Accessibility Guidance

The accessibility portion of the J1B/C administrative evaluation is framed by a central, constructive question: **"How are you approaching accessibility in your course to ensure that all learners can engage with the course material?"** This inquiry acknowledges that digital accessibility is a shared responsibility between the individual faculty member and the district, emphasizing a collaborative process.

During the pre-evaluation meeting, instructors are encouraged to share their specific strategies for creating an inclusive environment, including any partnerships they have formed with the campus Online Learning team to audit or refine their materials. While instructors have the option to demonstrate their progress using the PopeTech dashboard or the page-level accessibility tool, this is not a requirement. Instead, the focus remains on the instructor's intentional approach to ensuring materials are usable for all students, fostering a culture of continuous improvement and proactive design.

The evaluation should only consist of material that is utilized in the asynchronous portion of the class, and the evaluator should focus their review of materials to the two weeks of agreed upon content material plus course onboarding materials. In the pre evaluation meeting, the instructor is encouraged to demonstrate how they have been mindful of accessibility as they created their course materials.

During the post-evaluation meeting, the evaluator and instructor should engage in a collaborative dialogue regarding any concerns noted during the assessment. If repeated accessibility errors are identified, it is the evaluator's responsibility to clearly point the instructor toward available campus support services in the evaluation writeup. Recommendations for remediation should include meeting with members of the campus Online Learning team and may also include links to remediating training materials, or attending workshops to ensure all instructional materials meet federal accessibility standards.

While conducting the class observation, the evaluator is encouraged to note accessibility issues surrounding the Big Seven:

The "Big Seven"

<need example for each – link>

1. **Alternative text**:
    a. Do all images, graphics and charts have meaningful alternative (alt) text, or are they marked as decorative?
2. **Links:**

    a. **Links have a meaningful name** (eg. "Review the National Weather Service website'' instead of Review https://www.weather.gov/"

    b. **Underlines are only used for links**; to emphasize information use **bold** or *italics*.

    c. **Link to accessible sites:** Only link to external websites that are accessible (use WebAIM WAVE extension tool to check – if there are questions refer to an Instructional Designer for support)

3. **Headings are:**
   a. **Sequential**
   b. **Short topic descriptions** (less than 5-7 words)

4. **Tables:**
   a. Do all tables have captions and headings?

5. **Lists**: Are all lists formatted using the editor?

6. **Color**:
   a. Contrast Ratio for AA normal text must be 4:5:1 (WebAIM Color Contrast Checker)
   b. Do not use color alone to convey meaning

7. **Video captions**:
   a. Are all videos accurately captioned?
   b. Do videos include audio descriptions?
   c. Do all audio files have transcripts?

Rubric

Meets Expectations	Needs Development	Unsatisfactory
The instructor articulates a clear strategy for accessibility. A review of course content shows an absence of repeated errors among the "Big Seven" (e.g., images have alt-text, videos have captions, and pages use proper heading structures). If complex materials such as PDFs, PowerPoints or complex images are present, the instructor is able to share their strategy for collaborating with their campus resources (such as collaboration with the Office of Online Learning or DSS/DSPS/DRC) to ensure the materials are accessible. They utilize tools like PopeTech to monitor and improve course accessibility.	The instructor has an inconsistent approach to accessibility. While some areas are accessible, repeated errors from the "Big Seven" are present (e.g., unedited auto-captions or "click here" links), indicating a need for a more systematic collaboration with support staff to ensure accessibility of course materials. The instructor is aware of campus/district support and tools (like PopeTech) but has not yet utilized them to review their course materials or seek assistance for complex remediation.	No intentional accessibility strategy is evident. Pervasive errors from the "Big Seven" are found throughout the reviewed materials. The instructor has not engaged with available campus/district accessibility support services and shows no evidence of using provided accessibility auditing tools.