

Accessibility & Usability Checklist for Instructional Materials

Aligned to Florida ESE Requirements and Universal Design Principles



Accessibility & Usability Checklist for Instructional Materials

Aligned to Florida ESE Requirements and Universal Design Principles

Accessibility Domain	Title	Description	Purpose	Page
	Purpose of this Tool	Explains the intent, scope, and use of the Accessibility and Usability Checklist within the instructional materials review and adoption process	Establish a shared understanding of how the tool supports planning and decision-making	2
	Scoring Guidance	Identifies scale score and description for each Accessibility Indicator	Establish a scale and rubric for each Accessibility Indicator	2
Accessibility Domain 1	Digital Accessibility	Evaluates how well digital materials are designed to be accessible, navigable, and usable for students with diverse needs across devices and platforms	Ensure digital materials can be accessed and used by all students, including those using assistive technologies	3
Accessibility Domain 2	Print Accessibility	Examines the readability and usability of printed materials, including layout, formatting, and visual supports	Ensure print materials reduce barriers to comprehension and support access for a range of learners	4
Accessibility Domain 3	Alternative Formats	Reviews the availability and quality of materials in multiple formats (e.g., audio, digital, large print, Braille)	Ensure students can access content in formats aligned to their needs and receive materials at the same time as peers	5
Accessibility Domain 4	Assistive Technology Compatibility	Assesses whether materials function effectively with common assistive technologies (e.g., screen readers, text-to-speech, speech-to-text)	Ensure materials can be used seamlessly with assistive tools required for student access	6
Accessibility Domain 5	Overall Accessibility and System Alignment	Evaluates whether accessibility features are embedded, consistent, and aligned to district systems (e.g., ESE, MTSS, IEP/504 supports)	Ensure accessibility is built into materials and can be implemented consistently across classrooms and systems	7
Final Reflection	Summary of Accessibility Findings	Synthesizes strengths, gaps, and risks identified across all sections	Support decision-making, identify implementation needs, and determine overall accessibility readiness	8

PURPOSE OF THIS TOOL

This checklist supports districts in evaluating instructional materials for accessibility and usability to ensure all students, including students with disabilities, can access and engage in grade-level content.

This checklist supports compliance with federal and state requirements for accessible instructional materials and equitable access for students with disabilities. It is aligned to:

- ▶ Universal Design for Learning
- ▶ Accessible Educational Materials (AEM Center)
- ▶ Federal and Florida requirements for students with disabilities

This tool is designed for use alongside the Subgroup Criteria Bank and District Reflection Tool during materials review and adoption processes. It provides detailed evidence to support scoring for Subgroup Domain 6: Accessibility & Usability in the Subgroup Criteria Bank.

SCORING GUIDANCE

Each indicator should be rated:

Score	Description
1	Not present; significant barriers exist
2	Limited; inconsistent or incomplete
3	Partial; some accessibility features present
4	Strong; generally accessible and usable
5	Fully embedded; consistently accessible across materials

ACCESSIBILITY DOMAIN 1: DIGITAL ACCESSIBILITY

Indicator	1 Not Present	2 Limited	3 Partial	4 Strong	5 Fully Embedded
Materials are compatible with screen readers and accessibility tools					
Text-to-speech functionality is available and usable					
Digital navigation is clear and consistent					
Visual elements include alt text or descriptions					
Content is accessible across devices (laptop, tablet, etc.)					

Evidence / Notes:

Overall Evaluation Score for AD1: Digital Accessibility = _____

Score of 5 to 10 ▶ Limited Digital Accessibility

Score of 11 to 15 ▶ Partial Digital Accessibility

Score of 16 to 20 ▶ Strong Digital Accessibility

Score of 21 to 25 ▶ Fully Embedded Digital Accessibility

ACCESSIBILITY DOMAIN 2: PRINT ACCESSIBILITY

Indicator	1 Not Present	2 Limited	3 Partial	4 Strong	5 Fully Embedded
Materials are available in large print formats					
Text is readable (font, spacing, contrast)					
Layout supports readability (chunking, headings)					
Visual supports aid comprehension					
Print materials include consistent organization and navigational supports (e.g., page numbering, labels, tables of contents, clearly identified sections)					

Evidence / Notes:

Overall Evaluation Score for AD2: Print Accessibility = _____

Score of 5 to 10 ▶ Limited Print Accessibility

Score of 11 to 15 ▶ Partial Print Accessibility

Score of 16 to 20 ▶ Strong Print Accessibility

Score of 21 to 25 ▶ Fully Embedded Print Accessibility

ACCESSIBILITY DOMAIN 3: ALTERNATIVE FORMATS

Indicator	1 Not Present	2 Limited	3 Partial	4 Strong	5 Fully Embedded
Materials are available in multiple formats (audio, digital, print)					
Students can access content in different modalities					
Materials support conversion to alternative formats (e.g., Braille)					
Accessible formats are available at the same time as core materials					
Alternative formats maintain the same instructional content, rigor, and usability as core materials					

Evidence / Notes:

Overall Evaluation Score for AD3: Alternative Formats = _____

Score of 5 to 10 ► Limited Alternative Formats

Score of 11 to 15 ► Partial Alternative Formats

Score of 16 to 20 ► Strong Alternative Formats

Score of 21 to 25 ► Fully Embedded Alternative Formats

ACCESSIBILITY DOMAIN 4: ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY COMPATIBILITY

Indicator	1 Not Present	2 Limited	3 Partial	4 Strong	5 Fully Embedded
Materials are compatible with common assistive technologies					
Speech-to-text tools can be used with materials					
Students can interact with content using assistive tools					
Materials do not create barriers when assistive tools are used					
Assistive technology tools function reliably across instructional environments					

Evidence / Notes:

Overall Evaluation Score for AD4: Assistive Technology Compatibility = _____

Score of 5 to 10 ▶ Limited Assistive Technology Compatibility

Score of 11 to 15 ▶ Partial Assistive Technology Compatibility

Score of 16 to 20 ▶ Strong Assistive Technology Compatibility

Score of 21 to 25 ▶ Fully Embedded Assistive Technology Compatibility

ACCESSIBILITY DOMAIN 5: OVERALL ACCESSIBILITY & SYSTEM ALIGNMENT

Indicator	1 Not Present	2 Limited	3 Partial	4 Strong	5 Fully Embedded
Accessibility features are embedded within materials (not external)					
Materials reduce barriers to perception, processing, and response					
Materials support consistent implementation across classrooms					
Materials align to IEP/504 accommodation needs					
Materials can be implemented within district systems (ESE, MTSS)					

Evidence / Notes:

Overall Evaluation Score for AD5: Overall Accessibility & Systems Alignment = _____

Score of 5 to 10 ▶ Limited Overall Accessibility & Systems Alignment

Score of 11 to 15 ▶ Partial Overall Accessibility & Systems Alignment

Score of 16 to 20 ▶ Strong Overall Accessibility & Systems Alignment

Score of 21 to 25 ▶ Fully Embedded Overall Accessibility & Systems Alignment

FINAL REFLECTION: SUMMARY OF ACCESSIBILITY FINDINGS

Purpose

This section supports teams in synthesizing findings from the Accessibility & Usability Checklist to inform instructional materials decisions and implementation planning.

- ▶ Final Reflection Part A: Strengths, Gaps, and Risks
- ▶ Final Reflection Part B: Cross-Cutting Patterns
- ▶ Final Reflection Part C: Implementation Considerations
- ▶ Final Reflection Part D: Overall Accessibility Classification
- ▶ Final Reflection Part E: Final Recommendation
- ▶ Final Reflection Part F: Next Steps

FINAL REFLECTION PART A: STRENGTHS, GAPS, AND POTENTIAL RISKS

Category	Discussion Prompts	Notes
Strengths (Embedded Supports)	Where are accessibility features consistently built into materials and available to all students?	
Gaps (Dependent on Local Capacity)	Where do materials require teacher expertise, additional tools, or system supports to ensure access?	
Potential Risks (Barriers to Access)	Where might gaps in accessibility limit student access or create inconsistent implementation across classrooms?	

FINAL REFLECTION PART B: CROSS-CUTTING PATTERNS

Discussion Prompts	Notes
Where are accessibility supports fully embedded and consistent—and where do they vary?	
Where do materials rely on teacher adaptation?	
What barriers may impact students with disabilities?	
What patterns do we observe across sections (digital, print, formats, assistive technology)?	
Which types of learners (e.g., sensory, cognitive, language-based, physical) may experience the greatest barriers?	

FINAL REFLECTION PART C: IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Discussion Prompts	Notes
What additional support would be required to implement these materials effectively (e.g., training, tools, staffing)?	
How consistent is access likely to be across classrooms and schools?	
To what extent does accessibility depend on individual teacher adaptation?	
Are accessible materials available at the same time as core instruction?	
What system-level conditions (ESE supports, MTSS alignment, technology access) are necessary?	

FINAL REFLECTION PART D: OVERALL ACCESSIBILITY CLASSIFICATION

HQIM	AD1: Digital Accessibility	AD2: Print Accessibility	AD3: Alternative Formats	AD4: Assistive Technology	AD5: Overall Accessibility and System Alignment	Notes from Parts A, B, and C Discussions	Overall Classification
	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited		☐ Strong Embedded Supports ☐ Dependent on Local Capacity ☐ High Risk
	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited		☐ Strong Embedded Supports ☐ Dependent on Local Capacity ☐ High Risk
	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited		☐ Strong Embedded Supports ☐ Dependent on Local Capacity ☐ High Risk
	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited		☐ Strong Embedded Supports ☐ Dependent on Local Capacity ☐ High Risk
	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited	☐ Fully Embedded ☐ Strong ☐ Partial ☐ Limited		☐ Strong Embedded Supports ☐ Dependent on Local Capacity ☐ High Risk

FINAL REFLECTION PART E: FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Discussion Prompt	Notes

FINAL REFLECTION PART F: NEXT STEPS

Action	Owner	Timeline