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Introduction

Accessibility is a growing concern for universities and academic libraries as they create and provide more digital resources for their communities. The development of best practices for accessible web pages and documents is well underway. To date, no in-depth study of digital content management systems has been done.

Purpose

To evaluate the level of accessibility provided to visually impaired users by two of the most used digital collections platforms: CONTENTdm and Digital Commons.

Methods and Tools

1. Reviewed WCAG 2.0 Level AA and Section 508 standards.
2. Established list of links to different pages within each CMS to test different elements and display structures.
3. Used web accessibility evaluation tools to test the list of links.
4. Interviewed visually-impaired student who tested the list of links and provided verbal feedback about his experience.

Results

- According to each products' Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT), both CONTENTdm and Digital Commons meet basic Section 508 accessibility standards.
- Web accessibility evaluation tools identified some errors and several common potential areas for improvement.
- There are disparities between technical and functional accessibility.
- The student helped us identify configuration changes that we could make to help improve accessibility.

Conclusions/Next Steps

- It is difficult to provide sufficient labeling and context for functional accessibility.
- Changes to locally configurable settings can improve accessibility in CONTENTdm:
  - Metadata fields
  - Controlled vocabulary settings
  - Compound objects
- Investigate future accessibility upgrades with OCLC and bepress.
- Determine how research results impact our decisions about CMSs for future digital collections.
- Conduct additional usability/accessibility testing with more visually-impaired users.
- Expand usability/accessibility testing to include users with other kinds of disabilities.