1EdTech Vendor Self-Assessment

This resource helps vendors and educational organizations interpret scores from the 1EdTech TrustEd Apps Accessibility Rubric. It provides guidance on assessing accessibility maturity, understanding rubric scores, and identifying next steps for improving accessibility in product design, procurement processes, and user accommodations. The document supports informed decision-making in accessibility compliance efforts.

Example solicitation language

Educational organizations may consider including language in solicitations that encourages vendors to complete the 1EdTech TrustEd Apps Accessibility Rubric as a way to evaluate the accessibility maturity of a solution.

Example language:

We encourage all respondents to this RFP to complete the 1EdTech TrustEd Apps Accessibility Rubric, following the <u>1EdTech TrustEd Apps Accessibility Rubric Specification 1.0</u>. This rubric serves as a tool for evaluating the accessibility maturity of products, ensuring they cater to a wide range of student abilities. Respondents provide detailed insights into their accessibility policies, design considerations, and training initiatives. This aligns with our commitment to ensure that all educational tools procured meet the accessibility needs of users.

1EdTech's TrustEd Apps Accessibility Rubric is a component of the <u>1EdTech TrustEd Apps Program</u>, empowering trust in the digital ecosystem. Contact <u>support@1edtech.org</u> if you have any questions.

Interpreting Rubric Scores

Interpreting Rubric Scores: Understanding potential implications and identifying possible next steps

This resource is designed to help educational organizations and ed tech vendors

- Understand the potential implications of the current landscape.
- Identify possible next steps.

For each section of the rubric, determine the average score for all items.

Information and Documentation

| Score | Ed Organization | Ed Tech Vendor |
|-------|---|---|
| 0 | The vendor lacks a public accessibility statement and conformance documentation, suggesting a low priority on transparency and accountability in accessibility. This may indicate higher risks and challenges in ensuring compliance and support. | Reflects a need for significant improvement in providing clear, accessible information about accessibility features and standards. It indicates the need to develop and maintain comprehensive documentation to support users and meet compliance requirements. |
| 1 | The vendor provides some accessibility information and documentation but lacks depth and comprehensiveness. This may require additional efforts from the district to verify and ensure the adequacy of accessibility measures. | Shows progress but highlights areas for improvement in transparency and documentation. The vendor should focus on enhancing the detail and availability of accessibility information to build trust and facilitate better support. |
| 2 | The vendor offers detailed, accessible information and comprehensive conformance documentation. This suggests a high level of commitment to accessibility, reducing the district's burden of verification and compliance checks. | Indicates a strong commitment to accessibility, with thorough documentation supporting transparency and user trust. This can ease the adoption process for ed organizations. |

Procurement Process and Communication

| Score | Ed Organization | Ed Tech Vendor |
|-------|--|--|
| 0 | The vendor does not highlight accessibility features or provide clear feedback mechanisms, indicating potential challenges in understanding and verifying product accessibility. This may increase the district's effort in ensuring compliance. | Reflects a need to improve communication and transparency about accessibility during the procurement process. The vendor should establish clear processes to share accessibility features and gather feedback effectively. |
| 1 | The vendor communicates some accessibility features but lacks a structured approach to feedback and transparency. This may require additional inquiries and checks from the district to ensure accessibility. | Shows basic efforts in highlighting accessibility but indicates areas for improvement in communication and feedback processes. The vendor should enhance these processes to support better collaboration and transparency. |
| 2 | The vendor thoroughly demonstrates accessibility features and provides robust feedback mechanisms. This suggests a proactive approach to accessibility, making it easier for the district to ensure compliance and address any issues. | Indicates strong communication and feedback processes, supporting transparency and collaboration. This can lead to higher customer satisfaction and better compliance outcomes. |

Accessibility Conformance

| Score | Ed Organization | Ed Tech Vendor |
|-------|---|---|
| 0 | The vendor does not integrate accessibility into design, development, and testing, indicating a high risk of non-compliance and significant remediation efforts required by the district. | Reflects a need for substantial improvements in integrating accessibility throughout the product lifecycle. The vendor should prioritize training and |

| Score | Ed Organization | Ed Tech Vendor |
|-------|--|---|
| | | process adjustments to meet accessibility standards. |
| 1 | The vendor includes some accessibility considerations but lacks consistency and thoroughness. This may require additional verification and remediation efforts from the district. | Shows progress but highlights the need for more comprehensive integration of accessibility in design, development, and testing. The vendor should focus on enhancing training and embedding accessibility into all processes. |
| 2 | The vendor integrates accessibility comprehensively in all phases, suggesting a high likelihood of compliance and reducing the district's burden for verification and remediation. | Indicates a strong commitment to accessibility, with thorough integration in all processes. This can enhance the vendor's reputation and ease compliance efforts for ed organizations. |

Alternatives and Accommodations

| Score | Ed Organization | Ed Tech Vendor |
|-------|---|--|
| 0 | The vendor does not address diverse user needs, indicating a significant risk of non-compliance and higher effort required by the district to ensure accessibility. | Reflects a critical gap in providing necessary accommodations. The vendor should prioritize developing and offering flexible solutions to support diverse user needs. |
| 1 | The vendor offers basic accommodations but may not fully meet all user needs, requiring additional efforts from the district to ensure full accessibility. | Shows initial efforts in providing accommodations but highlights the need for more comprehensive solutions. The vendor should focus on expanding and enhancing accommodation features. |

| Score | Ed Organization | Ed Tech Vendor |
|-------|---|--|
| 2 | The vendor provides detailed, flexible accommodations, suggesting a proactive approach to accessibility and reducing the district's burden for ensuring compliance. | Indicates a strong commitment to supporting diverse user needs with comprehensive accommodation solutions. This can lead to higher satisfaction and easier adoption by ed organizations. |

Document notes

- Resource by <u>Donna Murray</u>, Digital Accessibility Specialist, NCDPI. When developing resources, I sometimes use AI tools to assist with brainstorming, summarizing, and synthesizing information.
- Except where otherwise noted, this presentation content is licensed under a <u>Creative Commons Attribution 4.0</u> <u>International License</u>.
- All content is for informational purposes only and should not be interpreted as legal advice. Any reference to
 external websites, tools, or services should not be considered as endorsement.