The January 20, 2005 minutes were approved as distributed.

**Proposal from University ADA/504 Advisory Committee for Web Accessibility**

Marty met with Paul Alberto, Chair of the Executive Committee, and Dr. Susan R. Easterbrooks, Chair of the ADA Committee, regarding the proposed Web Accessibility Proposal. The proposal, guidelines and legal considerations were distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting. Format and content are of concern. Marty opened the floor for discussion.

Tom asked where the resources are coming from and why budgeting is mentioned in a proposal: “This university plan should also allocate resources and service providers to assist instructions, departments and colleges in implementing the plan.”

Mary Jane said that a lot of rework will be required on many web sites. Tom said if budgeting is mentioned, amounts should be shown.

David referenced the last statement in Appendix B that says “...the community of persons with disabilities is consulted in the development of this policy.” He asked if that had been done. Marty said that duty is the ADA Committee’s.

David asked what the legal ramifications are when a department or unit makes server space available to a faculty web page; what extent is that faculty governed by the policy? He assumes they would be equally governed. Marty said that is part of the overall plan to be developed by the ISAT Committee.

Marty said that the ISAT Committee needs to lay out a plan and timeline. Many things are already compliant, some easily and others may take a longer time. High priority items will be done first. Karen mentioned that PowerPoint presentations are not ADA compliant. Dabney said she has about 900 PowerPoint slides that change every year. It would be a monumental task to review them each year for compliance. David said that, while this is a huge mandate, the ADA doesn’t give us exceptions.

Karen said that the guidelines in the document on the table are out-of-date. Many of them have changed. Marty said before we go into a detailed level, look first at the process and determine the kinds of activities affected and the timeline. He said that within a few years, sophisticated software may be designed to easily analyze the web sites and convert them to ADA compliancy. Mary Jane said she is not aware of UGA going through the process. She said that the University System Webmasters met for the first time, and this issue was a big topic of discussion. They are grappling with it as we are, and have no solutions yet yet.

Tom suggested that ADA compliancy can be made available on demand. Jim said that the policy, and certainly the University community (administrators, faculty, staff, students and all systems), are to be compliant with the law in the same way as all of the University community is required to be. Ellen asked where Georgia State is currently in its compliancy. Mary Jane said Georgia State is at Level One. All departmental web sites developed by UETS Web Services over the last 3-4 years meet Level One compliance, which is standard practice. Some universities separate their web pages as “Official University Web Pages” and “Non-Official University Web Pages.”

Jim suggested that this committee return the proposed policy to the ADA committee and have them consult the legal department. Marty believes that ISAT should follow-through in order to control the timeline, content, hierarchy and priorities. Every web site may not necessarily be handled in the same timeline or level.
they have a plan and are making progress which shows a good-faith effort. Having a plan is one thing, but imple

different story. Marty said he would like a precise definition of “good-faith plan.”

All variations of disabilities have to be addressed on the web sites. Major technology providers have a stake in prov

as it will be costly. Missy reported that she teaches a course that was re-developed by Georgia Tech, under Federal |

that it took three technicians the better part of four months to complete. She said that Georgia Tech’s Center

Technology and Environmental Access (CATEA) is a great resource and can help GSU determine the scope an

meeting ADA requirements. Marty said GSU may not need that level of detail…first determine what is necessary.

we do need to know the scope of the work and the cost in resources: money, time and staff.

Cherise said that the Registrar’s Office shows good faith by providing accommodations to every student with

functional limitations of their disability, whatever it may be. They have a legal responsibility to accommodate only a

defines specifically his/her disability. Marty interprets the policy to mean that all web pages have to be ADA compliant

or not that capability is ever used or not.

David recalled that six or seven years ago, an ADA Compliance Officer discovered that half the buildings on the ci

Georgia College did not have elevators. West Georgia responded by saying they did not have funds for elevators

threatened with the possibility of losing federal funds, they did find the money and installed the elevators. David sa

ADA is such a strong statute, it has to be taken seriously, despite the enormous cost to the institution, and at some ti

unavoidable because the courts strictly interpret the ADA laws and deliver strong rulings. He cautioned against

making a “good-faith effort” by putting something on the web pages and thinking we’ve dealt with it. David

consulting with law faculty and the disability office for their input.

Marty would like to align Georgia State with the University System, which could relieve some of the cost. Tom sug

legal department could contact the Board of Regents and USG. Marty again cautioned about losing control. He sai

committee—understanding the broader institutional implications—now has the responsibility to take the issue forwa

anyone was interested in forming a sub-committee to study the policy. David said that a sub-committee membe

beyond the ISAT committee to assure appropriate representation. It was agreed to form a sub-committee. Volunteer

Web Accessibility Policy Sub-Committee are:

J. L. Albert (or designate)
David Cheshier
Missy Cody
Cherise Peters (or designate)

Ellen nominated James Jones. A representative from the Law School should be selected, and others as the subcom

necessary. A chair will be elected at the organizational meeting. The subcommittee will draft a policy that meets

and legal requirements.

Proposed Changes to “University Information Systems Use Policies”
http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwccs/doc/uccs/policy/pol/archpolicy.htm

Basically, this proposed change accounts for the fact that not all violations are appropriate for the University Secu

handle and the Legal Department has asked for some slight wording changes to Section 6.0. Motion was made,

approved for further discussion on the topic. Chip asked how we can know that the person observing a violation

determine whether or not it is a security issue. The alleged incident would be moved up the line, evaluated and final de

the authority notified. Only incidents involving a security hazard to the University’s technology resources will be

University Security Officer. If necessary, disciplinary and/or law enforcement authorities and the Security Officer r

investigations and responses to alleged violations. At no time does the Security Officer levy punishment or fines. Ji

Faculty Affairs Committee is dealing on a serious level with the issue of three different units of the Unive

complaints and conducting investigations, causing confusion to University employees. When an investigation is s

no record or report, and a faculty member may not even be aware of the investigation. Jim suggested changing t

statement to say “…the University’s Information Security Officer to investigate, prepare a written report and r

alleged violations.” After reviewing the last two sentences, it was agreed that Jim’s concern is covered. Quest

approval was unanimous to accept the amendment to the policy.
**Virtual Inventory of Machines Obtained with Student Technology Funds and Storage Issues**

J. L. explained that there are approximately 350 computers, purchased with last year’s student technology fees surplus equipment and he does not have space to store them, unless he places them in the basement of the Conn (where they would be ruined). He asked the Committee if these machines are within his purview to distribute. He is working with cluster computing and could use some of the machines for that purpose. Dr. Pan said students do this work, so using tech fee purchased equipment is justified. Also, Art is assisting Dr. Ying Zhu and his graphics render farm and some of the machines would be very useful to that undertaking.

A new requirement established for the re-use of equipment purchased by tech fees goes forward from this year and to the surplus now creating a storage urgency in IS&T spaces. Tom suggested offering them to the new Tech F. however, since they are last year’s purchases, and are a storage problem, the Committee decided that JL could distribution of the current surplus. He will offer them to the campus via email. Requests for student’s use of the c take priority, and after those are filled, the remaining equipment will be released for other uses, first-come, first-serv Jane stressed that any action must be documented. The question was called and motion made to allow J. L. to dis year’s computers; motion approved.

**Other Issues**

Tom requested that J. L. invite a speaker to meet with the ISAT Committee to discuss how information technol university campus-wide.

Tom requested an update on the status of the uninterrupteed power supply (UPS). He would like the commit annual UPS status reports.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted March 23, 2005,