# Winter 2021 Business Meeting

* Date: Thursday, January 28, 2021; 1:34-3:45pm
* Location: Zoom
* 43 Attendees

## 1:34-1:44PM Recap of Fall 2020 Business Minutes (Megan J.)

* Megan J.: We sent a survey to approve in December, but we got low response; so we want to review and give membership a chance to vote.
  + Pause to give membership a chance to review minutes.
* John R. motions to vote, Dan E. seconds.
* Megan J. calls for questions or discussions on minutes before voting.
  + No discussion.
* Vote taken, minutes approved.
* Megan J.: Would membership prefer to vote during next business meeting or via survey between meetings?
  + Mary G. likes seeing the minutes closer to the next business meeting.
  + Michael H. (in chat): Voting at meeting allows discussion.
  + We will continue to vote at the start of the next business meeting.

## 1:44-1:49PM Treasurer Report (Bryan F.)

* Not much change since Fall meeting. There will be a cost for captioning, but awaiting final bill.
* Explains that we need to replenish accessibility line item. After today’s meeting we will have approx. $2400 in General line item and approx. $2200 in Accessibility line item. Total ending balance is $4685.71.
* Dan E.: With no cost Zoom meetings, what happens when we don’t have money in the future?
  + Bryan F.: We will eventually have to reinstate registration fees to sustain funds.
  + Megan J.: Recommendation from WSSSC is to keep budgets lower and below $5000. No cost meetings was a way to spend down budget, but we will eventually need to reinstate fees.

## 1:49-2:08PM WSSSC report or updates (Brendon)

* Megan J. introduces Brendon Taga, VP of Student Services at Olympic College, our WSSSC liaison.
* Three things WSSSC is focusing on: DEI, Guided Pathways, Access and Retention
* WSSSC keeping track of bills in Olympia and executive orders from new federal administration regarding DEI training.
  + Working to step into this work mindfully.
  + Doing best to push back against unfunded mandates and working with Presidents to advocate.
  + SB 5194: Requires institutions to come up with a plan around access and retention w/ focus on DEI. Trying to understand impact to student services areas.
  + SB 2257: DEI and anti-racism professional development/training. The work we do occurs at the intersection of identities.
* Marisa H.: Can you explain WSSSC and reporting structure for new members?
  + WSSSC comprises student service VPs. Addresses issues that cuts across the different councils and commissions. Each one has a WSSSC liaison to assist with communication and advocacy across institutions and groups. SBCTC often uses WSSSC to bring forth legislative priorities. Metaphor: COO for SBCTC and student services to vet efforts and legislation.
* Dan E.: Bill regarding counselor ratios?
  + Brendon T.: There is a fiscal note attached regarding cost.
* Karen F.: Expresses support of SBCTC commitment to DEI. But accessibility seems to be an afterthought, even though it links to DEI. How can WSSSC help us communicate/advocate for that up the chain and get needs met for SWD as part of bigger DEI goal?
  + Marisa H.: How can we express to folks statewide that disability justice is part of racial justice? We need think about how BIPOC individuals with disabilities are impacted by policies.
  + Brendon T.: Understands this and thinks that DEI team in WSSSC is looking at these groups and populations. Will take these questions back to WSSSC.
    - Megan J.: Maybe WSSSC can make recommendations to include intersectionality, accessible tech, and inclusion of these groups in work.
* Jennifer H.: What is WSSSC?
  + Megan J. reiterates what the group is and does.
* Marisa H.: Any updates regarding ctcLink accessibility from WSSSC meeting?
  + There have been a few developments and some conversations. But they knew that there was going to be updates and conversation at our meeting today.

## 2:08-2:26pm Online Admissions Application Portal (OAAP) (Sandy Main, SBCTC)

### Status of the new admissions app and it’s accessibility: Sandy from SBCTC.

* SBCTC has engaged with vendor (Castech) to create new online admissions application. OAAP is the new one.
* Level Access has been contracted to engage in accessibility initial review of OAAP. Found 250 issues, some may be repeated on other pages. Number may be lower once duplicates are removed across pages.
  + Have been broken out by severity level and who it affects (applicant v. backend).
  + Based on findings, vendor has made updates to address them. SBCTC is reviewing fixes and making sure each issues has been evaluated.
  + Vendor has been very responsive to requests RE: access issues.
  + Not 100% done yet, will be sharing finding ctcLink steering committee this afternoon. Information is changing rapidly as vendor is constantly making improvements.

### Membership questions

* Megan J.: Who is vendor and what’s the accessibility plan?
  + Castech and the vendor is contracted to make them WCAG 2.1AA compliant. Will be working with Level Access to verify compliance.
* Dan E.: Will accessibility be completed by 2022 when tech colleges go live?
  + Should be compliant by then, and OAAP will be live at that time along with ctcLink.
* Megan J.: What’s the timeline for when this will go live?
  + Grant R.: Meeting today will review accessibility, go live could be approved today. But want to see what’s been resolved. If high severity has not been resolved, then go live will not be recommended. However, if better than current system individual colleges could decide to move forward, but with knowledge of what’s not compliant and with alternate paths for applications. Discusses go live phases for ctcLink/OAAP.
* Megan J.: For colleges that are live, if a decision is made today to go live with OAAP, then current ctcLink live colleges could opt to begin using OAAP. To membership: Do you think your college might wait for accessibility, or will they go live?
  + Karen F.: Olympic may choose to do so, especially if it is better.
  + Grant R.: OAAP is better than current online app, and vendor is contracted to make accessible. Will be up to each college to weigh factors such as current app, accessibility of OAAP, and timeline for remaining fixes to be implemented, and then decide how to proceed with full transparency of issues.
  + Marisa H.: Recommends that SBCTC state to colleges what laws and policies are being broken if they choose to go live with OAAP before full accessibility is implemented.
    - Grant R.: Thinks that’s fair that colleges are aware of liability, know how to provide alternate access, etc.

## 2:26-2:55pm Okta (Grant Rodeheaver, SBCTC)

### Status of the Okta project, multifactor authentication tool for ctcLink

* Shares background and purpose of Okta. Being implemented for ctcLink.
* Implementation has been pushed back from phase 4.
* Screen reader accessibility will be WCAG 2.1AA compliant for first rollout group and will make sure that there are multifactor authentication options which are accessible before being rolled out after that.
* Vendor has been working with SBCTC on accessibility. Okta is testing new platform to make sure that it is fully compliant. SBCTC will get early peek to see that. Okta is demonstrating commitment to accessibility and collaboration with SBCTC on this.
  + Expecting peek in March to begin testing on new platform.
* SBCTC will work with colleges on login page implementation. And then smaller groups on second implementation piece.

### Membership questions

* Megan J.: What’s in writing with Okta regarding commitments to not deploying login until compliant?
  + Grant R. is willing to put in writing to DSSC that login page will not be deployed until compliant. Also hopeful that full platform will be compliant by rollout.
* Karen F.: Expresses appreciation that there is a willingness to wait on rollout until accessibility compliance. Could we have had more leverage with Okta if we had addressed this piece at the beginning?
  + Grant R.: Accessibility was originally included. No platform that was considered was fully compliant. Due to this there are exceptions that can be made, but you have to have workarounds that are accessible and a plan to become compliant.
* Karen F.: Who will do final accessibility vetting on this product to determine compliance? Same with OAAP?
  + Grant R.: 1) Okta is bringing in independent third-party to validate compliance. SBCTC will be able to test our implementation. 2) Multi-factor piece will also have this same validation and SBCTC will test implementation.
    - SBCTC is really relying on Okta’s third-party validation and documentation for colleges’ decisions.
  + Karen F.: It’s likely that colleges will trust and be attracted to new products if SBCTC is presenting them for deploying.
    - Grant R.: There are often no fully compliant products, we have to make sure we document shortcomings and commitments with vendors to make progress towards and maintain compliance.
    - Karen F.: Colleges should be fully aware and able to find information about these issues.
  + Karen F.: Any updates on Accessible IT Policy Associate position?
    - Grant R.: Saw the email last night that the position has been approved for recruitment. Expects it to be posted anytime.
  + Karen F.: Who’s liable if an institution is sued for non-compliance of a product?
    - Grant R.: Not sure that he has an answer. AG represents all of us and would make that determination. This was a system purchase and system decision in 2012. Best defense is to make progress as quickly and as best as possible.
    - Megan J.: Can Jamie T. share more information on liability?
      * Jamie T: Clarifies that her update was not regarding liability, but the process for a complaint would go through the college.
  + Bryan F.: Are colleges informed about compliance and discrimination concerns?
    - Grant R.: Colleges are provided documentation and have access to vendor’s customer service. Reiterates that many products are not fully compliant and plans are made to reach that.
    - Doug H.: Shares experience with Okta where sales rep thinks just having a VPAT means compliance, but once a tech side rep was involved better clarification of compliance was shared.
  + Marisa: Can you clarify what you mean by equivalent access, especially with regards to a user who is blind?
    - Grant R.: This could be a variety of solutions, for example an actual person to help that individual navigate the process.
    - Marisa H.: That work actually falls on DS professionals and is adding to our workload. Also, Policy 188 states that SWDs should be able to access our institutions from the beginning same as peers without disabilities.

## 2:55-3:13pm Break

## 3:13-4:07pm ctcLink Update (Sandy Main & Grant Rodeheaver)

* Megan J.: Welcome back from break. Acknowledges that Grant R. posted a link to Policy 188 in chat during break.
  + Discussion about evolution of Policy 188 and waiver for equivalent access.
  + Mary G.: The waiver has given CTCs some wiggle room for technology purchasing in our very specialized programs. But VP at her college has to sign off on waiver due to liability.
    - Megan J.: Different risk factors for one-time purchase/class v. something everyone has to use.

### Accessibility status/updates

* Sandy M.: In the past 3 months changes have happened structurally to help support ctcLink accessibility and overall accessibility. Updated how engineers are hired and have a line item to support this work which has allowed them to bring on employees with this skill set.
  + Each ctcLink pillar has an “image” that is reviewed by these engineers for accessibility updates from Oracle.
  + When an image is released an overview document is created that discusses these changes which includes accessibility. Moving forward, there will be supplemental document that discusses this in more depth.
* Sandy M.: ctcLink Mitigation Reports detail what’s been worked one, what’s coming up, and reports from Level Access.
  + One just came out last week.
* Sandy M.: Discussion of prioritization of work. DSSC can help identify pain points that need immediate focus. What suggestions does membership have to this end?
  + Doug H.: How much communication is there between SBCTC and other orgs across US regarding PeopleSoft accessibility? Also, screen reader access is probably most pressing.
    - Sandy M.: SBCTC engages through Higher Ed Users Group for support, and with Oracle’s support pages.
    - Grant R.: Has been in touch with other college/univ. systems which has been helpful, but is more commiserating about their own difficulties working with Oracle. No magic solutions has been identified yet.
  + Marisa H.: Could you clarify what you’re looking for from DSSC?
    - Sandy M.: Asking for DSSC to help identify specific areas of inaccessibility to be addressed.
    - Marisa H.: This doesn’t seem like an appropriate ask for DSSC, rather specific accessibility consultants or Level Access should be doing this.
    - Grant R.: Was thinking that this group, through anecdotal information, may help identify trends that highlight needed priorities.
      * Doug H.: This seems reasonable, but recommends prioritization based on impacts to the greatest number of users.
  + Megan J.: Doesn’t want one college to be responsible for weighing in specific needs. Seems more appropriate for informal, open sessions to be available to the CTC system where anybody can come share accessibility concerns. What do other colleagues think?
    - Jamie H.: How is this different than submitting tickets?
    - Sandy M.: Tickets are individually addressed and prioritized. When there’s a large number of tickets they can’t all be addressed at the same time. SBCTC is then left to prioritize based on their perspective. Is hoping for more information to help them prioritize.
    - Megan J.: Not re-ticketing every time something comes up, but would be likely to come to an open session to share this information. Also, thanks Grant R. and Sandy M. for continuing Highpoint App to help with accessibility. Many issues coming up with students are not being ticketed.
  + Marisa H.: If SBCTC is unclear on how tickets are effecting screen reader users, then SBCTC should consider hiring a screen reader user and paying them appropriately, to help with this. Additionally, it’s not DSSC’s group to engage in prioritization.
    - Sandy M.: Looking for help understanding where pain points are that need to be addressed to make the biggest improvement.
  + Bryan F.: A lot of colleges have had to use 3rd party apps to make Oracle products accessible. Has there been any conversation about bringing in one of these 3rd parties to help with making it accessible?
    - Sandy M.: SBCTC is sometimes limited on what can be done, and these 3rd parties have not always been able to apply a fix w/o completely writing the system.
  + Karen F.: Could focus be put on the sections that are used by the highest number users? And then look at the tickets for those areas.

### Membership questions about ctcLink (or OAAP and Okta)

* Karen F.: Because Highpoint is more user friendly, is there anything there that can be used to help?
  + Megan J.: Suggested at Clark that instead of putting ctcLink on the student page, just put Highpoint there for all students. However, all the training was done in vanilla ctcLink so this was not implemented. Seconds Karen’s idea to prioritize Highpoint use over ctcLink where possible.
    - Karen F.: At Olympic people don’t know about Highpoint.
    - Grant R.: Highpoint is available to all colleges. Acknowledges that SBCTC can probably help get the word out about this to colleges that are live or going live.
    - Jamie H.: Is there a newer version of Highpoint coming soon? If so, that’s a good time to begin advertising it and what it can do.
    - Grant R.: Affirms that new version with additional accessibility is coming soon, by end of year, if not sooner.
* Megan J.: Are there any plans or commitments with Oracle to get accessibility implemented.
  + Grant R.: Next opportunity will likely be in two years when contract is re-negotiated/renewed for maintenance. Updates are coming that may help address some of these issues. But working with large companies is difficult given their broad user base.
* Megan J.: Any estimate on where accessibility will be a year from now in ctcLink?
  + Grant R.: Any estimate now would be a guess at best. Things are improving, but can’t say what it will look like that far out.
* Jamie H.: Any updates on confidentiality issues?
  + Sandy M.: Meeting with security team next week to review what can be done to protect the individual areas. This work is beginning and will be reaching out to people for additional information and help.
    - Marisa H.: Happy to help with this as the work begins
  + Marisa H.: There seems to be misunderstanding across the state and w/in institutions about the specific confidentiality issues. Would like to make sure that the issue is clarified so that there is clear understanding.
    - Sandy M.: Working with AG on this issue. Next week will begin identifying why are these issues in the first place and investigating the downstream effects.
    - Megan J: An easy fix may be to say HR offices can’t use this area of the system so that employee/student disability confidentiality is protected to prevent employment discrimination. Or have DS offices report in a different way not in ctcLink.
  + Marisa H.: As DSSC, we can begin thinking about how we’re coding and what the state data board needs.

## 4:07pm Meeting Adjournment

* Megan J. concludes meeting and thanks membership.

END OF MEETING MINUTES.

*Submitted respectfully to the board by Jake Swanke, DSSC Secretary.*