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Program Analysis: Harvey Mudd College Web Accessibility Initiative

Background

Harvey Mudd College (HMC) is a small, private, liberal arts college serving undergraduate students studying science, mathematics, and engineering. The institution was recently contacted by the US Office for Civil Rights concerning complaints about public-facing web content failing to meet legal accessibility requirements. After determining that some web content did indeed fail to violate standards set by the ADA and Section 504 of the US Rehabilitation Act, the institution agreed to take proactive measures to address these web accessibility concerns.

Goals

The college’s Web Accessibility Initiative aims to ensure that the college’s public-facing web content meets contemporary web accessibility standards, namely the World Wide Web Consortium’s Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 Level AA (World Wide Web Consortium, 2008) and the Web Accessibility Initiative Accessible Rich Internet Applications Suite 1.0 for web content (World Wide Web Consortium, 2014). Starting on July 1st, 2017, all new public-facing web content created by the college will meet these guidelines, with a timeline to update or remove existing non-compliant content over the following two years. The program will prioritize heavily accessed content, such as the college’s home page and admissions site, but will gradually move to include all publicly accessible content, including individual faculty pages.

Process

At this stage, the program is still in its planning stages. The college formed an accessibility task force, comprised of a number of relevant campus leaders alongside a sampling of faculty, staff, and students, who have drafted and submitted an accessibility policy outlining the details above. The task force has partnered with an external consultant organization, which will provide regular
evaluations of the college’s web accessibility compliance, alongside some training for primary content creators on campus.

To supplement the consultants’ efforts, the task force has also begun to coordinate with the Offices of Communications and Marketing (OCM) and Computing and Information Services (CIS) to begin planning for the conversion of existing content. Members of CIS’s Educational Technology Services team will begin formal training in web accessibility compliance in order to provide on-demand consultations to faculty and staff who are creating or updating web content. Meanwhile, the Office of Communications will begin updating high-traffic web pages to meet accessibility standards, including posting a notice on all pages with information on how to file complaints and requests with college.

**Stakeholders and Responsibilities**

The following stakeholders will be impacted by the initiative:

- **IT and Communications Staff**, who will gain new job responsibilities in upholding new institution-wide accessibility standards
- **Faculty and other staff**, who will need to learn how to meet accessibility requirements in both new and existing documents
- **Students**, who will both benefit from the newly accessible content and need to meet standards with their own publicly facing content
- **External site visitors**, such as students applying to the college and their families, who may not be able to access valuable institutional information without this initiative

While members of all of these constituencies may benefit from this initiative due to either a disability or other access limitations, all HMC community members will also likely need to take on some responsibility in creating and maintaining accessible web content.
Climate and Challenges

At HMC, time is a rare commodity. Over the past several years, discussions of work-life balance have begun to reach a fever pitch for faculty and students, both of whom are often working 60-80 hours per week to fulfill their basic responsibilities. As a result, any new demand on time is controversial, even one that is legally mandated. Many are already beginning to debate who will be responsible for converting existing web content for faculty, who may lack time to do so.

Aggravating this challenge is the lack of budget and staff to support these initiatives. Apart from a newly hired Title IX/ADA coordinator, the institution has no staff for whom this work falls into their explicit job requirements, meaning that those taking on new responsibilities must determine how to also continue to fulfill their usual roles. The number of faculty and students is also continuing to grow each year, which is already putting some strain on CIS and other staff. Finally, since this initiative was not in place during the budgeting period earlier this year, there are only limited funds available for training and hiring temporary staff, fueling the anxiety of employees and administrators as the program gets underway. However, the college culture places great emphasis on teaching, so administrators have had some success earning shared community buy-in by emphasizing how this initiative will benefit students.

Ethical Challenges in Evaluation

Because the institution is small and has little budget, the current direction of the initiative seems to focus on meeting minimum requirements to avoid legal liability. While this will already be a challenging goal in its own right, this means participants may cut corners when possible rather than attempting to maximize accessibility. It will be up to the evaluators to determine whether current measures and objectives accurately represent the effectiveness of the program, taking into consideration conflicting biases toward cost-effectiveness and social justice.
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Formative Evaluative Criteria for Application and Reflection Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Work Submitted</th>
<th>A: Exemplary Work</th>
<th>B: Graduate Level Work</th>
<th>C: Minimal Work</th>
<th>F: Work Submitted but Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work reflects graduate-level critical, analytical thinking.</td>
<td>A = 4.00; A- = 3.75</td>
<td>B+ = 3.50; B = 3.00; B- = 2.75</td>
<td>C+ = 2.50; C = 2.00; C- = 1.75</td>
<td>F = 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assimilation and Synthesis of Ideas**

The extent to which the work reflects the student’s ability to-

1. Understand the assignment’s purpose;
2. **Apply presented strategies**
3. Understand and apply readings, discussions, and course materials.

*When referencing web-based sources, an active hyperlink to the original source must be included (if applicable).*

- Demonstrates the ability intellectually to explore and/or implement key instructional concepts.
- Demonstrates insightful reflection and/or critical thinking, as well as creativity and originality of ideas.
- Demonstrates exceptional inclusion of major points, using credible sources*, in addition to required readings and course materials.

* May include, but are not limited to, scholarly articles, web-based information, etc.

- Demonstrates a clear understanding of the assignment’s purpose.
- Provides careful consideration of key instructional concepts.
- Includes specific information from required readings or course materials to support major points.

- Shows some degree of understanding of the assignment’s purpose.
- Generally applies theories, concepts, and/or strategies correctly, with ideas unclear and/or underdeveloped
- Minimally includes specific information from required readings or course materials.

- Shows a lack of understanding of the assignment’s purpose.
- Does not apply theories, concepts, and/or strategies
- Does not include specific information from credible sources.
<p>| <strong>Adherence to Assignment Expectations</strong> | Assignment meets all expectations, Integrating exemplary material and/or information. Assignment demonstrates exceptional breadth and depth. | All parts of the assignment are completed, with fully developed topics. The work is presented in a thorough and detailed manner. Assignment demonstrates appropriate breadth and depth. Assignment integrates technology appropriately. | Most parts of assignment are completed. Topics are not fully developed. Assignment demonstrates minimal depth and breadth. Some elements of technology are included. | Does not fulfill the expectations of the assignment. Key components are not included. Assignment lacks breadth and depth. No technology integrated or integration method is inappropriate for application. |
| <strong>Written Expression and Formatting</strong> | Work is unified around a central purpose with well-developed ideas, logically organized in paragraph structure with clear transitions. Effective sentence variety; clear, concise, and powerful expression are evident. Work is written in Standard Edited English. No prominent errors interfere with reading. All web-based sources are credited through embedded links. Fair-use, | Ideas are clearly and concisely expressed. Elements of effective communication such as an introduction and conclusion are included. Work is written in Standard Edited English with few, if any, grammatical or mechanical errors. Few, if any, errors in crediting web-based sources. | Ideas are not clearly and concisely expressed. Elements of effective communication such as an introduction and conclusion are not included. Work contains more than a few grammatical or mechanical errors. Some web-based sources are not credited. | Major points do not reflect appropriate elements of communication. No effort to express ideas clearly and concisely. Work is not written in Standard Edited English. Contains many grammatical or mechanical errors. Web-based sources are not credited. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Assignment Grade</th>
<th>A: Exemplary Work</th>
<th>B: Graduate Level Work</th>
<th>C: Minimal Work</th>
<th>F: Work Submitted but Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A = 4.00; A- = 3.75</td>
<td>B+ = 3.50; B = 3.00; B- = 2.75</td>
<td>C+ = 2.50; C = 2.00; C- = 1.75</td>
<td>F = 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is expected that all applications and reflective essays will be submitted according to the assignment due dates indicated. Exceptions may be made at the discretion of the faculty member if contacted by the student prior to the due date describing extenuating circumstances. Last Updated: 7.14.09
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## Select an Evaluation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Model</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTISE AND CONSUMER-ORIENTED APPROACHES</td>
<td>• Efficient and straightforward</td>
<td>• Limited perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Easily applied to many contexts</td>
<td>• Emphasis on comparing a final product to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expertise-oriented may seem more credible to stakeholders</td>
<td>• Expertise-oriented is open to bias and conflict of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consumer-oriented focuses on decision-making</td>
<td>• Consumer-oriented lacks sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM-ORIENTED EVALUATION APPROACHES</td>
<td>• Emphasizes research and program theory</td>
<td>• Results may not be practical for decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoids “black box” phenomenon where outcomes are observed without explanation of their source</td>
<td>• Emphasis on outcomes at expense of process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION-ORIENTED EVALUATION APPROACHES</td>
<td>• Can inform decisions throughout program, from before planning to after implementation</td>
<td>• Overemphasis on priorities of managers and leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organized and systematic</td>
<td>• Narrow scope defined by the organization seeking the evaluation may miss important information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides useful information to people who can use it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT-ORIENTED EVALUATION APPROACHES</td>
<td>• Involves stakeholders, improving both scope of evaluation and value of results</td>
<td>• Difficult and/or expensive to coordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expands possible uses of evaluation results</td>
<td>• Risky to put stakeholders in charge of parts of evaluation, due to both bias and lack of evaluation expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explain your choice of model for your program evaluation:

A decision-oriented evaluation approach will best serve this evaluation because the evaluation needs to guide decision-making in early to middle stages before the project is completed (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011, p. 173). Many approaches to evaluation, such as consumer-oriented and program-oriented evaluation methods, place emphasis on the final outcomes of a program, rendering them impractical or irrelevant for a program that has yet to be fully implemented. By contrast, decision-oriented models focus can emphasize not only product, but also context (identifying the problems that need to be addressed), input (selecting appropriate program strategies), and process (examining how effectively the strategies are applied) (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011, p. 174). Harvey Mudd’s accessibility initiative is still in its early stages, so it would benefit from decision-oriented evaluation to
examine the scope of the problems the initiative is meant to address, as well as the efficacy of current plans and practices in achieving desired outcomes.

In this case, I recommend using Stufflebeam’s CIPP model (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011, pp. 174-176). In preparing our evaluation, the accessibility task force and other stakeholders could work together through the following steps:

1. **Focusing evaluation.** Identify the primary decision-making parties and the decisions they will need to make with respect to the accessibility initiative. Outline the criteria for decision-making and the policies which will restrict program operations, including both legal obligations and current campus policies.

2. **Collecting information.** Determine the types of information gathered, including surveys of website users, assessments of web authors’ accessibility knowledge, and results from accessibility audits. Specify the tools, conditions, and procedures used to gather this data: for instance, the software that will be used to perform accessibility audits, the frequency with which it will be used, the pages that will be subject to audit, and the sampling methods used to conduct the audit itself. Check these methods with the Office of Institutional Research to ensure they are both methodologically sound and practical within the constraints and policies of the institution.

3. **Organizing information.** Select and implement a format for collecting information, again in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research. Make sure this information is stored in a way that is accessible to all appropriate participants and provides useful information relative to selected goals and benchmarks.

4. **Analyzing information.** Specify the analysis methods, as well as the metrics and benchmarks to be used, to avoid having the data influence the methods used once data is collected.

5. **Reporting information.** Develop a plan for sharing evaluation results with the college community, including which constituents to contact, which information to share with each, and what format to use to best convey the results. Set a schedule for this reporting process and coordinate with the Communications office to ensure that reports are well-written, informative, and timely.

6. **Administering evaluation.** Select a project manager to oversee execution of the evaluation plan, preferably from within the accessibility task force. Formalize a schedule, staff and resource list, communication plan, and budget for the evaluation program. Ensure that evaluation approach will meet goals and adhere to policies set out in step 1.

This primary model could be accompanied by some features of expertise-oriented and participant-oriented models by involving both credentialed experts in accessibility and stakeholders from throughout the college community throughout the evaluation process. From
beginning to end, the accessibility task force should schedule regular opportunities to meet with both college constituents and external consultants. Based on previous experience with initiatives at the college, including stakeholders from across the community will improve the credibility and acceptance of results, especially for faculty and students. However, this involvement of community members must be complemented with the presence of true experts in web accessibility, as no one within the college currently has sufficient knowledge or experience in this field to reliably evaluate our college’s initiative. Working with the external accessibility consultants should hopefully establish expert knowledge and tools to support the work of community members.
Evaluative Questions and Criteria

Though it would be valuable to evaluate many facets of Harvey Mudd’s accessibility initiative, this evaluation plan will focus on informing the initial stages of planning and implementing the initiative. This evaluation will center on the following questions:

1. How much of our website is inaccessible? To what extent and for what reasons?
2. How does inaccessible content affect student learning, faculty and staff productivity, and web-based engagement of people outside of the Harvey Mudd community?
3. Do the proposed training programs and materials adequately prepare content creators to meet accessibility standards?
4. How quickly and effectively are existing pages being converted to accessible versions? Is the current rate adequate to meet the initiative's goals and the requirements set by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR)?
5. In what circumstances are faculty, staff, and students most likely to follow principles of web accessibility to create compliant content? In what circumstances are they least likely to do so?

The first two of these questions will guide a needs assessment for the program. Since the current motivation for this initiative is exclusively avoiding litigation, developing a clearer sense of how accessibility issues may harm the community should help improve buy-in and momentum for the program, as well as to identify specific problem areas that may require additional resources. The other three questions aim to determine how successful the initiative is in both reforming existing web content and preparing content creators to meet accessibility requirements after completing training.
This set excludes questions centered on measuring final outcomes, since we hope to complete and act on the results of this evaluation while the initiative is still in progress. It would be neither possible nor practical to answer many questions about outcomes during this evaluation, since most outcomes of the initiative will not be visible until its completion. However, this is not to say that questions regarding the future of the program are irrelevant to this work; they simply are not within the scope of this evaluation. Instead, these questions focus on the types of information that could help guide the leaders of the initiative to assess and revise plans for training, support, and content conversion to make all of these processes efficient and effective.

Harvey Mudd’s Accessibility Task Force should take the primary responsibility for refining these evaluation questions. The task force, which is tasked with the responsibility of planning and carrying out this initiative, consists of a sufficiently broad cross-section of campus constituents to represent most decision-makers and other stakeholder groups on campus. This committee already serves as a sort of advisory council for the evaluation, so it should make a good sounding board for questions and ideas throughout the evaluation process (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011, p. 329). However, rather than selecting evaluation questions in isolation, it would be best to include relevant members of the Office of Institutional Research, the Educational Technology Services team, and the outside accessibility consultant organization in order to assure that the questions are both relevant and answerable through available methods. Through this collaboration, the task force should be able to select and act upon questions directly related to future decision-making for the accessibility initiative.
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## Reporting Strategy Table

### Reporting Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Reporting Strategy</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Stakeholder Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Task Force</td>
<td>• Attend task force meetings and provide regular status reports</td>
<td>Reports will influence, if not dictate, next steps for the task force, and will likely become the primary source of basis for all planning and decision-making in the subsequent 1-2 years.</td>
<td>• Task force should approve all campus-wide communications and reporting activities, including emails, presentations at meetings, and feedback sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schedule individual discussions of results and reporting strategies before any larger act of reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate task force members may co-present evaluation findings to members of their constituency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct extremely regular (at least biweekly) email correspondence about plans and progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale: this team will be primarily responsible for carrying out decision-making based upon evaluation results, as well as for fielding responses from the community on this topic. They should have a fair bit of understanding and control over how evaluation results are reported so that they are well positioned to move forward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members</td>
<td>• Report out major outcomes at select faculty meetings and departmental meetings</td>
<td>Report will indicate the current accessibility of faculty web content and the rate of progress for bringing pages into compliance, as well as some qualitative information on what attitudes and behaviors hinder or aid accessibility efforts. The report will likely indicate whether faculty need to take on additional responsibilities in converting web</td>
<td>• Evaluators should ask department chairs and other faculty leaders for advice on how to effectively communicate with faculty, including what information to share, what format to share it in, and what schedule to use for reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide reports and formal updates by email, both those specific to the faculty and those relevant to the entire campus, with at least one scheduled in-person discussion following every major announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>• In public forums following major evaluation updates,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reporting Strategy Table

| **Rationale:** Faculty should be kept abreast of evaluation findings, as the outcomes will have arguably the largest impact on their future work. However, all reporting that takes place should be informed by formal results to avoid rumor-mongering, should be written carefully to maintain absolute clarity, and should come with an opportunity to discuss with evaluators, the task force, and each other. This will make it possible to address questions or concerns as they emerge; failing to do this often results in messy, noisy, campus-wide conflict. |
| **Communications Department** |
| - Report out major outcomes at select departmental meetings  
- Provide regular, informal updates by email |
| - Communications will need to assist in preparing evaluation results for large-scale distribution AND will need to immediately address the results in their approach to content on the main college website and through emails. The evaluation may include details on how they can improve training and compliance for new content, as well as to what extent they need to revise existing content. |
| - Communications staff should help draft content for the web site and for formal campus-wide updates about the initiative to ensure that content is accessible and well-written. |
| **IT Staff** |
| - Report out major outcomes at select departmental meetings  
- Provide regular, informal  
- IT staff may be able to help create email lists and advise on appropriate technology to |
| - The report will certainly influence IT staff, especially the user support and educational |
| - IT staff may be able to help create email lists and advise on appropriate technology to |
## Reporting Strategy Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Staff</th>
<th>Updates by email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Strategy</td>
<td>Rationale: IT staff will need to be involved in supporting many of the decisions that will emerge through this initiative, including implementing appropriate technology and providing training and professional development. Like communications staff, they should likely receive early drafts of reported outcomes in order to be able to contribute to final reports and proposals of how to address the evaluation results as efficiently as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Ensure that reporting methods all meet web accessibility standards. Evaluators and task force members should consult with IT before conducting a new type of reporting (e.g. the first email, the first discussion forum, etc.) to ensure these standards are met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All Staff

- Report out major outcomes at select departmental meetings
- Provide reports and formal updates by email, both those specific to the staff and those relevant to the entire campus, with at least one scheduled in-person discussion following every major announcement

Rationale: Many staff work directly with either faculty or students, so they should be kept at the same level of awareness as these communities. They should also have unique venues to share feedback on evaluation results, as their opinions may differ from faculty and students, but the hierarchy of campus roles often

- Staff may need to change their approach to creating accessible content depending on evaluation results. They may also play a pivotal role in normalizing and simplifying accessible content creation for faculty, students, alumni, and fellow staff in their departments to confront the pitfalls and inadequacies that may appear in the evaluation report.

- Evaluators should ask deans, VPs, and other administrative leaders for advice on how to effectively communicate with their staff, what information to share, what format to share it in, and what schedule to use for reporting.

- In public forums following major evaluation updates, facilitators should explicitly ask for staff feedback on the reporting process and the evaluation itself. Document this feedback (in an anonymized form), share it with participants by email, and use it to inform subsequent work.
## Reporting Strategy Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Students</th>
<th>Current Students</th>
<th>Current Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Since students will be the primary benefactors of this work (at least in the eyes of the faculty), they should be included in the reporting process and kept up to date on results. That said, like faculty, the student body tends to respond best to complete and coherent report, especially with opportunities to discuss with peers and leaders. The evaluators should make sure all reporting is formal, clear, well-written, and accompanied by guided discussions of the results.</td>
<td>Students are more consumers than creators of content on campus, though they may do a fair bit of both. The results of the evaluation will likely give students, especially those with disabilities and their allies, some data to support their requests and demands of the college community.</td>
<td>Evaluators should ask student organization leaders for advice on how to effectively communicate with student body, including what information to share, what format to share it in, and what schedule to use for reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Report out major outcomes at selected meetings for various student organizations, including student government, the Academic Excellence tutoring program, and residential life staff.</td>
<td>- Provide reports and formal updates by email, both those specific to students and those relevant to the entire campus, with at least one scheduled in-person discussion following every major announcement.</td>
<td>- In public forums following major evaluation updates, facilitators should explicitly ask for student feedback on the reporting process and the evaluation itself. Document this feedback (in an anonymized form), share it with participants by email, and use it to inform subsequent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create and maintain a highly accessible web page documenting goals and progress for the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-HMC Community members</td>
<td>Non-HMC Community members</td>
<td>Non-HMC Community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Results of the evaluation may change the image that those outside of the community have of the college, particularly in terms of accessibility and inclusivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public-facing Accessibility Evaluation web page should include method for emailing evaluators/task force with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reporting Strategy Table

| process | Since we do not know precisely who our website users are and what their goals are in observing our content, we can only do so much outreach. However, we must do what we can to maintain transparency in our good faith effort of making our web resources universally accessible, both in upholding our college’s values and in meeting the Office of Civil Rights’ requirements. | of its efforts toward diversity, equity, and inclusion. The implications for prospective students are significant, as positive evaluation results may encourage students with disabilities to apply to the college, while discouraging results will likely deter these students and others. | questions or comments on process. If this is utilized heavily, and especially if specific questions come up repeatedly, the page should include an updated FAQ listing the responses to these questions for public benefit. |

### Values, Standards, and Criteria:

1. The mission of this evaluation is to inform decision-making for the accessibility initiative. As such, all data collection and analysis should aim to provide as full an impression of current accessibility practices at the college as possible by including a broad selection of perspectives from our community, including faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni, and families of current or prospective students. Data collection should include all these community members, and results should be shared with the full community.

2. To ensure that interviews, surveys, and focus groups provide accurate information, evaluators will need to ensure that participants feel comfortable sharing private information or controversial opinions without fear of retaliation. Creating this sense of safety will require anonymizing all data and potentially excluding quotes or statistics from the report that implicitly identify the respondent. This is especially important at a small college to ensure that evaluation results promote productive conversation rather than feeding divisiveness.

3. Final note: All documents, web pages, and other communications distributed for purposes of reporting on this evaluation must conform to WCAG 2.0 AA accessibility standards. Failure to comply with these standards will undermine the efforts of this initiative to create a culture of accessibility on campus.

### Potential Ethical Issues:

1. Generally, the institution values transparency and inclusion of all community members in decision-making. At the same time, many community members – especially faculty and students – are highly resistant to any campus changes that will require time or impact their current approach to work. This creates two conflicting impulses: first, to share all evaluation results with the community, and second, to avoid sharing any evaluation results likely to cause a stir. Finding the right middle ground may pose a challenge for those who would like to remain fully open about the evaluation process and product.

2. Evaluation results will include information that implicates the college for cases of non-compliance. While this initiative is intended to
address those cases, documenting those cases may introduce the possibility of litigation from third parties, who could use evaluation results as evidence. The distribution of reports may have to be somewhat discreet to reduce this risk, potentially rendering the outward-facing information pages less effective than the documents shared on campus.

3. Since our community is extremely small, it is often difficult to share specific evaluation results – excerpted quotes, results filtered by demographic, etc. – without violating the privacy of those reporting. For instance, if there is only one student on campus with severe vision impairment, it will not be possible to report the responses of vision-impaired students without identifying them to the campus community, at least implicitly. It may not be possible to share the crucial perspectives of these community members while preserving their anonymity.