Integrating Accessibility Into Database Procurement Processes

Rebecca Oling, SUNY Purchase
Carli Spina, SUNY FIT

Initial Goals

1. Evaluate e-resources

2. Build community

3. Develop accessibility skills

4. Create a generalizable process

5. Document & share best practices

6. Share with the wider SUNY-community

Cohort Structure

✓ Assembled A SUNY-Wide Team

✓ Structured Training

✓ Developed Testing Process

✓ Paired Testing

✓ Local Testing

Office of Library and Information Services

SUNY Office of Library and Information Services / Guides / Accessibility and SLS / Reviewing the VPAT®

Accessibility and SLS

covers what SUNY Library Services is doing to address accessibility both internally and for SUNY

Enter Search Words | Search

- Home
- Best Practices for Web Design
- Best Practices for Zoom
- Training
- SUNY Presentations / Best Practices
- Library Procurement Accessibility Toolkit
  - Library Involvement in Campus EIT
  - Assessing EIT Priority
  - Determining Compliance Requirements
  - Retrieving the VPAT®
  - Reviewing the VPAT®

Best Practices for Reviewing a VPAT

Here are some things to consider when reviewing the VPAT®:

- **Currency:** When was the report published? On what version of the VPAT is it based?
- **Commitment:** What indications show that the vendor takes accessibility seriously? Do they provide a dedicated accessibility contact person? Do they have an accessibility statement and/or webpage on their site? Do they provide a road map detailing when problem identified in the report will be resolved?
- **Thoroughness**: Does the vendor provide full remarks and explanations as to why they meet or do not meet the criteria requirements?
- **Level of Support:** How many of the criteria are identified as Does not Support, and in which sections (i.e. Level A, Level AA, Level AAA)? For those areas where it notes that it does not support the standards, is this reasonable? For example, if there is no audio content on the site, the vendor might have marked the captions and transcript criteria as does not support, when it might have been better to mark it as not applicable.
- **Accuracy:** Based on review of the platform, are the vendor's assertions about the site's accessibility still valid? Has the platform's accessibility improved or degraded since the report was published?

VPAT Review Process, Part I

- Is the VPAT current and up-to-date?

- Was it completed in-house or by a third party?

- Does it demonstrate that the vendor takes accessibility seriously?

- Are any comments or note thorough and clear?

- What level of accessibility does it indicate the platform achieves?

- At first review, does it appear accurate?

VPAT Review Process, Part II

- Test for and evaluate alternative text

- Check for and evaluate captions, transcripts, and audio descriptions

- Test for assistive technology compatibility, including using a screen reader to navigate content

- Evaluate color contrast

- Test keyboard navigation

- Check for flashing content

VPAT Review Process, Part II (cont.)

- Evaluate the predictability of navigation and content layout

- Test input assistance

- Review compatibility with various tools and technologies

What Went Well?

- Collaboration, community, confidence

- Leveraging networks with the same goals

- SUNY support was invaluable:
  - Professional development (access to Deque University)
  - SLS testing and reviews

What Could Be Better?

- Baseline skills and understanding

- Limited local support, particularly time

- Some vendors still lag behind accessibility standards

- Turnover (locally and in cohort)

Future Priorities

- Compliance with New ADA Rules

- Communicating Best Practices Across SUNY

- Expanding Training Opportunities

Recommendations

- Create a supportive environment

- Support using multiple tools and methods

- Balance structure with flexibility

- Limit load

- Build in time for confidence building

- Document your work and share it widely

Thank you!

Rebecca Albrecht Oling Rebecca.Oling@Purchase.edu
Carli Spina Carli_Spina@fitnyc.edu