**Fall 2021 Business Meeting Agenda**

DSSC Virtual Zoom Business Meeting, 32 attendees

Thursday, October 21st, 1:30pm-4pm

1:30-1:40PM (10 min.) Vote on Spring 2021 Business Minutes. (Megan)

* Review of minutes. Corrections made.
* Jake motions to approve minutes. Craig K. seconds.
* Minutes approved by membership vote.

1:40-1:55PM (15 min.) Treasurer Report (Quida)

* Laquida W. shares and reviews report. Discusses starting balance, revenue, expenses, and ending balance.
* Megan J.: Explains the purpose of the accessibility line item. We try to keep $3000 reserved for accessibility needs at meetings. We will be a little below $3000 after this meeting.
	+ Craig K.: Do we use 3Play because of the state contract? REV is cheaper and just as accurate as 3Play.
	+ Megan J.: We don’t have to use 3Play, the 3Play line item is really a captioning line item. Are there any tips for captioning and reducing cost?
	+ Susanne W.: The CART file can be edited and used as the captions.
	+ Monica O.: When you have a CART provider in Zoom, you have access to their file and the Zoom auto-transcript file. Perhaps Susanne and Monica could demo steps for editing CART files to use as captions.
	+ Megan J.: Will reach out to members about possibility of doing captioning.
	+ Monica O.: It can be done in-house, but it’s easier to send it out and saves stress and frustration, especially if the cost is already budgeted.

1:55-2:25PM (30 min.)  SBCTC Liaison Updates and DAP reporting (Monica Olsson)

* Monica Olson, SBCTC Policy Associate
* Information is available in PowerPoint document in Fall 2021 Meeting Materials in Google Drive.

**SBCTC Updates**

* Recently hosted a webinar, “How to Read a VPAT”. Webinar has been recorded, captioned, and will be made available along with the PowerPoint.
* Procurement policy workgroup meets to improve the state procurement policy and to create a guidance document on procurement to be shared out.
	+ A common issue that continues to come up is that the vendor’s accessibility information is not always accurate.
* Not every school has a person with expertise to conduct accessibility testing of software or the web. Working on resources to build skills on this at the state board level and across the system.
* Working on refreshing and updating the “Micro Courses” pdfs and Canvas modules on accessibility. These are courses that people can enroll in and earn badges for completing.
	+ Karen F.: Are the public facing courses also affected?
	+ Monica O.: Not yet, but they will update eventually.
* Common messaging document was sent out and is available in meeting materials.
* Presidents have decided to delay for 1-2 years the allocation funding review and improvements.
	+ Marisa H.: The delay puts the new timeframe for review at the same time as the new biennium. Shouldn’t that be done beforehand?
	+ Monica O.: I understand and don’t have additional info on that currently. Will look into it.
	+ Brendon T.: Does not have anything to add on that at this time either.

**DAP discussion**

* SBCTC requires DAP reporting, but it is not reviewed on a consistent basis.
* DAP reports do not inform or change funds that colleges receive for student accommodation services.
* Karen F.: It would be helpful to give an overview of DAP for newer members. Also, DAP has been helpful in that it allows our office to carefully track spending.
	+ Megan J.: DAP was originally used for fund allocation, but it has been helpful to demonstrate at institution what we spend. Essentially, the state board tells us to do it, but it benefits at the local level. There are no funds attached to DAP anymore.
* Rebecca L.: Was DAP reporting due in August?
	+ Monica O.: It is not required this year. There’s no clear benefit for why to do it so we’re taking time to determine how to move forward.
* Megan J.: Is there a group that wants to work on reviewing DAP with Monica?
	+ Marisa H.: There may be some possibility to partner on this with ctcLink coding issues, or to do the coding piece first and see how that influences DAP. Coding probably needs to take priority.
	+ Megan J.: Let’s circle back to this later in the meeting so that we can take a break and have time for scheduled guests?

*2:26-2:40 (15min break)*

2:40pm-3:07pm (15-20min) SBCTC Updates related to Accessibility of ctcLink/People Soft (Monica Olsson & Sandy Main)

* Monica O.: State board now has on-going meetings with Oracle to address accessibility. Accessibility focus groups with Oracle. Information has been provided to Oracle and Oracle is reviewing per the internal process. Moving forward, how will SBCTC integrate accessibility remediation in the post-deployment ctcLink world? And how do we transition to a proactive approach/model for accessibility remediation?
	+ Sandy Main: It is now part of process when something new is introduced to engage in an accessibility review and working with Oracle on those.

**Questions**

* Karen F.: Could you clarify, the accessibility review is happening internally? Is there external review?
	+ Sandy M.: The review is happening internally, we don’t have the resources for external review. Will welcome volunteers to help.
	+ Monica O.: Reiterates that Sandy’s team is reviewing new updates before they go out or as soon as possible to catch accessibility issues.
* Monica O.: Has gotten the go ahead to draft an accessibility position for review at the state board.
* Megan J.: One of our colleges needs a third party agreement to remedy our ctcLink/PeopleSoft to accessibility compliance by a specific date set by OCR. Would that request go to SBCTC or Oracle or? Could you get back to me so I can share that answer?
	+ Sandy M.: We will look into this and get back to you on this.
	+ Marisa H: (in chat) Since OCR has findings on ctcLink, are we able to know what those were from Clark?
	+ Megan J.: There are not findings now, it may go to findings if a resolution on ctcLink does not happen. It is in-process and there is nothing that can be shared currently.
	+ Craig K.: Encouraging us and SBCTC to pay attention to this as similar complaints could happen system-wide.
	+ Sandy M.: Have requested fixes from Oracle, but we don’t have a resolution or timeline from them yet.
	+ Monica O.: Summarizes that we need to know who the third-party agreement goes through and need to know a timeframe for this. Priority is making student-facing pages accessible.

3:07-3:18pm (15min) WSSSC report or updates (Brendon Taga)

* Brendon T. shared the following links in chat:
	+ Strategic Technology Advisory Council:
	<https://www.sbctc.edu/about/task-forces-work-groups/stac/default.aspx>
	+ Washington State Student Services Commission (WSSSC): <https://www.sbctc.edu/colleges-staff/commissions-councils/wsssc/default.aspx>
* WSSSC is putting together strategic plan for coming year with specific focus on DEI/equity work.
* WSSSC wants to be able to escalate issues from DSSC and get answers and timelines with as minimal a burden to DSSC in that process.
* Strategic Technology Advisory Council (STAC) is looking at how enhancements and issues are evaluated and prioritized; system or global enhancements/issues vs. local ones. Creating a decision making structure and process so that these can be more clearly tracked and escalated as needed.

**Questions**

* Mary G.: No question, thanks Brendon for jumping in and support DSSC.
* Brendon T.: Please email with any questions; btaga@olympic.edu

3:18-3:29pm (10-15min.) Voting on Work plan for this year (Megan)

* Megan J. shares work plan on screen.
* Megan J.: We are proposing that we continue previous work plan. Other councils use two-year plans.
* Megan J. reviews work plan goals and outcomes.
* Megan J.: Thoughts on continuing the same work plan for the next year?
	+ Mary G. likes the idea of continuing it.
* Megan J.: We need to motion to vote on continuing the work plan for next year.
	+ Mary G. motions to approve. Bryan F. seconds.
	+ Membership votes to approve work plan.

3:29-3:44 (10-15min) CATO updates (Karen)

* Karen F.: For new members, CATO is Committee on Accessible Technology Oversight. It formed as a group to bring attention to inaccessibility of emerging technologies, spurred by lawsuits at the time happening at other institutions, to powers that be at the state. Doug Hayman and Zach Lattin are current co-chairs of CATO.
* Ward Naf has created a compliance tracker to help see what others have said about accessibility of product.

3:25-3:40pm (15min.) ctcLink data issues & email sent to membership (Megan)

* Megan J.: Any action items to discuss regarding ctcLink coding or data issues?
	+ Susanne W.: Do we need to have a group to work with Monica to talk with the state board about how data is being used?
	+ Megan J.: Marisa H. wants to explore, with others, the data and coding issues in ctcLink.
* Megan J.: DAP is optional now. We should bring it back in winter once we know more about data and how it is being used.

3:40-4:40pm (15min.) Medical Exemptions for students & drafted letter (Marissa)

* Megan J.: How as membership do we want to raise this issues? Does a group come together to draft a letter, and is it from DSSC or individual institutions?
	+ Karen F.: Do we need to first determine what our position is? And who on campuses is qualified compared to DS offices?
	+ Eric T.: DS offices that shouldn’t be doing it. I’m reluctant to be involved as it isn’t a request for accommodations. The CDC has provided clear guidance on when exemptions should be provided. But the onus is on the campus as a whole to put a process together, not just DS offices.
	+ Bryan F.: A concern is the differential treatment of medical exemptions vs. religious exemptions. Why are medical exemptions being subjected to greater scrutiny than religious exemptions? Would be happy to work in a group to draft a letter on the topic.
* Megan J.: There seems to be a consensus of the need to draft a letter. Some campus leadership or AGs seem to want to provide more flexibility than others.
* Eric T.: The work we do is based on laws, court determinations, etc. These vaccinations are not currently based on laws, they are based on campus policies and the governor’s directives.
	+ Marisa H.: We are being asked to engage in our process as directed by relevant laws. There are not laws that guide every accommodation, but on campus we engage in that review. There are long-term recommendations that we can make that would address a similar situation in the future.
* Marisa H.: There is a Google doc to help draft the letter. We need to decide on if we’re doing a letter and how were doing that.
* Karen F.: Supports the drafting of a letter. Didn’t necessarily want to be involved with process, but more concerned about what would happen if she wasn’t.
* Mary G.: Concerned about how we manage approved exemptions once mask mandates are lifted and how we ensure those with approved exemptions are wearing masks once those mandates are lifted.
* Karen F.: We started process about 1 month ago and no official approvals have been sent.

*4:07-4:17 10 minute break in this discussion*

* Marisa H.: Shared letter in chat. Perhaps we should vote on bullet points as topics to include in letter?
	+ Craig K.: When the letter is in final format, will we vote on that? If so, we probably don’t need to vote on the draft.
	+ Marisa H.: Previously we have voted when we want to write letter to make sure majority of membership is in agreement on the direction.
* Karen F.: Concerns over current lack consistent guidance amongst AGs.
	+ Marisa H.: We probably should call out specific individuals, or positions, but we can ask for consistent guidance across the system. And resources.
* Megan J.: We could recommend that campus nurses or health centers take on or be involved in the process.
	+ Natalie B.: Could counseling centers assist with this given their medical experience?
* Karen F.: There is still a clarification needed around if an exemption is an accommodation. If the campus policy requires vaccination, then requesting an exception/modification to it is requesting an accommodation.
* Megan J.: Are you comfortable with your office making a determination on an exemption, or determining accommodations after an exemption decision is made?
	+ Craig K.: An exemption request is a request to a policy modification, step one. Then reasonable accommodations for that exemption decision is made, step two.
	+ Mary G.: Craig who will make sure exempted students are wearing masks?
	+ Craig K.: We haven’t determined that yet since our mask requirement for mask is through the end of the quarter
* Hope S.: We make decisions/accommodations on disability. A lot of these requests, the conditions do not rise to the level of disability. If we’re involved, do we redefine what disability is in the context of our offices and work?
	+ Marisa H.: Determining disability status is about determining if there is significant barrier to participation being experienced. People who are not familiar with this week may come to different determination because they don’t do this on a regular basis like we do.
	+ Hope S.: Pierce is just asking providers to check a box that the individual cannot be vaccinated for a medical reason. Concern is that the college is determining that those individuals have a condition serious enough to exempt them, they may then expect other accommodations down the road.
* Megan J.: Is there a motion to move forward drafting a letter using the bullet points in the shared google doc?
	+ Hope S. motions. Mary G. seconds.
	+ Motion approved by membership vote.

4:40pm Close (Megan)

* Business meeting adjourns.