

ATI Prioritization Framework

# Introduction

The ATI recognizes the importance of focusing finite resources on ATI-related activities with the greatest potential impact to the CSU community. ATI Coded Memorandum AA-2010-13 states that “Resources for ATI implementation should be utilized based on priorities, with the greatest attention given to objectives with the highest impact.”

The ATI has therefore developed a framework that campuses may use to prioritize activities associated with Success Indicators in their campus plans. The intent of this framework is to promote a consistent approach to prioritizing activities and to encourage effective documentation of these activities. It may also be useful in prioritizing adoptions of technology products/services on which the campus focuses resources. Campuses are encouraged to adapt this framework as necessary to meet their specific prioritization needs.

This document describes the framework and provides instructions for effectively implementing it on campuses.

The ATI framework involves a 5-step approach:

* **Step 1—Assess Risk Factors** (consider 2 key factors below):
	+ Impact (the consequences for persons with disabilities and the campus) and
	+ Probability (the likelihood that these consequences will occur)
* **Step 2—Assign a Risk Level** (quantify the risk associated with these consequences)
* **Step 3—Determine Campus Capacity** (consider whether the institution has sufficient resources to address these consequences)
* **Step 4—Set a Priority Level** (determine the institutional response to these consequences)
* **Step 5—Document the Campus Response**

More details regarding how to implement this framework are provided below.

# Step 1: Assess Risk Factors

## Instructions

Complete the questions provided in the Impact and Probability sections below.

## Impact

Several factors contribute to assessing the impact of ATI activities. Each of these factors is outlined below along with sample questions for gauging the relevance of that factor.

### Will there be a barrier?

* + If this activity or process is not implemented, will persons with disabilities be denied access to a university program or service?
	+ If this activity or process is not implemented, will persons with disabilities receive erroneous, incomplete, or untimely information?

### Is it a critical barrier?

* + Does this activity or process relate to an essential academic or administrative function?
	+ Does the lack of this process or activity contribute to ineffective operations (i.e. would the cost/complexity of providing accommodations be burdensome or disruptive)?

### What are the risks associated with the barrier?

* + Does the lack of this process or activity increase the risk of financial loss or exposure?
	+ Has the institution received complaints from persons with disabilities due to lack of this process?

### Are there workarounds for the barrier until resolved?

* + Are there accessible, alternative processes or workarounds to provide the related academic or administrative function?

## Probability

* How many people would be impacted by the lack of this activity or process?
* Would members of the public be impacted by the lack of this activity or process?
* Will the lack of this process or activity create barriers that reoccur or persist over time?
* Is the lack of this process or activity likely to impact programs or services with a primary audience of persons with disabilities?

# Step 2: Assign a Risk Level

## Instructions

First, determine a Risk Level (high/medium/low) for each of the Impact and Probability factors.

1. Compare your answers from the Impact and Probability questions above to the expected outcomes in the Risk Assessment Framework table below.
2. Select a risk level which best corresponds to your answers.

Next, assign an overall Risk Level (high/medium/low) that incorporates both Impact and Probability levels. The Overall Risk Assessment chart below illustrates the following points:

* A Risk Level of high should be assigned to projects in which both Impact and Probability factors are rated high
* A Risk Level of medium should be assigned to projects in which one factor is rated high and the other rated low
* A Risk Level of high should be assigned to projects in which both Impact and Probability factors are rated low

## Risk Assessment Framework

| **Risk Level** | **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Impact | * Denies access to a program/service
* Impacts a critical program/service
* Creates high accommodation costs
* Creates significant legal exposure
* No available workarounds
 | * Limits access to a program/service
* Impacts an important but non-critical program/service
* Creates moderate accommodation costs
* Creates moderate legal exposure
* Workarounds for some functions
 | * Does not limit access to a program/service
* Impacts an optional program/service
* Creates little or no accommodation costs
* Creates little or no legal exposure
* Workarounds for all functions
 |
| Probability | * Impacts a large audience or members of the public
* Creates frequently-recurring barriers
* Strong likelihood of impact for persons with disabilities
 | * Impacts a moderately-sized audience, not public-facing
* Creates occasionally-recurring barriers
* Moderate likelihood of impact for persons with disabilities
 | * Impacts a small audience, not public-facing
* Does not create recurring barriers
* Low likelihood of impact for persons with disabilities
 |

## Overall Risk Assessment Decision



# Step 3: Determine Campus Capacity Level

## Instructions

First, complete the questions provided below:

* Does the institution have personnel with sufficient technical knowledge to address accessibility gaps?
* Does the institution have personnel with appropriate tools (software/hardware) to address accessibility gaps?
* Does the institution have sufficient financial resources to address accessibility gaps?

Next, determine your campus Capacity Level by assessing the sufficiency of available resources. Select a Capacity Level that most closely corresponds to the answers to the questions above. A description of the 3 possible Capacity Levels is provided in the table below.

| Capacity Level | Description |
| --- | --- |
| High | Institution has sufficient resources (knowledge, tools, and funds) to address all issues  |
| Medium | Institution has sufficient resources (knowledge, tools, and funds) to address some of the issues |
| Low | Institution has sufficient resources (knowledge, tools, and funds) to address few (or none) of the issues |

# Step 4: Set a Priority Level

Use the Risk Level, campus Capacity Level, and other relevant campus data (e.g. the timeline for a planned product upgrade) to determine how to prioritize ATI activities. A sample implementation of how to apply this framework to Success Indicators in the Campus Plan is provided in the table below.

## Sample Implementation

| Success Indicator | Impact | Probability | Capacity |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Campus has screened its LMS to determine whether it conforms to Section 508 standards… | High (precludes curricular participation, requires expensive accommodations) | High (large audience, used repeatedly) | Medium (campus has current VPATs and other accessibility docs but is unable to conduct formal testing) |
| Established a process to perform regularly scheduled accessibility audits | Medium (campus-wide) or High (high-impact sites only) | Medium (campus-wide) or High (high-impact sites only) | Medium (campus has implemented HISoftware instance, but not all sites have been added to site inventory) |

For example, conducting an accessibility screening of the campus LMS, while involving high Impact and Probability, might not be prioritized highly if a major product update is imminent that would invalidate the benefits of conducting the screening at this point in time.

# Step 5: Document the Campus Response

Enter the Priority Level selected in Step 4 above into the ‘Priority Level’ column for the appropriate Success Indicator on the Campus Plan. Next document the anticipated campus response in 1 or more of the following ways:

* Indicate in the ‘Leverage ATI Project’ column that the campus will utilize an ATI shared project to address the Success Indicator
* Indicate in the ‘Include in 2012 Task Dashboard’ column that the campus will utilize a campus project to address the Success Indicator
* Indicate in the ‘Hold’ column that the campus does not yet have sufficient resources to address the Success Indicator. Consider the identified risks for a Success Indicator that has been placed on hold and, where appropriate, document the reasons for placing it on hold in the ‘Notes’ column.

Campuses should update this information, as appropriate, to reflect changes to the activity status over time.

The ATI welcomes feedback on this document at ati@calstate.edu.