

COGA TF review of APA Accessibility of Remote Meetings working draft

<https://www.w3.org/TR/remote-meetings/>

APA would like to receive feedback by December 10, 2021

General

- (name) feedback
- [lisa] need a new section added : 3.3.2, 4.2, and 4.3 relevance of making content useable for people with learning and cognitive disabilities (why was this deleted?)
- John k: more on self pacing and transcription
- (julie) The current draft has very little about cognitive differences. For example, there is nothing about cognitive load—building in break time, limiting the amount of text on each slide, inviting participants to speak without pressuring them to speak. Can we suggest adding new sections or subsections? See below for suggestions on ways we could expand the 4th and 5th parts of this document.
- (Jennie) I do not see anything in the document about break out rooms.
Recommendations should include:
 - Provide information ahead of time if breakout rooms will be used
 - Provide opportunity for participants to choose to join a breakout room, or not
 - Provide information ahead of time about what will happen in each breakout room
 - Provide the opportunity to control leaving a breakout room
 - This addresses the needs of those with startle responses, those with social anxiety issues, and others

Specific sections

Section name

- (name) feedback

[1.2 Types of remote meeting platforms](#)

- (julie) The definition of “hybrid meeting” is buried at the end of this section, with no boldfacing like the other terms above it. It’s hard to notice “hybrid meeting” here, and the term also seems out of place. Suggest moving the hybrid paragraph to the end of section 1.1, which defines “remote meeting” in broad terms. Moving the hybrid info up to

1.1 would also help meet the expectations set in the first sentence of the abstract, which emphasizes both kinds of meeting: “remote and hybrid.”

3.1 Selecting an accessible remote meeting platform

- (julie) The 1st bullet may sound very daunting to the person doing the selecting: “Ensure that platforms have user interfaces that conform to Level AA of the latest version of the WCAG standard.” I suggest adding two sentences on *how* to go about doing this: “Some platforms say in their marketing materials that they are AA compliant. The last paragraph of this section details how to access conformance reports for remote platforms. Section ”
- (julie) There are two consecutive bullets about ATAG. Suggest either combining them into one bullet or swapping the order so that users encounter the full name and link for ATAG before they encounter the acronym on its own without explanation.
- (julie) The last bullet would benefit from adding a hyperlink to RAUR.

3.3.2 Relevance of the User Agent Accessibility Guidelines

- (lisa) In short we need a section 3.3.2 : relevance of making content useable for people with learning and cognitive disabilities . and that should be a summary of
- (rain) All of the examples of alternative content to time-based media are centered around captions or sign-language. It may be helpful to include something in here that real-time captions and transcriptions are helpful not just for users who are Deaf/hard of hearing, but also for users with cognitive disabilities who might still be using their eyes or ears, but need **additional**, not just alternative, media

3.3.4 Relevance of the Real-Time Communication Accessibility User Requirements

- (rain) For the list item, “Support for an “instant message” style of communication in which the entire message is transmitted as a unit, rather than character-by-character. (This may be preferred, for example, by screen reader users.)”
 - Suggest changing “screen reader users” to “screen reader and text-to-speech users” because individuals with coga needs are more likely to use TTS but not full on screen readers, and it is important to clarify that these features benefit individuals who may still be reading the words visually, as well
- (Jennie) Suggest the addition of the use case of people that use AAC devices. They may benefit from the Real-Time Communication option, but also sometimes need time in order to use it effectively. Considerations should be added for both this use case, and specific use needs.

3.4 Additional guidance for creating remote meeting platforms

- (rain) For the list item, “Ensure that status messages of video-conference controls, including user notification upon activation of camera-on status, is provided to assistive technologies so that someone who cannot see a visual activation sensor is not broadcasting video unawares.”
 - This is great, but it also really only makes one think of the example of someone who is eyes or ears free, and not someone with cognitive accessibility challenges who may not recognize a subtle notification or snackbar, especially one that is transient. It may be worth adding that not only should these notifications be available to assistive technologies, but that they NOT be transient so that it is certain that a user has to see them before they go away

4.1 W3C guidance relevant for accessible remote meetings

- (rain) I really wish that [Making Content Useable](#) were called out here, even as a note for best practice, as this would really help a lot of people.
- (julie) I agree! See my suggestion below for a new section (4.1.3)

4.1.1 Relevance of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines

- (julie) The bullet about “Success Criterion 1.2.4: Captions (Live)” is worded very negatively and does not point to any possible solutions.
 - Here is current wording: “Success Criterion 1.2.4: Captions (Live). This is applicable to real-time communication by meeting participants. The quality of captions is essential to effective communication. It should be noted that the use of automatic speech recognition (ASR) technology to generate captions will not yield sufficiently high quality without manual intervention to correct errors. Moreover, such correction is difficult to perform effectively in real time.”
 - Suggested rewording in brackets: “Success Criterion 1.2.4: Captions (Live). This is applicable to real-time communication by meeting participants. The quality of captions is essential to effective communication. It should be noted that the use of automatic speech recognition (ASR) technology to generate captions [may] not yield sufficiently high quality without manual intervention to correct errors. [Delete: Moreover,] Such correction is difficult to perform effectively in real time. [Ask participants with disabilities if manual captioning is needed.]

[Julie suggestion for new section] 4.1.3 Relevance of Making Content Usable for People with Cognitive and Learning Disabilities

- This section would be similar to the preceding sections (4.1.1 Relevance of WCAG and 4.1.2 Relevance of ATAG)
- Start with one- or two-paragraph summary of Content Usable

- List several COGA bullets that are especially applicable to the theme of this section ([4. Creating accessible content for remote meetings](#)), with each bullet including a bit why and how detail:
 - Start decks with a summary/overview
 - Use consistent design
 - Use clear language and limit the text on each slide
 - Prioritize white space to help users focus
- FYI, the current draft mentions an interesting W3C resource, “[How to Make Your Presentations Accessible to All](#)” (published in February 2021). Have you all seen this document? It overlaps with some of Content Usable, but definitely has some gaps.

5.1 Hosting accessible remote meetings

- (rain) For this list item, “Remind all participants to, if possible, ensure that their faces, including their mouths, are visible and well-lit in the videoconferencing window.”
 - For some individuals, this creates exclusion. Suggest adding language to encourage hosts to make it “okay” for participants to “mute their cameras” if needed, and to provide enough modalities that this will still enable members who may need to lipread to participate.
 - This also doesn’t acknowledge that some individuals may not be able to really understand what facial expressions mean, and so it is helpful to make implied reactions explicit (examples, smiling or nodding to say “yes” or “agree” should be matched with someone explicitly clarifying that the individual has agreed)
- (rain) It would be great to add an additional item to the effect of, “where possible, provide meeting content ahead of time so that individuals who need extra time to prepare are able to do so”
- (julie) This section has an unnumbered list of 17 bullets. That is not best practice. I suggest splitting this into several shorter lists with clear headers.
 - Option A: Break into three sections:
 - Before the meeting
 - During the meeting
 - After the meeting
 - This structure leaves room for us to add COGA bullets like
 - Before: Send agenda and other materials at least a day in advance
 - During: Build in pauses or “think time” so people with different processing speed capabilities can fully participate
 - After: Share the meeting notes and recording with participants and store these resources in a central location that is easy for find/search
 - Option B: Break into types of challenges, such as:
 - Audio accessibility
 - Video accessibility
 - Cognitive accessibility

- Option C: Other members of the COGA team may have a totally different idea on how to approach this. But the current version is already overwhelmingly long and we want to make it longer by adding cognitive details. What is the best way to tackle this?

6. Holding accessible hybrid meetings

- (julie) Suggest expanding 3rd bullet with extra sentences in brackets: “Ensure that online participants and in-person participants can see and hear each other. [For example, try to zoom in on in-person speakers so it’s easier for remote participants to see their faces. Likewise, ensure that in-person speakers use a microphone or that an in-person question asked by someone without a microphone gets repeated by someone with a microphone.]”