to bringing the district into compliance with the law.
  - Accessibility Specialists should be involved in the development and periodic review of accessibility plans and policies, in order to ensure that current laws and best practices are integrated correctly into policy;
  - Accessibility Specialists should have sufficient subject matter background to provide discipline-specific accessibility support when necessary, e.g. math equations, foreign language transcription, complex images.
  - Accessibility Specialists should have the technical skills necessary to complete accessibility work that cannot reasonably be completed by faculty. This work is summarized below, and detailed in the attached Specialist Responsibilities report.
- In terms of direct accessibility support for course materials, either an Accessibility Specialist, or a district-funded external accessibility service, should facilitate the completion of any needed work in the following areas:
  - PDF accessibility remediation for legacy documents, complex PDFs, and PDFs that were not created by the faculty member;
  - Captioning videos and transcription of audio materials;
  - Websites and HTML coding, including external website screening and needed alternative formats;
  - Providing alternative formats for textbooks, Open Educational Resources, software programs, or apps and requesting and evaluating Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) information when available;
  - Evaluating complex course materials, such as interactive online activities, for accessibility, and assisting faculty with developing any necessary Equally Equivalent Alternative Access Plans (EEAAPs) for materials that specialists deem “inherently inaccessible”;
  - Other advanced accessibility tasks that cannot reasonably or correctly be completed by a typical faculty member.

### Specialist Work Recommendations

This subcommittee was tasked with identifying and describing the higher-level accessibility work that should not be completed by faculty. Our recommendations for the types of work that should be the responsibility of a specialist, rather than a faculty member, are summarized below.

These recommendations are based on current technology and accessibility requirements that we are aware of as of Fall 2020. If available technology and accessibility policies change in future years, or if additional accessibility requirements are found to apply to Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in future years, then these recommendations should be re-visited.

### 1. PDF Accessibility and Remediation:

A specialist should be responsible for remediating and making accessible pdf documents that are:

- Long (e.g. more than 20 pages)
- Complex (e.g. contain complex tables, math equations, special symbols, forms, multiple columns, etc.)
- Not authored by the faculty member (e.g. pdf from another office/organization)

### 2. Captioning Videos and Audio Transcription:

A specialist should complete captioning for videos and transcription for audio files. This includes videos produced by faculty for use with students, and other instructional videos produced by third parties. This subcommittee further suggests that the specialists who are responsible for video captioning should not be dependent on variable grant funding.

### 3. HTML and other Web-coding and editing:

A specialist should be responsible for completing any accessibility work that requires HTML coding or editing of HTML code, both for remediation and producing new accessible documents. This responsibility should also apply to other Web languages or markup languages that are used in the future in place of HTML.

### 4. Accessibility of E-textbooks, OERs, and software or apps that are assigned and required for use by students:

A specialist should be responsible for completing work related to accessibility of electronic textbooks, electronic OERs, other equivalent course materials that function in place of a textbook and required instructional software and apps for student use. This includes:

- locating and interpreting VPAT information
- accessibility screening of reading materials, including interpreting results of accessibility checkers (e.g. WAVE) and manual checks
- evaluating the accessibility of software programs and apps that are required for use in an instructional setting (e.g. graphing calculator app, nutrition tracking software, etc.)
- estimating the time, cost, and feasibility associated with making the materials “fully accessible” as defined in district policies

- remediating materials or making new materials accessible when appropriate (e.g. for OERs, or online textbook alternatives that can be modified or reproduced without copyright restrictions)
- obtaining accessible formats of copyrighted materials from publishers when appropriate (e.g. e-textbooks, article pdfs)
- ensuring that accessible formats produced retain the appropriate license as required by law (e.g. compliance with copyright laws, retention of creative-commons license for derivative works).

## 5. External Websites:

This sub-committee acknowledges that it is not feasible to fully assess all websites referenced in course materials, and that it is not possible to directly remediate external websites. However, if any checking and remediating external websites is required, then a specialist should be responsible for:

- interpreting accessibility checker reports from WAVE
- manual checks of external website evaluation, including any “re-checking” that may need to be done in response to website changes
- understanding and applying WCAG 2.1 and related guidelines
- converting websites to an accessible format when necessary, in compliance with copyright laws and relevant accessibility standards

## 6. Equally Equivalent Alternative Access Plans (EEAAP)

This sub-committee notes that it might not be feasible to create a written EEAAP so that a “DSPS approved plan for accommodation is in place and ready to be provided as necessary for each inaccessible learning activity or instructional media” (OEI Rubric). However, if this is required, specialist knowledge and support is necessary. A specialist should be responsible for assisting instructional faculty with the following:

- determining whether a EEAAP is necessary for each learning activity or instructional media item
- developing appropriate EEAAPs that provide “equivalent access” to the content and purpose of the activity/media
- applying standards for determining whether an ICT is “inherently inaccessible” and whether it would be an “undue burden” to make it accessible
- ensuring that EEAAPs are in compliance with any relevant policies and laws
- submitting EEAAPs to DSPS, or other offices or agencies, whenever this is required.

### Further notes about these recommendations:

These are recommendations for which accessibility work should be the responsibility of a specialist because it requires skills and expertise that classroom faculty generally do not have.

If a faculty member is capable of completing any of the specialist work above, they should have the option - but not the responsibility - to do that work themselves.

### DAPIC Workgroup 5 - Workload Recommendations - Draft

- Due to the ongoing nature of accessibility work, faculty need reliable technical support from Accessibility Specialists who can do the work of making course materials accessible.
- Additional training cannot be expected to meet all accessibility needs, and no amount of training will effectively address the workload issues related to accessibility.
- The workload associated with accessibility is not evenly distributed among disciplines, therefore it can be expected that some faculty areas will need more specialist support than others.
- Editing video auto-captions impacts the workload of all faculty, but disproportionately impacts faculty with disabilities and non-native speakers of English. Therefore, a captioning service that provides human-corrected captions should be made available to meet the captioning requirements for instructional materials.
- The ever-changing accessibility tools and standards that faculty are expected to apply to course materials creates conflicting information and undue workload burden for faculty. Providing Accessibility Specialist support staff who can complete more nuanced accessibility tasks will save faculty time and ensure that accessibility modifications are in compliance with current standards.
- Publisher assistance is not available in making Open Educational Resources (OER) materials accessible, therefore direct Accessibility Specialist support is necessary to make OERs accessible for faculty who are willing to adopt more equity-focused and free course materials.
- The requirement that electronic resources be made accessible creates additional workload for online and hybrid classes. Therefore, we suggest reducing the class cap for these courses to equalize the workload associated with these teaching modalities.
- Any institutional documents, announcements, or flyers that faculty are asked to share with students should be provided to faculty in accessible format - faculty should not be responsible to make these accessible.
- The burden of institutional accessibility should not solely fall on our Distance Education, Instructional Design, DSPS, or Online Course Design coordinators - that is not sustainable or realistic and additional staffing is necessary.
- Because the typical faculty member cannot meet accessibility requirements through FLEX or service hours, it is not appropriate to require faculty to use FLEX or service hours to complete accessibility training or the work of making materials accessible.
- The instructional faculty workload associated with accessibility should be reviewed on a regular basis, as accessibility requirements change.
- We recommend that the current District Accessibility Plan be reviewed, and the specific accessibility requirements and the scope of circumstances when ICTs need to be made accessible be clarified. Until that happens, the true workload associated with making course materials accessible will be imprecise.

## Additional Considerations and Detailed Committee Member Comments on Scope of Accessibility Work

Other than the obvious goals for the report, the main thing I think is important is that the district accessibility plan be reviewed and updated as soon as possible, and then periodically. I think that needs to be communicated as a recommendation as clearly as possible.

Ideally, I think that recommendation should say that the district accessibility plan:

- Should be reviewed for legality by legal experts.
- Checked to make sure that the accessibility modifications it requires match current best practices (by a trained accessibility expert who is up to date on accessibility requirements of current state law, not by a consulting group with limited experience in accessibility, or someone who is knowledgeable about accessibility in general);
- Be revised to concretely clarify the scope of circumstances when accessibility modifications need to be made

Also, the current district accessibility plan includes references to district policies as though the policies contain relevant information. But then, the referenced policies themselves actually do not contain that information – specifically R-2731 and P-7136. So, reading the accessibility plan casually, it appears that the necessary information to interpret the policy is being provided but in fact it is not, and that is not clear unless you read the plan while also checking what information these policies contain, which I assume that very few people have done.

### “Inherently Inaccessible”

For determining which activities that are “inherently inaccessible” what is the screening process, and what are the criteria for an ICT to be labeled as “inherently inaccessible”? Eventually, we will need to address who determines what is “inherently inaccessible,” and at that point it will be helpful to clarify which types of activities need to be evaluated using those criteria, and what type of expertise is required for the evaluation. Basically, I think it would be helpful to have an idea of what the criteria are for something to fall under the **scope** of “inherently inaccessible.” I think we are already partly addressing this by finding out more about the EEAAPs and the standards for that. I’m excited to learn more about the EEAAP standards at our next meeting! But someone also must determine whether the activity is “inherently inaccessible” to begin with and what the standard is for it not being possible to make something accessible and needing the EEAAP instead.

Side note: not all classes will be in the OEI, and some will not even be online classes, but still have these ICTs. So, we can’t rely on the OEI accessibility process to be a solution for this screening. Activities also change, and my understanding is that the OEI screening is a one-time process for each class.

### “Alternative and Accessible Format Requirements”

When an alternative format is necessary, what are the range of alternative formats that are acceptable (and who determines that?) For example, if there is an eBook which is also available

as an audio book, but is not available as a screen reader compatible book, is this audio book an acceptable alternative format or does the book have to be made screen reader compatible regardless? Or, if there is one content item that is provided as a narrated video version and also a written text version with screenshots, would the screenshots still need alt-text descriptions if they are verbally described well enough for the instructional purpose in the video format. If a publisher doesn't provide accessible pdfs for a journal article, but does provide an accessible ePub version, is that good enough, or does every single version of every ICT have to be completely accessible on its own, even when there are already alternative formats available.? Basically, does the **scope** of these accessibility requirements apply to alternative formats that have been created specifically so that students will have access to the material in more than one modality, where the two versions of the material already provide reasonable accessibility to all audiences? And, who decides what formats are sufficient in these types of cases?

### “Expected Audience”

Can we clarify the intentions behind the taskforce recommendations and district policies when it comes to the **scope** of situations where these accessibility requirements apply? It is not just ICT type, but also “expected audience,” that is part of the consideration of what accessibility features are necessary for a shared ICT. What if a student missed class and I share the PowerPoint only with that student, who doesn't have accommodations or a visual impairment? Should I have to write picture descriptions for all the content when my expected audience only includes a single student? What if an individual student struggles with a concept, and there is a short YouTube video that explains it, but the video only has auto-captions and the student has no accommodation for captions? Should I not share the video with that student? What about one-time use videos, such as a recording of a live orientation for a specific class section that will never be used again, but will be shared only with students in that section, for those who missed the orientation? Who determines what is reasonable to assume in terms of expected audience, and what are the criteria that are going to be used for that determination? This is necessary to know, because we can't know how many ICTs will fall under the scope of this policy until we correctly understand the circumstances when those ICTs will need to be made fully accessible. (I know we are not discussing workload or cost currently. But will it work, realistically, to do the work and spend the money to make accessible versions of ICTs that will never be needed or used by someone who needs that format? Is the district going to commit to providing the resources for that? If they are not, should we be requiring things that will not be possible given the resources provided?)

### “Undue Burden”

I think we should clarify what falls under the scope of being exempt from these accessibility requirements. The district policy uses the phrasing, “unless to do so places an undue burden on the District/College or to do so will fundamentally alter the nature of the educational program or service” – how is this phrasing to be interpreted? I feel this is two separate things, but first, “undue burden.” How is undue burden defined? For example, if a video is posted on the college website or sent to all SCC students, a reasonable person would think it should have to be captioned first, as we know that some students need captions. However, imagine the college

sent out an uncaptioned short video about how to use the new SCC website when it came online, and told us to share it with students. And imagine that when an instructor asked for a captioned version they are told there “was not time” to caption it because it had to be made at the last minute, and that the instructor was welcome to make their own accessible version. Was the college “not having time” to caption a short video a fair case of undue burden? (I personally don’t think so when it’s a 5-minute video -- but who decides?) What about when an instructor teaches a live class on Zoom and wants to put the recorded lectures online after class for that section only, and there is no student who has a captioning accommodation enrolled in the class? Is it an undue burden on the district to provide this amount of captioning service (54 hours per semester per section) in a timeframe that would allow hypothetical students who would need captioning to have “equivalent access” the information, when there are no such students enrolled in the class? Basically, who has the authority to decide what is under the scope of an “undue burden,” and what are the standards that define that?

Note: the language in the Regulation 7136 ICT Accessibility document states that this decision “shall be made in accordance with the procedures of Board Policy and Administration Regulation 2731” and that it “shall be made in consultation with the Vice President of Student Services and the General Counsel.” Regulation 2731 is clearly intended to address “Programs and Services for Students with Disabilities” and it discusses accommodations, not universal accessibility. The only sentence in Regulation 2731 that contains the phrase “undue burden” says: “If it is determined that an undue burden or other extenuating circumstances exists, a particular academic accommodation will not be provided.” But I don’t see an explanation of who decides, or what the standards are.

### “Fundamentally Alters the Nature of the Educational Program”

“Fundamentally alter the nature of the educational program” – again, as above – what are the standards and who decides? It seems to me like classroom faculty would have the right to determine what is fundamental to the nature of their class, and that it would be difficult for someone outside an academic discipline to decide on that. Sometimes there might be transfer issues as well. What types of cases involving ICTs would fall under the scope of “fundamentally altering the nature of the educational program,” if the ICTs would need to be changed or removed to meet accessibility standards? For example, SPSS is a software program required for the psychology statistics class and written into the course outline; the course will not transfer to Sac State if we don’t teach students to use statistics software. If SPSS is not accessible, would that be a case where it could be used anyway, because removing it would fundamentally alter the educational content of the class?

## Appendix F

### Captioning Project Pilot Summary and Next Steps

#### Fall 2021

#### Basic Summary of Captioning Process

##### Step one

Captioning Project Team (CPT)—faculty coordinator and or classified professional—will publicize services available and work with faculty to identify videos in need of captioning. This process includes simple vetting via communication with faculty in order to select videos that will have extended use beyond the current semester or year.

##### Step two

CPT works with faculty to gather files or links of videos needing captioning and delivers those files to the captioning vendor

##### Step three

CPT delivers captioning files to faculty for pairing with videos.

#### CPT Staffing

2 adjunct faculty coordinator positions at .20 FTE (or partial classified professional staffing) Fall 2021-Spring 2022

#### Next Steps

- Determine optimal staffing needs and shift to classified support as classified FTE is identified
- Widen promotion of the project to all faculty across district
- Evaluate project effectiveness (faculty survey and analysis of courses & relevant data)
- Identify permanent funding and sustainable practices/process



## Appendix G

### Accessible Files Team Pilot Process and Next Steps

#### Draft

Basic summary of proposed process

#### Step One

Identify coordinators who will comprise Accessible Files Team.

#### Step Two

Accessible Files Team (AFT) identifies a vendor to work with and one or more faculty in the BSS Division at SCC who are identified as subject matter experts using the (3) OERs selected by the department for the initial stage of this pilot.

#### Step Two

Establish billing and accounting procedures with vendor.

AFT gathers info from faculty to provide to vendors, e.g. alt text for images, or editing of documents to remove unnecessary materials.

#### Step Three

AFT monitors the vendor process, getting faculty input where needed by the vendor.

#### Step Four

AFT applies applicable copyright info to file and provides to faculty.

#### Step Five

AFT and DAPIC team refine process and identify additional OERs for processing.

#### AFT Staffing

2 adjunct faculty coordinator positions at .20 FTE (or partial classified professional staffing) Fall 2021-Spring 2022

#### Next Steps

- Identify adjuncts and vendor(s)
- As project begins, design parallel process for in-house remediation of document files.