# Kansas Partnership for Accessible Technology (KPAT)

## Meeting Minutes

April 15, 2009
Landon State Office Building, Room 106, Topeka, KS

The meeting was called to order by Duncan Friend. Those members present were:
Duncan Friend
Cole Robison
Denise Moore
Mary Grace
Martha Gabehart
Matt Veatch
Mike Erickson
Ivan Weichert
Michael Donnelly
Mike Branam
Jason Auvil
Wendy Dressler
David Rosenthal
Joe Oborny
Don Heiman
Kelly O’Brien
Nathan Eberline

Members present via conference call:
Anthony Fadale
John Martello
Melinda Stanley
Brad Hook

### I. Welcome and Introductions

Duncan Friend welcomed the group and asked for introductions then thanked the sign language interpreters for being here.

### II. Approval: January Minutes

Martha Gabehart moved to approve the January minutes, Denise Moore seconded. The minutes were carried by the group.

### III. ITEC Policy 1210 Update

Cole Robison introduced the new Web Accessibility Requirements Update Working Group and described what the group’s goals had been and the progress that they had made:

* The group identified main goals, omitted obsolete details, and streamlined Policy 1210 which basically consisted of moving from W3C 1.0 to W3C 2.0 guidelines. The new 2.0 guidelines are going to be industry wide so we are just updating our guidelines accordingly. These new guidelines should be a smooth transition for current web developers.
* A developer guidance document has been drafted and will be placed on the KPAT website.
* There was discussion regarding making sure that these guidelines also apply to vendors that we contract with. Purchasing does have a complaint process for situations where compliance to a contract is not followed.
* Michael Donnelly moved to approve supporting the changes to Policy 1210. Matt Veatch seconded. The changes were approved by a voice vote.

### V. Web Content Accessibility Guidelines

* One of our goals is to find a way to do assessment statewide. Assessment needs to be consistent, able to be compared, repeatable, able to be aggregated and quantified.
* Currently most assessment is manual via developer’s tools. We have been looking for an automated tool that could give us some consistency as well as some reporting capabilities. There are pros & cons to an automated tool, the cons being no panacea, copious results being overwhelming & cost. We do want to compliment automated testing with manual testing.
* Because of cost constraints Cole proposes running a pilot program of getting a one-time sample benchmark, a relative sampling of a number of agencies to give us an idea of where we are at on accessibility to start with. Even with using a scaled back version of software this could help establish dialogue with state agencies that this is something we are starting to do.
* There was some discussion as to what sites should/shall be checked. These kinds of questions are ones we might want to address with a working group.

### VI. Video Interpreting

David Rosenthal provided a very interesting presentation on video interpreting. His presentation focused on Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) but he also gave us an overview of what some of the other types of services that are out there. i.e., VRS – Video Relay Service, TRS – Telecommunications Relay Services, Speech to speech services, etc.

### VII. KPAT Direction

* New KPAT website: <http://da.ks.gov/kpat/>
* 2008 Annual Report – we would like to get it approved before the ITAB/ITEC meeting next week. Martha Gabehart moved we accept the report, Matt Veatch seconded. The vote carried.
* Summary of requests for KPAT feedback:
	+ Overall impressions were positive.
	+ We tried to squeeze too much into the first meeting.
	+ Resource constraints are a concern.
	+ Agency impact a common theme.
	+ Other questions raised centered on support
		- Technical expertise
		- Glossary of unfamiliar terms.
	+ Future direction/topics suggestions:
		- Extending reach beyond state government
		- Strategies for web assessment
		- Examples of good accessibility, tools
		- Accessible remote meetings
		- Stakeholder community outreach
* Goals for the next 90 days
	+ Assessment
	+ Outreach
	+ Procurement
	+ Information Technology Architecture

Meeting adjourned.