

Accessibility Testing Process

This section of the survey seeks information on how an Agency tested their site(s) for conformance with WCAG 2.0. Information will be used to determine the commonality of testing processes and tools across agencies.

- 1 Does your agency use site-wide **automated** conformance checking tool(s) to assess compliance against WCAG 2.0?
-

Yes

No

Do you have plans to use an automated tool in the future?

Yes

No

Undecided

2 Does your agency use any **manual or page based** testing tools to assist in checking conformance against WCAG 2.0?

- Yes
 No

Which manual or page based testing tools does your agency use? *[Please select all that apply]*

- aChecker
 aDesigner
 CodeSniffer (Squiz)
 Colour Contrast Analyser (TPG/Vision Australia)
 Firebug
 TAW - Web Accessibility test
 Total Validator / other HTML validator
 WAVE (Webaim)
 Web Accessibility Toolbar (TPG/Vision Australia)
 Web Developer Toolbar (Chris Pederick)
 Other [Please list these other tools]
i)
ii)
iii)
-

3 Does your agency use any **document specific** checking tools to assist in checking conformance against WCAG 2.0?

- Yes
 No

Which document specific checking tools does your agency use? *[Please select all that apply]*

- Acrobat Pro - Accessibility Full Check
 Common Look PDF
 PAC - PDF Accessibility checker
 Word 2010 Accessibility checker
 Other [Please list these other tools]
i)
ii)
iii)
-

4 Does your agency use **assistive technologies** as part of your accessibility testing?

- Yes
 No
-

5 Does your agency use people with a disability in your conformance testing?

- Yes
 No
-

6 Has your agency used an outsourced service provider to conduct conformance checking?

- Yes
- No

Which outsourced service providers does your agency use? *[Please select all that apply, and then answer the additional questions that will appear below]*

- 4 Syllables
- Access Testing
- AccessibilityOz
- Inclusive UX
- Max Design
- OPC IT
- Scenario Seven
- Stamford Interactive
- Vision Australia
- WebKey IT
- Web Usability
- Other [Please list these other providers]
 - i)
 - ii)
 - iii)

How are you using your outsourced service providers?

	One Off (i.e. single point in time)	Ad hoc	Multiple Instances	Ongoing
Stamford Interactive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vision Australia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What services is your outsourced service provider delivering? *[Please select all that apply]*

	Conformance Checking	Reporting	Remediation Assistance	Priority Setting	Other
Stamford Interactive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Vision Australia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please describe the 'other' services provided by Stamford Interactive

Training

Please describe the 'other' services provided by Vision Australia

Training

Assessment of Agency Progress

This section of the survey seeks to capture the **overall** progress made by agencies in implementing WCAG 2.0 since 2010.

To determine the primary barriers to implementing WCAG 2.0, the section breaks down accessibility into categories which can be reported at an Agency level. Consolidation of this information will assist AGIMO in developing specific guidance to assist agencies in the final implementation phase of the NTS.

1 Which aspects of your combined agency web sites conform at WCAG 2.0 Level A or higher?

	Compliant	Mostly Compliant	Moderate Compliance	Minimal Compliance	No Compliance	Not Applicable
a Layout	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
b Content (including heading, links, etc)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
c Images	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
d Colour contrast	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
e Navigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
f Keyboard access	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
g Tables	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h Forms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i Multimedia	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j Code validation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2 How have these aspects of your combined agency's web sites **improved** since December 2010 with respect to conformance with WCAG 2.0 Level A or higher?

	Conformance Maintained	Conformance Fixed	Significant Improvement	Moderate Improvement	Minimal Improvement	No Improvement	Not Applicable
a Layout	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
b Content (including heading, links, etc)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
c Images	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
d Colour contrast	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
e Navigation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
f Keyboard access	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
g Tables	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h Forms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i Multimedia	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j Code validation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3 For documents published in 2012, how well do you consider your agency satisfied the following accessibility aspects?

	Always	Mostly	Some	None	Not Applicable
a HTML version	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
b HTML landing page	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
c Headings and other structure	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
d Colour contrast	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
e Images (e.g. use of alternative text)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f Navigation (e.g. table of contents in Doc files; bookmarks in PDF files)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g Tables (e.g. headings tagged)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h Forms (e.g. clear labels, tagged in PDF)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i Alternative format (e.g. PDF & Doc/RTF)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Agency Infrastructure and Capability

This section of the survey follows up on the 2010 collection of data relating to an agencies' web publishing and procurement processes.

1 Has your agency made accessibility related changes to its internal web publishing processes to promote conformance with the NTS?

- Yes
- No
- Not yet, but intend to do so in the future
- No changes required; processes already in place in 2010

2 Have you upgraded or changed your content management systems or processes since 2010 in order to address accessibility issues?

- Yes
- No
- Not yet, but intend to do so in the future
- No changes required; CMS already suitable in 2010

3 Has your agency reviewed its ICT related procurement policy and processes to include web accessibility where appropriate and reference WCAG 2.0 and the NTS requirements?

- Yes
- No
- Not yet, but intend to do so in the future

Training and Education Update

This section of the survey follows up on the 2010 data relating to an agency's skills, with a particular focus on accessibility education and awareness. It will help gather information related to the staff responsibilities and training.

1 Has your agency produced any accessibility education or training material?

[This might include guidelines, checklists, how to test for accessibility, publishing hints, presentations, diagrams, etc]

Yes

No

Please describe this accessibility education or training material:

Training course, checklists, cheat sheets, templates

Is your agency willing to share more broadly?

Yes

No

[Optional] Please email any relevant documents or copies to xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx, or provide relevant URLs to the material in the area below:

Can provide separately - currently undergoing some reviews

2 Please provided updated information for the number of internal and external staff performing within each role shown below on a headcount basis.

[Individual staff members should only be shown once in their primary role.]

	Internal Staff - 2010 (headcount)	Internal Staff - 2012 (headcount)	External Staff - 2010 (headcount)	External Staff - 2012 (headcount)
a Web Management (activities include: site wide management, policy/procedures, technical quality assurance)	10	4		0
b Content owners / authors (activities include: creation of content, page level edits, content approval and/or authorisation)	1300	1000		0
c Communications / Media (activities include: Online Publications, multi-media, social media)	4	2		0
d Technical ICT support (activities include: application development, programming, IT infrastructure)	10	4		
e Other role for example training, help desk, access provision, security: <i>[Please specify]</i>	200	150	0	
Total	1524	1160	0	0

3 How many of these staff (in total) primary role is dedicated to web accessibility?

(headcount)

4 How many of your (APS) internal staff have completed each of the following types of accessibility training?

	No. of Staff in 2010 (headcount)	No. of Staff in 2012 (headcount)
a Internal Course	10	110
b External Course/Workshop	9	20

5 Which external training providers has your agency used since 2010? *[Please select all that apply]*

- 4 Syllables
- Access iQ
- AccessibilityOz
- Alpha Computer Consultants
- Max Design
- Scenario Seven
- Stamford Interactive
- Vision Australia
- Web Usability
- AGIMO / Microsoft - Office Training Session
- AGIMO / Adobe - PDF Training Session
- Other [Please specify]
 - i)
 - ii)
 - iii)

6 How many external staff (i.e. non-APS / contractors) has your agency educated or trained in web accessibility?

(headcount)

Risks

This section of the survey follows up on the 2010 data relating to the major risks identified by Agencies in implementing the NTS.

- 1 The top 5 risks identified by agencies in December 2010 for transition to WCAG 2.0 under the NTS are highlighted below; please indicate where your agency perceives itself to sit with each of these risks at December 2012?

	Low Risk	Moderate Risk	High Risk	Extreme Risk	Not Applicable
a Funding & resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b Skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c Third party products	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d Legacy publishing issues	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e PDF documents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- 2 If your agency is experiencing any additional risks, please describe them below:

i) Other risks...

Whole of Government changes that impact on the web team's ability to maintain their accessibility processes e.g. FOI reforms, Digital Transition Policy

ii) Other risks...

The department has diverse responsibilities which sometimes makes it difficult for a small web team to engage fully with all areas of the department

Agency Documentation

This section of the survey captures an agencies documented strategies, plans and processes to deliver web accessibility and achieve conformance with the Web Accessibility National Transition Strategy. It also provides the opportunity to report success stories at the agency level.

1 Has your agency produced an Agency Implementation Plan?

Yes

No

Is the plan publicly available?

Yes

No

Has the plan been lodged with the Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC)?

Yes

No

2 Please provide two BEST examples of **effort** from your agency that demonstrates progress towards website accessibility (this might include Training and Education efforts, Websites, Web Applications, development of Action Planning and Prioritisation registers, governance/publishing processes, etc).

If you are relying on a document please provide a copy (email to xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx.xx), a website – please provide the URL etc.

Example 1:

AGD has made a concerted push to educate content authors (primarily) but also other staff in the department on online accessibility compliance - why and how. This is reflected in the increased numbers reported on the education and training pages.

Example 2:

The department has very recently decided that there needs to be increased scrutiny and governance surrounding information management practices. A position has been established that will oversee online governance and policy in this space and will work closely with other information management practitioners.

- 3 Optional – Please provide any additional comments your agency may have on meeting NTS, WCAG 2 or website accessibility?
-

Our external facing websites are largely compliant, in baseline testing our sites (and these figures can be extrapolated to other sites created using the same templates), were between 75%-85% compliant to WCAG 2.0 Single A. Areas where do not comply include the publishing of non-compliant PDFs as part of the FOI reforms and code validation errors because we are using SharePoint 2010.