

Including Accessibility in Your EdTech Decisions

Video Transcript

JENA FAHLBUSH: We're really excited to have you all here today for our session and our webinar titled Including Accessibility in your EdTech Decisions. I'm Jena Fahlbush, a technical assistance specialist with NCADEMI, and I will be your moderator for this session. I know I'm really excited for this topic. We tend to get a lot of questions about procurement and accessibility, so I'm going to work through a few housekeeping items and get things passed over to our presenters as quickly as I can.

For this webinar, we ask you to use the Zoom chat. So look right now for that chat button, and use that for communicating with other attendees today and for sharing resources. We will also be sharing some resources in the chat with you so that you can click directly on the links. We have reserved time at the end of our webinar today for live questions and answers, so please make sure to put those questions that you have for our panelists or our presenters into the Q&A feature. So if you would take a look for that Q&A button and make sure to use that specifically for your questions for our presenters, that will ensure we don't miss an important question that got posted in the chat.

Regarding website-- or excuse me-- webinar accessibility and resources, please know that you can turn on the captions using the CC button in the Zoom toolbar. You can also find our presentation slides today and some additional resources on our webinar resources page at tinyurl.com/edtech-procurement. And I will put that link in the chat for you so that you can access it there.

The session is being recorded, so it will be available on that same web page tomorrow. And we really encourage you to share a link to that page with anyone that you think is interested in this topic. And now I have the pleasure of introducing our presenters today.

With us, we have two members of the NCADEMI team, Rob Carr, a digital accessibility specialist, and Christopher Phillips, a technical assistance specialist. Also joining us is Aujalee Moore, whose title is Standards Guidance Program Analyst at the Oregon Department of Education. Thanks for joining us, Aujalee. We're really excited to have you with us. And now I'm going to pass this over to Rob to get things started.

ROB CARR: Hey. Good day, everybody. We are thrilled to be here and have a chance to spend a little bit of time with you this afternoon, potentially morning, depending on time zone or when you're watching this recording. I just want to quickly introduce what we're going to talk about today. This will be brief because we're going to expand on each one of these a little bit in the time that we have together.

But what we're aiming for is to give you some tips about how to integrate accessibility into all of the parts of procurement. And so we broke this up into two pieces. There's a piece where you can embed accessibility into things that you likely already use. And then there are places where it's helpful to add accessibility specific things to the process as well.

With embedding, we're going to talk about making sure that accessibility works its way into requests for information, then much more commonly used request for proposal. We're going to talk about making sure that you integrate and embed accessibility in any scoring that you might do when you're looking at candidate products and in contract language.

The additions may come in the form of a couple of pieces of vendor documentation that you might ask for. One is some evidence of how mature a vendor is with its accessibility practice. And again, we'll explain what that means here in a few minutes. And also, pulling information out in accessibility conformance reports. And finally, maybe folding into your process having accessibility focus to demonstrations, as well, in addition to maybe just general functional demonstrations.

CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS: Thanks, Rob. So the first area we'll talk about is request for information and request for proposals. Now, some of you may be new to the purchasing or procurement world. And so just as a quick recap, these are the documents or the process that we go through before purchasing a large software purchase-- a request for information just to gather information from different vendors and then a request for proposals, which is more common. Request for proposal, or RFP-- we'll focus on a little bit more-- is that tool that you use to say, we're interested in purchasing this type of software product. We're putting this out to the world for vendors who may be interested to let us know about this. And this is really the first area where it's super important to make sure accessibility is embedded into the process so it can be considered right from the very beginning. Again, if this is built into that process and you don't have to think about it, we don't have to work with or remind our purchasing offices every time we're sending out an RFP. It's just part of the process.

And a really big deal with this is just sending that strong message right from the get-go that we care about accessibility, that if you want us to purchase your product, you need to care about accessibility, as well. And so whatever that language is that you include in that request for proposal, make sure you're setting clear expectations. It may be asking about, for example, we need you to tell us how accessible your product is according to the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines. Maybe, even, there's a specific version of that you're looking at. Or we want to understand, how do you deal with accessibility bugs in your software cycle? Or who is our best contact for that?

But working with your purchasing offices to figure out and understand-- and put the vendor on notice, really, that this is going to be a part of this conversation all along the way. And here are the specific things that we are going to be asking you for and that we need to get back from you to help us make a decision and understand how accessible your product is.

ROB CARR: So another piece that many times you have-- and sometimes this is less formal, sometimes it's a very formal process-- is creating a scoring matrix. And commonly these will include scoring different vendor products for the functionality, for ease of use, for vendor communication. And this is another place where if you have some of scoring system to score candidate products against one another, it's really important to integrate accessibility into that.

And so this can look a lot of different ways. It depends on how, again, formal or informal your process is. But what we're aiming for is to at least lower the chance that accessibility just gets set aside in the decision-making process. If accessibility is part of your scoring overall and, say, it has a meaningful percentage, it carries some weight, then the goal is to make sure that, by using these objective measures, we keep accessibility from just being pushed to the side in these decisions. That's relatively common when accessibility isn't represented in the scoring process.

The idea here is that we can assign objective scores to the vendor documentation that we're going to talk about and to their communication. I think that that's a piece of the conversation that we don't often think about. If a vendor doesn't communicate with you very well, really about accessibility or anything else, at the time that you're trying to decide to make a purchase, in other words, when they're trying to sell you

their product, then what's that going to be like after you actually make the purchase and they have the investment from you?

The guidance that we'll give here is just to align this with anything that you are currently doing. I do think that there's value, if you're not trying to assign some objective scoring to different products, to keep that process pretty uniform from one selection to the next. It's not a bad idea to build that. But I wouldn't necessarily just do it for accessibility.

However, if you do have something in place, then fold accessibility in and make it be, like I said, a meaningful part of your overall score so that what you'll usually see is at least one product, one candidate product out of maybe three or four really fall near the back. And when that happens, if we do have an objective system and it does, as I said, really bring accessibility in line with all of the other needs that we have out of a piece of technology, then when that product scores poorly on accessibility, it's likely to fall out of the running.

And I think there's just a tremendous benefit to approaching accessibility, as you do anything else in your decision making, if you have less formal, subjective scoring, more of just conversation and maybe passing notes. Still include accessibility and try to elevate it to a level where it is important enough, like I've said, that it'll keep a really inaccessible candidate product from being acquired when you have far more accessible or even marginally more accessible products there at the ready.

CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS: Thank you, Rob. This next area is-- can often be-- this is where the rubber hits the road after these conversations. We've put out these requests for proposal or we've chosen a vendor that we want to go with using that scoring matrix. And then it comes time to purchase a product, and we've got to come up with a contract. And really, at this point, figuring out how confident they are legal and product teams are with all of the promises that their marketing and sales teams have made about how accessible their product is.

And so as we think about the contract process-- and here on this slide, we have an image of a person holding a large pen with a big contract-- I think an important thing here is you don't have to be contract experts in how we approach this. It's working with those that are, though, whether that's your legal counsel or those purchasing and procurement teams, to make sure this is written into the contract.

And it's really a way to hold the vendor accountable. I had an experience a few months ago where we had some very productive conversations about accessibility with the vendor. We're really feeling good about what they were doing and their plans going forward. Really, though, when we got to the contract piece of that, they took the language that we had suggested and basically said, we care a lot about accessibility, and we'll do our best. And that was as much as they were able to say at that point to start with a conversation. And then we had to say, that is just not good enough. All these promises that you made and assurances you gave us, we want to see those written down on paper.

And along with that, I think it's setting those specific expectations. What is that? If the product is not fully accessible, by what date do you plan on making it accessible? Or what happens if we discover an accessibility issue? We want to make sure that if we report that and need that to be fixed that you don't try to come back and give those costs to us or make us pay additional costs.

And there's a variety of different samples of contract language out there that you can look for and find that is a great starting point for this. And often it'll be a little bit of back and forth. But, again, I think it's such a great opportunity to really just ensure that whatever requirements you have are actually explicitly defined and required and then written down in that contract so that, if or when problems happen down the road,

you can always refer back to that as a resource to say, actually, what was promised here-- and it's written in the contract, a legal document-- that this is where we're going to go, and this is what needs to happen. And so ensuring that contract language is in place and really explicitly defines what those assurances are that will give you a lot of confidence knowing that you can continue to use that product in a way that will work for all of your users.

And so there is necessarily a lot of emphasis in conversations about accessibility and procurement on individual products. But it's a really good idea to have a higher level conversation with vendors that you're working with. Now, this is going above and beyond what some vendors might expect, so this could be somewhat tricky. You might not get as uniform a response as you would like. But like I alluded to at the beginning, what I think it's a good idea to do is to ask the vendors how they, quote unquote, "do accessibility."

And what we're looking for here are assurances that, if we have an accessible product now, it's likely to stay that way, that they do have a good grasp on accessibility. So some example questions-- and there are several that you can pose to a vendor. But ask them questions about any internal accessibility standards that they aspire to.

Ideally, you'll get a response back that aligns with accessibility standards that you're aiming for in your procurement documentation and your contract. That's really the ideal situation. But if they don't have an internal set of standards, that can be a little bit of a warning that they're not terribly mature, that they haven't really folded accessibility into their work.

Another good thing to ask about is, how do they train their people? The reality with accessibility, even for very technical designers and developers, is that it's not commonly taught. And it means that when the companies who build the software, who sell the software, hire folks, they need some internal professional development, and they need to keep skills sharp over time.

Then a couple of specifics-- who is the accessibility expert? Do they have somebody on staff maybe with that title, not accessibility expert, but accessibility coordinator or something like that? Do they have at least one person who specializes in accessibility and hopefully works with the different teams who actually build the technology that you might buy? Is that contracted? Do they rely on a third party to come in and consult with them and help? That's still much better than just winging it and hoping that they're doing it right.

And related to that, it's good to know who the accessibility contact is. For your big technology companies, they're likely to have just an accessibility@company.com email address. But for your medium size, it's reasonable to ask for a contact for a human being. Now, there are times when you may not get direct access, and then it's just a matter of fleshing out what the process is to get questions or concerns to that individual.

It might be that the business development, the sales folks on the front end or after the purchase, the regular support contact is what you'll use. Then I just want to know, OK, if I send an accessibility-related question in, how does that get routed? What's the typical turnaround? Knowing that there is an extra layer of communication there.

But it's really, again, I think, a fantastic idea to ask these bigger picture questions to get a sense of the grasp that a vendor does or doesn't have with accessibility in general and then drill down a little bit more specifically into the products.

AUJALEE MOORE: Hi, everyone. My name is Aujalee Moore. I'm from Oregon Department of Education. And I'm excited to share more about accessibility conformance reports with you all from the perspective of Oregon. And I really appreciate a framing of this webinar with the embed and the add, because as a state education agency, we had done a lot of work through our policy and statute and administrative rules within our contract language to embed accessibility requirements, whether that be through the National Instructional Materials Access Center and their standards for print materials, looking at our Web Content Accessibility Guidelines.

And I think, as Chris and Rob referred to, a lot of the times, that policy was reliant on assurances, assurances that the publisher makes. And in many cases, it's a sentence with a yes or no checkbox. So we relied as a state agency heavily on our districts who are using the materials to come in and say, these are supposed to be accessible. But, in practice, they actually aren't. Which led us as a state to look at our Accessibility Conformance Report policy.

And to give you a little bit of background, an Accessibility Conformance Report, or an ACR, is a completed version of the VPAT, or the Vendor Product Accessibility Template. So I always try to use the Pokemon analogy. The VPAT evolves into this ACR once it's been completed, and hopefully that evolution has been done with authenticity and integrity around the testing.

So our ACR, when we receive them, or any ACR, should be a demonstration of compliance with accessibility standards. And in Oregon, we connect ours to the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines and are able to adjust as those guidelines also evolved.

The product and owner developer has to test the product against the standards in order to complete the Accessibility Conformance Report. So rather than check boxes a, yeah, we think this is accessible, it should be, actually going in and performing testing of the components that need to be reported on.

And the other thing about the Accessibility Conformance Report is that there are multiple levels of compliance. So it does give a little bit more nuanced view of a product's accessibility, whether or not it's somewhat compliant, if it is compliant, and you can see that there is evidence that the accessibility tools have been tested. You can see a greater picture with more of that information, opposed to a black or white, yes or no, accessible, not accessible assurance.

So we went through a two-year process in Oregon to update our administrative rule to account for the fact that digital instructional materials and the market around instructional materials continues to evolve. The Web Content Accessibility Guidelines continue to evolve.

And as I'm sure many of you recognize, it's happening at a really rapid rate, faster than we can change policy at the state education agency level. So we adapted two of our administrative rules that already existed to include requirements to submit an Accessibility Conformance Report.

One is the Division 11 rule in Oregon related to digital, electronic, and web-based materials. And this is a rule that's related to any of the materials that Oregon Department of Education evaluates and adopts.

So any publisher that submits a bid for evaluation must agree to provide an up to date, complete, and accurate Accessibility Conformance Report. We also required in the policy that that report must be completed by a third party and include manual verification of testing. And this was really important to us because we have seen some self-produced Accessibility Conformance Reports that might not be accurate or might indicate that manual testing has occurred, but that manual testing might have been at the conception of the product being launched, opposed to as it has evolved with updates and so forth.

We also, in Oregon, allow our districts, since we're a local control state, to independently adopt materials. But they do have to still assure that they are accessible, that they meet our criteria in Oregon, and that vendors are providing the same legal requirement assurances that they would be if they were going through our state process.

So all of our independently adopted materials in Oregon also need to have an Accessibility Conformance Report. We did provide a little bit more flexibility here because third-party verification, that manual testing, it does come with a cost. And in Oregon, it's a cost that we felt confident saying, publishers, if you want to be on the state list, this is something that you need to invest in. We can't expect every single one of our districts to do that, because many publishers were telling them that they needed to take the cost on as a district, opposed to the vendor paying for that Accessibility Conformance Report.

So we have allowed them to have more flexibility around the third-party component. However, we've provided contract language, language that they can use as they're communicating with vendors, to very much communicate that this should be a vendor-provided Accessibility Conformance Report, and if there is any resource or funding that is attached to it, that should be something that is on the side of the vendor. I did want to provide the Accessibility Conformance Report that we received during our health adoption.

So 2024 was the first year that this policy took place. In the chat, there is a link with a list of our approved vendors. There are very few for health in Oregon. If you know, our health standards are pretty advanced. So it's a short list. But any of the approved vendors did have to provide that.

So all of our districts now have access to information on the product, the accessibility features, evaluation methodology, the conformance level, as well as the remarks and explanations. And in Oregon, that's a really important part, is creating that feedback cycle and communication loop so that we can progress and evolve in our conversation around accessibility, come together as a collective to shift the publisher market, and, again, I think, as it was mentioned earlier, really elevate that this is important and close enough isn't good enough. So the information is something that we are really excited for our districts to have.

CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS: Thank you so much, Aujalee. So valuable to have that boots on the ground experience of how you're rolling this out in the work that you're doing there. Before we talk demonstrations, just a reminder, we have reserved some time at the end to answer any questions that you have. And so please continue to put those questions in the Q&A, and we'll be sure to address those as we wrap up our presentation in just a little bit here.

I especially love that idea, Aujalee-- just this is really work that different groups can do on their own. But the more of us doing this work, the more we put those publishers and vendors on notice to help move these conversations forward. So it's just something that is expected in the work that those vendors do. This next section on demonstrations is such a-- it's kind of a fun area, for me at least, when we-- let's say you-- different states and districts may be at different levels of how much in-house expertise you have on digital accessibility or how much you're able to do any testing on your own. But what this process is, is really talking to the vendor. You've had that maturity discussion already. They've maybe let you know who is responsible for accessibility in their organization and saying, OK, great, we'd love to schedule-- let's say, maybe, it could be 15 minutes or an hour, whatever, how much time you need to say, let's just jump on Zoom for a little bit and have you demonstrate your product or your tool, your online textbook, and show us about that accessibility work that you've done and the things that you're-- demonstrate to us how where those accessibility features are and how they work in your tool.

And once you get on there, I think you can give them the floor to talk through some of that. But then you also have opportunities to ask some questions to-- for example, a basic, quick test you can do is to say, can you please-- you set aside your mouse and show me how you can navigate your tool using only the keyboard. And you can just look and see, does that work? Can they get to all the different important parts of the application or tool using their keyboard only?

Or if it's something that has video, a video component or part of it, you can go to a video and just a quick-- great, can you show me-- can you turn on the video captions and show me how those work? And are they good quality video captions?

And these are things that I think anybody could do without really understanding all the technical details that go into what it means for a product or an application to be accessible. And then there's also a lot of free tools online. WAVE is one that our partner organization, WebAIM, provides for free that you can just click on this link in your-- there's a browser extension that you can click on, and it simply-- you can go to the tool and just run WAVE on it. And it'll either show up with a lot of green, saying that this is-- as far as we can tell, the automatic tool show this is accessible, or there's a lot of red on there that they have to look at and explain and go through.

And so-- but just hopefully they'd be willing to sit down with you, look at the tool with you, and help understand, How accessible is this? What are the things they've done? and put that onus on them to demonstrate what they've done to make the tool accessible and potentially identify where there's areas where improvement is needed still.

ROB CARR: So just to summarize a little bit-- when it comes to getting ready to wrap up a little bit, we'll talk a little bit, again, just a reminder about the embed and the add piece and integrating accessibility into your procurement process by making sure that accessibility is, first and foremost, in those RFIs or RFPs, which, like we've talked about, are much more commonly used, that you're accounting for accessibility, as you score candidate products against one another, and that you're protecting yourself with strong contract language. That's really the only way that we, as purchasing entities, can indeed protect ourselves.

Then adding some accessibility-specific stuff-- so asking accessibility questions at a high level with the vendor's accessibility practice and how they integrate accessibility themselves into the work that they do, vetting and getting those Accessibility Conformance Reports. And like Christopher just talked about, the value of having an accessibility-focused demonstration. And like he said, you don't have to know everything about the web to be able to get some really good information about the way the thing either does or doesn't work when it comes to accessibility. And I think I'll turn it over to Jena now, and we'll start fielding some questions.

JENA FAHLBUSH: OK. And even before we get to those questions, I do want to point out our survey at tinyurl.com/webinar-survey and the number 6. So if you could grab that link, and we'll also add that to the chat so that you make sure to open that into a bookmark or a tab and fill that out. We'll share it again at the end of the webinar.

And now we will get into the questions that we have. And we do have a few questions so far in our Q&A. And if anything is coming to mind, please make sure to ask those questions, because we definitely want to get those answered. And I'm just looking for the chat real quick so I can get that link posted. So there is a question from Deb. Do you know of any examples or samples of accessibility scoring matrices?

ROB CARR: There are a few. A lot of organizations-- even in the public sector, what I've seen, a lot of organizations will put that behind the login. There are a couple that have general guidance. There's one

that I have referred folks to before from the University of Michigan. And they have a section in this about evaluating the VPAT or the conformance report. They point to an instrument called HECVAT, which is something that grew out of higher education. But we're starting to maybe see some momentum to use it. It combines questions about security and accessibility into one instrument. A new version just came out shortly after the first of the year.

So that's one. There is a little bit more detailed. This is, I hope, an accessible PDF, which is-- I feel like we say that before we share a PDF with anybody. Let me get the right part of the web address here. But I'll drop that into the chat, as well.

It's maybe a little more detailed from the State of Minnesota. And they have a really good mature accessibility program. And it's another one that I think can be instructive in considering how this stuff works. So that's the link to Minnesota's scoring matrix, as well. So just a couple not prescriptive, hopefully, though, valuable in getting some models. I don't know if anyone else on the panel has examples, as well.

CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS: Not right off the bat. I think, as we consider some of the questions that come up, I think some of these will help guide our future development and resources we provide, as well. And so we'll look at ways we can share some of this on that webinar page.

And then to follow up on the question that Kim asked about, additional training sites and school districts, that April 2026 deadline that you mentioned, hopefully that's probably on many people's minds as we think about, how do we prepare for those new requirements? NCADEMI is preparing a number of training resources and things like that. There are also a number of existing training resources out there, though. I think the best way might be we would love if you reach out to us just at that email on the screen right now, ncademi@usu.edu. Especially if there's a specific training that you're interested in, we'd be happy to share. But also just to go to Google, and there are so many wonderful free training resources that are out there and available that anyone can use.

And then to the first part of your question about WAVE, Kim, it is a free tool that anyone can use. You just go to wave.webaim.org. I think Rob put that URL in the chat just a minute ago. If you need to use WAVE across hundreds of pages or whatever, there are some paid options that you can look at that allow you to do that. But anyone can go and review a page on using the WAVE tool at no cost at all.

AUJALEE MOORE: And if I could hop in really quick, as well. I put a link in the chat to our digital instructional materials toolkit, and this toolkit is meant to be comprehensive. It includes more than accessibility. However, accessibility was one of our main priorities as we developed this document, and it was intentional outside of it being an alphabetical order for accessibility to be the first section, because we felt like it needed to be the foundation of any evaluation or adoption of digital materials.

So page 9 does begin that section. And we went through and tried to create an entry point for individuals who might not have technical experience with accessibility but are at potentially a district level, and they're being asked to be on an adoption team and to have accessibility as a main consideration while they're doing their evaluations locally.

So this tool does provide some language. It helps to summarize the policies around it. But if you get further into the section, there are also some instructions around evaluation and accessibility during the evaluation process, including some quick look-fors as evaluation team members might be looking at an Accessibility Conformance Report for the first time ever. They might not be familiar with WCAG or with the

accessibility guidelines. So this is meant to give them, again, that high-level view before somebody who does have that deep expertise is able to come in and to do that work.

We also provided some frequently asked questions and, getting to Deb's question, an accessibility rubric that is meant to supplement the criteria for instructional materials in any given content area. So we create our own criteria in Oregon-- universal design for learning, equitable student engagement. Those things are already embedded in that criteria.

But this is meant to be supplemental for districts and educators who, again, might not have the deep expertise in technical accessibility but are still tasked with making sure that the materials are accessible. So please feel free to use, to adapt, to share. It's openly licensed. So if you are a state agency and want to borrow, you are more than welcome to do so.

JENA FAHLBUSH: Aujalee, I was curious if you would share, from your experience, have you had an instance where a vendor didn't-- maybe said that they met the Accessibility Conformance Report? You know, they have all their documentation, but that material was inaccessible. And how did you handle that?

AUJALEE MOORE: Yeah. Thanks, Jena. So it's really an awesome story, I think, because the conception of our policy change came from the work of the Oregon Accessible Educational Materials cohort. And we worked through the AEMs Center and CAST to come up with a strategy for statewide accessibility, procurement of materials that were accessible implementation, et cetera.

And I had very little expertise or experience with accessibility prior to being in that space. And I see some familiar names from that cohort on the webinar. So a lot of appreciation for those individuals, as well. But coming in, I had no idea that accessibility was an issue in the field. I was like, yeah, they're accessible. All of the assurances are signed. They're adopted. They have a contract saying they're accessible. Wipe my hands clean. Move on to the next one.

And as we know, that's not always the case in practice. So that cohort allowed us, as an agency, to hear from special education coordinators, IT individuals, educators who are working with students in the classroom, and letting us know, hey, we did adopt materials from ODE's list, and then we put them in front of students, and they weren't accessible. They weren't available in alternate formats.

The files needed weren't actually on file with NIMAC. And that was a huge moment for me where I was like, OK, we have to do something about this. So the two-year arc to change that policy really came from working with our districts and them letting us know the problems of practice in the materials that they were seeing.

And a big, I think, component was that we, as an agency, had not gotten our administrative rules up into the 21st century. So it was very-- like, our policy was very much grounded in print materials, print accessibility. And we realized the assurance language that we had connected only to NIMAS, or the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standards, weren't sufficient for digital materials, especially as they were adaptive.

So we, as we went through the process of going through policy change engagement, had the opportunity to meet with a lot of districts and, in the meantime, get some information about materials that we had adopted that weren't accessible. That allowed our agency to actually reach out to those vendors and say, hey, this is a potential breach of contract. You have a very small amount of time to get this fixed and to do that work as an agency.

But I think the other piece, too, is that we worked with that cohort to create resources for districts to have some of those conversations on their own, especially knowing that independent adoption does exist. We hear a lot about math materials and science materials having a really difficult time being accessible and flexible in a lot of different alternate formats in the classroom. So we were very, very lucky to work with our districts across Oregon to help remediate some of those issues and also to problem solve with the policy levers as well.

JENA FAHLBUSH: Thanks for sharing.

CHRISTOPHER PHILLIPS: Thank you, Aujalee. Yeah, thank you so much. You know, one of the challenges, I think, and opportunities around this is that some of you, on this call today at least, are not part of your purchasing or procurement office. And those folks who need to be in the room maybe aren't here just yet. And so, really, I think it's your opportunity, though, to share this with them and help those groups to be aware of these requirements and what is needed in this space.

And again, just to point out, this webinar page that has some of this information, we'll have the recording of this that will be captioned by tomorrow that'll be up and available to share, as well as some of these other resources that are here. This new publication on our website that is linked there has all the information that we shared today, plus some additional help that could be a tremendous reference, hopefully, as you continue to do this work and to know that we are available to reach out and help you with this journey, whatever that is, to help us understand what is needed from you and how we can help you as you work to make your procurement processes to improve them, to make sure all of your content is accessible.

JENA FAHLBUSH: And I just put a link to that resource in the chat. You all are getting the first look at that. Even though it's on our website, we haven't advertised it yet because we wanted to save it for you all. So please spread that out widely amongst your colleagues and let people know that we are here to support your needs when it comes to procurement. And we do have some exciting works in the pipeline that will be coming out to help collect some more information about vendor accessibility and provide that to you all as our audience.

Thank you so much for being here. We do still have a few minutes, so if anybody would still like to ask a question, feel free to do that. Otherwise, please make sure to complete the survey and let us know what you think about this webinar and our content and, again, how we can continue to build our services and supports to make sure that we're meeting your needs. And with that said, we'll just hang out in case there's another question. But we appreciate your time, and thanks for joining us today.