

**Attendance: 11 voting members, 1 non-voting, and 5 guests, total of 17 total attendees. (note: 8 voting members required to meet quorum)**

<b>Chairs (3)</b>	<b>Classified Senate (3)</b>	<b>Student Senate (2)</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bruce Griffin (DO CTO) (non-voting)	Christina Davis (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Theresa Pedrosa (CC)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christina Davis (CC Classified Supervisory)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rachel Ugale (DO)	<input type="checkbox"/> Vacant
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill Komanetsky (LPC Faculty)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott Vigallon (LPC)	<b>Guests:</b>
<b>Administration (4)</b>	<b>Academic Senate (4)</b>	Angela Castellanos
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nathaniel Rice (CC)	<input type="checkbox"/> Miguel Colon (CC)	Chasity Whiteside
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephen Gunderson (LPC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Ulibarri (CC)	Danita Troche
Vacant (ITS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Ruth Hanna (LPC)	Cathy Gould
Bruce Griffin (DO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Judd (LPC)	Kevin Kramer
<b>College IT Managers (2)</b>	<b>Bargaining Units (2)</b>	Stacy Harris
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Woods (CC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Debbie Fields (FA)	Tamica Ward
Stephen Gunderson (LPC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timothy Druley (SEIU)	Carlos Moreno

<b>Item</b>	<b>Information/Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
	<b>Meeting called to order @ 9:07 am</b>	
1.	<b>Welcome and Quorum Check</b> <i>For information:</i>  Quorum was met with 9 voting members	
2.	<b>Approve Today's Agenda</b> <i>For action:</i>  Lisa Ulibarri moved to approve agenda, Nathaniel Rice seconded. Agenda was approved without modifications 8 yes votes, no abstentions.	
3.	<b>Approve December 10, 2021 and February 11, 2022 Minutes</b> <i>For action:</i>	

	Lisa Ulibarri moved to approve both sets, Debbie Fields voted to hold over, no abstentions so both sets of minutes were approved.	
4.	<p><b>Goal 1 – Technology Master Planning Update and Request for RFQ Response Reviewers</b>  <i>For discussion:</i></p> <p>We had four responses to our RFQ. Three firms were qualified, for various reasons, one firm was not qualified. The selected firm will perform planning sessions and write strategic plans for all three organizations. Pending board approval, WTC Consulting will be our chosen firm. They only do technology planning for higher education, was a big differentiator between them and the other firms. Of the other firms considered, one did planning but was also a CPA firm out of the Midwest, one strictly works in higher education and also does consulting work, but we wanted to focus more on the planning piece without the concern somebody would identify issues so that they can then come back and fix them later.</p> <p>We had two responses that came in late so actually, we had six responses but because they missed the deadline, they were informed that they were non-responsive.</p> <p>As for WTC Consulting, the plan is for them to start immediately after the board meeting so that Wednesday morning we’re having a kickoff call and are identifying individuals that need to be on the initial kick off call. We also need to discuss if we should have an April TCC meeting as our April meeting falls during Spring break, so we want to discuss whether or not we should engage sometime in April so that we can meet with WTC Consulting as a group.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Goal 3 – First Reading of proposed Board Policies and Administrative Procedures</b>  <i>For discussion: Nathaniel Rice</i></p> <p><b>a. BP 3725 Information and Communications Technology Accessibility Rev. 4-22-21</b>  The review team: Tim Druley, Wanda Butterly, Wing Kam, Lisa Ulibarri, Christina Davis, Christopher Crone, Shriya Shah, Thomas Dowrie and Nathaniel Rice</p> <p>The review team found that the language currently used in BP 3725: “...timely manner means that the individual receives access to the instructional materials or ICT <b>at the same time</b> as an individual without a disability.”, cannot refer to alternate media requests because those are produced on an as requested basis and the chancellor’s guidance for alt media is 2 weeks or less for textbooks, not websites. Two weeks is not long enough as it can take an entire semester to convert a math textbook into Braille.</p> <p>Suggested language: “access to the <b>informational</b> materials or ICT <b>at the same time</b> as an individual without a disability, and <b>instructional</b> materials <i>within a specific timeline.</i>”</p> <p>Optional section, two items:  “The chancellor <i>or their designee</i>”  “Social media <i>and other communication and education</i> platforms”  --to cover YouTube, LMS, and as yet unknown interaction platforms</p> <p>Bruce Griffin asked Nathaniel Rice if we know or can we designate who decides what the timeline is, do we need that in or is that referenced elsewhere and Nathaniel replied we can use the specific letter from the Chancellor’s office as a</p>	<p><i>Action Item:</i></p> <p>After March meeting, policies will go to College Council in April/May for vetting than to the Board for policy adoption.</p>

reference. Bruce Griffin wants to make sure whoever it is who needs to make the timeline, actually gets to do it and it isn't handed down to another department.

**b. AP 3725 Info & Communications Tech Accessibility & Acceptable Use Rev. 4-22-21**

Under Equally Effective paragraph: "Equally and independently *as possible*"

Last line: "appropriate to the person's needs *and abilities*."

The review team thought the above listed were good additions because sometimes we have individuals who recently lost their vision and have not yet learned how to completely navigate the computer with accessible software so it is important to have the language reflect the fact that not everyone using accessible software does so at the same level as other user.

Under Instructional Materials paragraph: The committee believes a line needs to be added about "LTIs, publisher provided content, PDF content, and other 3<sup>rd</sup> party materials" as four additional items in the listing of examples.

Under Timely: The same suggestion as for BP

"access to the informational materials or ICT **at the same time** as an individual without a disability, and **instructional materials *within a specified timeline.***"

Under ICT: The last line for purposes of making the umbrella a bit larger to include volunteers, third party vendors, etc.: Ensuring equal access to equally effective instructional materials and ICT is the responsibility of all District administration, faculty, and staff, ***as well as contractors and professional experts, or any other person working under the auspices of the college.***

Under Authorized Users: The language was a bit vague so our suggestion is that it be expanded to include: a certain amount of people involved in the approval process like ePAF is, address who would be grandfathered in, have a time period for processing, training, and approval similar to a new user, and who would do the training and who would be allowed to do the postings?

Wanda Butterly provided a potential training resource: <https://digital.gov/resources/federal-social-media-accessibility-toolkit-hackpad/>

Under Monitoring Content: We suggest adding "...the effectiveness of the content, ***and the accessibility of the content.***"

Additional items needed in AP 3725 pertain to record retention policy (how long meeting minutes need to be publicly accessible), identifying clear and specific contact points who will address requests for remediation of web content which needs to be readily accessible on campus and non-campus websites, and creating and clarifying policies and processes of these issues which is essential in OCR cases, clear and well communicated, and readily available for both campuses.

Following Nathaniel Rice's presentation, Carlos Moreno asked if a discussion about using equitable rather than equally was warranted. Nathaniel responded with explaining "equally accessible" means everyone (sighted or not) has

	<p>access to a PDF whereas equitably accessible means a non-sighted person would be using a screen reading software to access the PDF.</p> <p>Scott Vigallon mentioned staffing shortages impact the ability to fully vet material which makes faculty wait longer for materials and that accessibility checklists are great but not always followed.</p> <p>Bruce Griffin shared AP 6365 regarding contracts and accessibility of information technology which is already in place we may need to refer to AP 6365 when we present to College Council.</p> <p>Motion was made by Nathaniel Rice to move forward with changes to BP &amp; AP 3725 with notes included. Tim Druley seconded. Motion passed with 10 ayes, 0 opposed and no abstentions.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Goal 4: Scheduling a HyFlex Meeting</b>  <i>Information:</i></p> <p>Bruce Griffin announced May 13 as in-person/virtual meeting at the District office for a TCC/HyFlex meeting in Conference Room One and OWL will be utilized.</p>	
7.	<p><b>STAC Software (Proctorio)</b>  <i>Information and discussion:</i></p> <p>Scott Vigallon: STAC list has been pushed back a bit. Proctorio was dropped from the list but can still be purchased through the foundation and not through STAC but it won't have the discount that came with STAC. Proctorio was removed from the list due to equity and privacy reasons, still a lot of instructors who use the tool have said they will not teach online if they didn't have Proctorio.</p> <p>Christina Davis: Chabot committee also made the same recommendation to continue with the same purchases from last year.</p> <p>Nathaniel Price: Proctorio is linked to many racist issues such as not being able to recognize students with darker skin, smaller eyes, or disabilities. An example was a student was not recognized due to a disability that causes his eyes to twitch and it made his entire test to get flagged. Nathaniel asked if any other proctoring tools were looked at such as Honor Lock.</p> <p>Bruce Griffin asked if any other proctoring tools were available through either the foundation or STAC. Scott Vigallon was not aware of any but had heard of Honor Lock and suggested a task force of faculty but didn't think that a task force could convene and vet other proctoring tools before we pay for STAC. Scott Vigallon thought it might be best to move forward with a task force after paying this year's STAC to ensure enough time is utilized to properly vet new software. Christina Davis concurred.</p> <p>Bruce Griffin asked if it made more sense to go back to the respective campus committees so they can look at the issue with Proctorio et al, to identify a proctoring tool with fewer racial implications. Perhaps bring Dean Forbes into the conversation.</p>	

	<p>Nathaniel Price agreed Dean Forbes should be included in the discussion especially as the majority of the faculty currently utilizing Proctorio are in Dean Forbes' area.</p> <p>Given this committee doesn't approve products for purchase, it is best to have the colleges find an equitable solution to this.</p>	
8.	<p><b>Need for April Meeting</b> <i>For information:</i></p> <p>As Spring Break falls on our next meeting date, perhaps instead of having a TCC, this committee can join an ad hoc meeting with WTC Consulting in April outside of our formal TCC meeting.</p>	
9.	<p><b>District ITS News/Updates</b> <i>For information:</i></p> <p>We are currently contracting with a firm to do a security assessment at the district which may tickle down to the colleges as well. We are seeing numerous attempts from overseas to the point that we have temporarily blocked traffic. A group out of St. Petersburg, Russia has been trying to inject code into a URL against Class WEB and they have been blocked. We are also blocking email from Russia and Belarus.</p> <p>The security assessment will bring back recommendations for us to improve our stance on these blocks.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Guided Pathways News/Updates</b> <i>For information/discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chabot College &amp; Las Positas College: Neither college had an update.</li> <li>b. District update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CRM Advise: We are very close to having technical environments completed. It is a cloud hosted tool. The instances at Ellucian are spun up, and in the process of provisioning data out of banner into those test instances.</li> <li>We have a high-level workshop happening on the 22<sup>nd</sup> through 25<sup>th</sup> of March to go over some strategy items to determine</li> <li>Degree Works: The server has been allocated more space, so we will be able to start wrapping up some things on that side.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
11.	<p><b>College Technology Committees News/Updates</b> <i>For information/discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chabot College: Nathaniel Rice reported Kevin Kramer is no longer going to be the admin chair due to a lateral move to Las Positas College. Also, in coordination with the District, we're going to be doing a marketing blitz this coming week for the app.</li> </ul>	

	<p>b. Las Positas College: Tim Druley reported STAC and AP 3725 was discussed at his committee. The main thing we addressed in our committee last week was the demo from Simplicity who demonstrated their product called Accommodate which helps DSDS students get their materials in a timely manner, allows for e-signatures, and electronic acknowledgements that can be used to manage documents.</p>	
12.	<p><b>Good of the Order</b>  <i>For information/discussion:</i></p> <p>Without any items, Bill Komanetsky moved to adjourned. Bruce Griffin seconded.</p>	
	<p><b>Meeting Adjourned at 10:19 with seven affirmative votes.</b>  <b>Future Meeting: May 11</b></p>	

DRAFT