**FA Resolution Concerned Faculty Rights and Role in Accessibility Training and Digital Compliance**

Whereas, the principle of shared governance between faculty and administration is the cornerstone and foundation of decision-making at the University of Colorado Denver and is clearly articulated in Article 5 of Regents’ Law (Article 5.A.1.B), that principle is being violated by the Accessibility Steering Committee (ASC)/Digital Accessibility Committee (DAC).

Whereas, CU Denver has adopted Anthology Ally and its accessibility scorecard as its tool for achieving compliance, without faculty input and despite Ally and the associated accessibility scorecard not being supported by institutions of higher education leading in accessibility across the country.  They have found these tools do not represent best practices and the generated scores are misleading in terms of how accessible the delivered course materials actually are to students. We oppose the adoption of these tools based on the research done by the FA-DisC on best schools and practices, the Accessibility Operations Team’s (AOT) research and engagement with campus representatives (faculty, staff, and students), and consultation with the nationally recognized Boulder Digital Office with whom we work closely and offer trainings. Anthology Ally and its accessibility scorecard is a severely flawed tool that can reflect negatively on the faculty’s work on accessibility and toward compliance.  Using Anthology Ally last year, faculty made 6000 changes which raised the school’s accessibility score .1 percent (62.2 to 62.3 according to TIPS yearend report). This minimal change was made with faculty supporting TIPS by providing and funding Ally Ambassadors. This information and collaboration helped us determine Ally is a backend, cumbersome program that is not suitable for our campus.  It would take over half a million “corrections” to get above 70% while the system for measuring increased accessibility is questionable. This tool evaluates all materials in Canvas and is not applied solely to course materials that are published to students.  Easy fixes can increase the accessibility score without significantly increasing the actual accessibility of course materials for students. For faculty, this tool is also extremely time consuming to both learn and implement compared to other tools available. Recognizing that it was not the best direction for faculty and compelled us to explore and pivot to other and multiple tools and training methods based on our research and consultations including experts throughout the CU system and community. This is a measurement tool that can only negatively impact faculty and their evaluations in an attempt to attain legal compliance rather than further real accessibility.  For these reasons, we do not support the adoption and compelling of faculty to use Anthology Ally and the accessibility scorecard.

Whereas, in accessibility, faculty have witnessed with growing unease:

* The creation of a committee called DAC, by the ASC, responsible for document accessibility, without  faculty vetting or inclusion and in concerning since this impacts pedagogy and classroom practices. ASC employed an internal directive that only positive outcomes of the committee can be shared out in a singular voice and no criticism of committee decisions is to be shared.
* The DAC’s adoption of Anthology Ally and its scorecard as the main means to address legal compliance and monitor accessibility on campus without faculty consultation or openly vetted through the ASC.
* Accessibility meetings held that are not accessible to the disability community.
* Unsound advice promoted on CU Denver sites by TIPS such as “do the easiest fixes first” rather than “work on the most vital and used content first” – a protocol that reflects a lack of pedagogical understanding of the methodology being extolled.
* Using “the university can be sued” as a primary motivation rather than a people-first policy based on better serving our students and employees. Compliance is the university’s responsibility. Expectations that faculty do additional work to protect the university need to be addressed to ensure faculty are adequately compensated for these efforts that are beyond normal teaching contracts.

Resolved, that in addressing accessibility on campus, we endorse the system-developed, vetted training available on Percipio though not promoted by the ASC/DAC. Faculty at CU Denver are committed to and already pursuing accessibility training and compliance efforts with the Boulder Digital Office, as well as adopted tools and best practices of universities leading in accessibility. We are extremely disturbed by ASC/DAC’s failure to acknowledge the sustained accessibility work of our colleagues and attempts to dismiss or marginalize the ongoing accessibility trainings, initiatives, and activities provided by dedicated faculty and accessibility groups on campus and note the ASC/DAC’s unwillingness to engage and build upon that work.

Resolved, that we are committed in our continued efforts to make this campus more accessible. However, in good faith, we cannot collaborate or participate in faculty training and teaching practices endorsed by the ASC/DAC until faculty, including those with expertise in both accessibility and pedagogy, are adequately represented in a transparent decision-making process and implementation process since these initiatives directly impact faculty and our pedagogical mission.