|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ​​Minutes​ | |
| Digital Accessibility and Equity Governance ​​Board Meeting (DAEGB)​ | |
| **​​DATE​** | ​October 21, 2024​ |
| **​​TIME​** | ​​3:04 PM​ EST. |
| **​​MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY​** | ​​Ashley Bloom, CIAO, EOTSS |

1. **Introduction and Roll Call**

Jason Snyder, Secretary, Executive Office of Technology Services and Security (not present)

Ashley Bloom, CIAO EOTSS (present)

Mark Fine, Assistant Secretary for Administration, Executive Office of Administration and Finance (joined at 3:14pm)

Heath Fahle, Assistant Secretary for Finance, Executive Office of Economic Development (not present)

Antoine Harrison, SCIO, Executive Office of Education (present)

Greg Martin Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (present)

Caroline Whitehouse, Executive Office of Health and Human Services (present)

Paul Franzese, COO, Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development (present)

Maria Michalski, SCIO, Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (present)

Dave Bedard, SCIO, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (present)

Brian Chase, SCIO, Executive Office of Veterans Services (present)

Yarlennys Villaman, Governor’s Office (present)

Dan Sionkiewicz (not present)

Dr. Opeoluwa Sotonwa, Commissioner, Massachusetts Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (present)

John Oliveira, Commissioner, Massachusetts Commission for the Blind (present)

Julia O’Leary for Mary MacCauley, Massachusetts Office on Disability (present)

Minh Ha (present)

David Kingsbury (present)

Larry Goldberg (not present)

1. **Accessibility Strategic Plan Feedback Discussion.**

​Discussion and feedback regarding accessibility strategic plan. Naomi Martinez, consultant for NAVA, guiding the feedback discussion and questions with other NAVA consultants. Naomi provides a brief overview of the process of collection of information and development of the strategic plan. Review of guiding questions and prompts regarding action steps for the strategic plan. Goals and Strategies review. NAVA will be documenting the feedback for today’s session.

Board members received a copy of the strategic plan on October 7th

1. Were all areas of digital accessibility covered sufficiently with priorities and action steps?
2. Which, if any, action steps need further detail or clarity in order to be actionable?
3. Which, if any, action steps seem infeasible and why?
4. What else can be included in this plan to provide the Commonwealth with strategic direction toward accessibility maturity?
5. Any additional ideas about what to change or include in this plan?

**Feedback spreadsheet:**

# Async Feedback from Board 10/21/24

[Feedback Spreadsheet Link](https://massgov-my.sharepoint.com/:x:/r/personal/yukiko_gannett_mass_gov/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7BE51B7DAE-BEF1-4BC0-9E58-38C69D955C02%7D&file=Feedback%20for%20the%20Digital%20Accessibility%20and%20Equity%20Strategic%20Plan.xlsx&fromShare=true&action=default&mobileredirect=true)

## Sections

### Executive Summary

* Feedback: The document is quite dense and could benefit from a matrix table with goals, strategies, next steps, who responsible, timeframe, etc. all in one place. This would make it much easier to see it holistically and all in one place. Otherwise, it is difficult to digest.
  + Ashley response: Can this be part of the accompanying roadmap? We also do not have defined roles and responsibilities yet, could be very lacking in some of these areas mentioned
  + **Action item:** We are not creating roadmap, follow-up with Ashley to align on this.
  + **Assigned to: N**alleli
  + **Status:** Complete

### Goal 1

* Feedback on strategy 1: When does EOTSS anticipate moving to WCAG 2.2
  + Notes from Nava: We will not be including info on WCAG 2.2 per our previous conversations
  + Ashley response: Agree
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Contracted Services - Reminder that MCDHH holds the contract (MCD10) for Interpreter services
  + Notes from Nava: Too detailed for the strategic plan, we propose keeping info high-level to align with the rest of the plan
  + Ashley response: Agree
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Contracted Services - Recommend standards for captioning driven by MCDHH, MOD, MCB - there is a consistent quality consideration with automated captioning, CART services are strongly recommended and generally preferred - MCDHH should weigh in on policy drivers here
  + Notes from Nava: We can include this language in a broader sense, please advise
  + Ashley response: Sure, add language, but not too detailed, really want to keep this high level
  + **Action item:** Work with/In collaboration with these agencies to create captioning standards. Captioning standards are driven by a series of agencies, including… A version of this language should be incorporated into SP
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Recommend review of CoMA spend on Interpreter Services and other contracted services from MCDHH to arrive at a funding starting point
  + Notes from Nava: This is for operationalization of agency/secretariat strategies. We propose keeping high-level
  + Ashley response: Agree
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Some agencies have funding restrictions (federal funding, grants) - are there matching grants or IT Capital paths to provide funding for audit and remediation?
  + Notes from Nava: Q for Ashley and team to follow-up on with Board
  + Ashley response: agree
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Enterprise adoption may impact staffing in MCDHH for Interpreter Referrals, and we may not have sufficient Interpreters available across the Commonwealth to support this
  + Notes from Nava: We highlighted that this will be an additional funding need, but this is something secretariats need to work with TSS to solution through
  + Ashley response; Agree
  + **Action item:** Add “interpreters” to list in section
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Recommend mirroring the Cybersecurity model, required annual training, managed through the same designee that pulls reports for compliance
  + Notes from Nava: This is a recommendation for operationalization and outside of the strategic plan scope. We propose keeping language as is, please advise.
  + Ashley response: Yes, please keep as is
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Who are the tooling users? Accessibility staff or all staff?
  + Notes from Nava: We have this level of detail in V1, should we add it back in?
  + Ashley response: Tooling is accessibility team and for all users, do not want to prescribe tooling requirements right now, please keep language minimal and high level
  + **Action item:** Take a look at wording and make sure it implies tooling is for all
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Should include specific learning opportunities for staff. Where should funding be allocated?
  + Notes from Nava: This is level of detail each Secretariat/Agency needs to determine for operationalization. We propose, adding a sentence or two somewhere in the strategic plan to call out that folks need to determine their funding needs, since they will vary across Secretariats/Agencies.
  + Ashley response: Would include language as part of the funding strategy to call this out
  + **Action item:** Include language as part of funding strategy
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** To-do
  + **Status:** Complete

* Feedback on strategy 2: Will a list of approved assets be created? Move users off of other assets?
  + Notes from Nava: Needs to be determined internally with TSS, can be included in an internal knowledge hub. The knowledge hub is included in earlier versions of the strategic plan, we can add language back in. Please advise.
  + Ashley response: I think we have an action step for one of the strategies to create an internal knowledgebase. What is included in this will be TBD. If this is already included as part of the action steps for a strategy, no further details are needed
  + **Action item:** Email Ashley to share that it was removed, should we add it back in under communications section?
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 2: Should be listed as #1 to align with previous section where SIAOs are hired first and they work on determining the requirements for funding needed for the program at the Secretariat level, including additional staffing.
  + Notes from Nava: This was originally removed, because it was repetitive with #3. We can move #3 to #1, please advise.
  + Ashley response: This is difficult to follow, please move where best fits
  + **Action item:** Move #3 up to #1
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete

### Goal 2

* Feedback on strategy 6: Please include Veteran identifiers as a characteristic, cross referenced to VA diagnostic codes for service connected disability/impairment determination ratings that match accessibility characteristics (see 38 CFR Part 4 for guidance)
  + Notes from Nava: No strategy 6 in goal 2, please advise on how to move forward with this. We also do not define types of disabilities in the strategic plan, too detailed, propose not including.
  + Ashley response : agree, too much detail, maybe they were thinking vets as part of external engagement constituents?
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 3: Not everyone feels they have the time to add this to their workload/responsibilities. Culture change is needed.
  + Notes from Nava: Worth following up on with the Board in future conversations.
  + Ashley response: Yes, culture and operational change management is definitely needed
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 3: Amend job descriptions, “Define roles and responsibilities of Commonwealth employees in the practice of digital accessibility and equity.”
  + Notes from Nava: we can add "and amend job descriptions when..."
  + Ashley response: Further internal discussion is needed about this
  + **Action item:** Email Ashely for follow-up
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 3: Add IT security, “Coordinate with other relevant strategic initiatives and programs (e.g., data governance, AI governance, IT security, language access, implementation of Executive Orders 612 and 615, etc.) to represent digital accessibility and equity considerations. The Central Team will incorporate requirements from these related initiatives into the Program as needed.” (start 3, next action item #8)
  + Notes from Nava: We can add
  + Ashley response: ok? Why add IT security?
  + **Action item:** Email Ashely for follow-up
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete

* Feedback overall: How does this fit with digital roadmap?
  + Notes from Nava: Needs to be determined outside of strategic plan when going through change management process
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete

### Goal 3

* Feedback on strategy 4: Opening - DAEGB includes MCDHH, MCB, stakeholders include MassAbility, DMH, DDS and DPH as well, so we hear the voice of the community effectively
  + Notes from Nava: We don't list other agencies, should we include this list?
  + Ashley response: I think we discussed this during our Tuesday meeting
  + **Action item:** Create list
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete

* Feedback on strategy 4: Commonwealth is spelled incorrectly in the link
  + Notes from Nava: We can fix
  + **Action item:**  fix
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** complete
* Feedback on strategy 4: Please include EOVS as many of our constituents have service-connected disabilities.
  + Notes from Nava: We don't list other agencies, should we include? We can add to strategy 5 if we decide to add, but it may be too specific
  + Ashley response: Too specific
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 4: Create working group for SCIOs and staff to meet
  + Notes from Nava: We can add
  + Ashley response: Can create collaboratives for SCIOs and SIAOS
  + **Action item:** Update language
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete

* Feedback on strategy 5: Opening - How do we defined underserved communities in the context of accessibility? What’s the driver - lack of access, lack of clarity, lack of preference, missing voice or stakeholder engagement? Trust? Culture & History?
  + Notes from Nava: Will add definition in appendix, please propose other language if you would not like to use 'underserved'
  + Ashley response: cannot think of alternative description, can we just use all communities?
  + **Action item: Update to ‘all communities’**
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 5: Add Schools and independent living centers as resources?
  + Notes from Nava: We can add
  + Ashley response: Sure
  + **Action item: add language**
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 5: Include MCB and MassAbility here
  + Notes from Nava: We can add
  + Ashley response: Sure
  + **Action item: add language**
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 5: Please include EOVS and community organizations focused on the accessibility needs of Veterans
  + Notes from Nava: We can add
  + Ashley response; Sure
  + **Action item: add language**
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 5: Build on practices already in place – ODCR
  + Notes from Nava: We can add, “build on practices already in place”
  + Ashley response; Agree
  + **Action item: add language**
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete

### Goal 4

* Feedback on strategy 7: After stage #2 - include a vendor scorecard approach to review vendor outcomes and rank those who perform well?
  + Notes from Nava: We can add, suggest this is included in a central knowledge hub for Secretariats/Agencies
  + Ashley response: This can be included as a recommendation, but would be very difficult to achieve
  + Goal 4 start 7 action Establish a process to address vendor noncompliance with accessibility and contractual obligations.
  + **Action item: add language on scorecard**
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete

### Goal 5

* Feedback re: responsibility: Plan to add to job descriptions
  + Notes from Nava: We have sample job descriptions in appendix. Should we include different ones or more?
  + Ashley response: Not sure what to do here, we will need additional members for the central team but I can create those descriptions
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on training and union approval: Required training/union approval
  + Notes from Nava: we can add language to call out that bargaining agreement would be consulted when developing or procuring training
  + Ashley response: Agree
  + **Action item:**  add language in union
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete

* Feedback on strategy 8: We have learned that it is very important to employees to have their training recorded in a transcript for managers.
  + Notes from Nava: We will add sentence to mention the importance of recording trainings
  + Ashley response; Not sure what this is, but sure, please included if needed
  + **Action item:** ass language on recording
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete

* Feedback on access and feedback: Develop a mechanism for employees to confidentially report digital products that are not accessible.
  + Notes from Nava: We can include catch-all accessibility email to gather feedback from Secretariats/Agencies. Please propose other method or approach if a catch-all email doesn’t make sense. Ultimately, we agree that there should be a way for employees to connect with the central team or the appropriate teams as needed for questions and support.
  + Ashley response; I agree, this is to be identified when we create feedback methods. Perhaps adding language to create internal employee feedback loop
  + **Action item:** add language oncreating internal employee feedback loop
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete

### Goal 6

* Feedback: Cadence should be annual
  + Notes from Nava: Will update language to say annual/be less vague
  + **Action item:** update language
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback: Recommend breaking this down into several goals, it's a great deal of detail and harder to measure in a single goal
  + Notes from Nava: Was originally across separate goals, we decided to merge in earlier discussions. We propose keeping as is.
  + Ashley response: Agree
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 9: Survey to set baseline, quarterly or annual to follow up?
  + Notes from Nava: Included in V1, we can add back in
  + Ashley response: Not sure what type of survey this is referencing, add back in if really needed as a recommendation
  + **Action item:** bring in language from V1, keep high-level, “set a baseline, develop method for tracking”
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 9: Do we need to collect VPATs for all SAAS and third-party software
  + Notes from Nava: Ashley and team, please advise. Language on VPATS was in V1, please advise on next steps.
  + Ashley response: This is more of a procurement process, there are several things that will be required from vendors more than just a VPAT going forward, too much detail to put in the plan in my opinion
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 9: bullet #2 this seems well outside the bounds of accessibility - is the intent to build a profile at the user level with these characteristics?
  + Notes from Nava: Will leave as is, added per Devyn's request
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 9: bullet #3 - what is the standard measure for usability?
  + Notes from Nava: It depends on what you're measuring, would be challenging to add a standard measure because of this. We propose keeping this out.
  + Ashley response: Agree
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 9: bullet #1 - is mayflower standard only applied to UI's on mass.gov?
  + Notes from Nava: Not everyone has to use it, but everyone does need to meet accessibility standards. We can include language on this, please advise.
  + Ashley response: Yes, please include language to call out accessibility being required for additional design system/component use other than Mayflower
  + **Action item: update language**
  + **Assigned to: Yuleidy**
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 9: "Peoples needs" - including people with disabilities, people from rural areas, people from historically marginalized communities and people from gateway cities.
  + Notes from Nava: Will do, please advise if you would not like us to include this.
  + Ashley response: No comment
  + **Action item: add language**
  + **Assigned to:** Nalleli
  + **Status:** Complete

* Feedback on strategy 10: Yes, but hard to find a one size fits all solution
  + Notes from Nava: N/A
* a timeline and expected cadence for remediation of legacy applications?
  + Notes from Nava: We moved away from timelines and deadlines, we propose keeping this out, but worth following up on in future conversations.
  + Ashley response: agree
  + **Action item:** Keep as is
  + **Assigned to:** N/A
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 11: Need an inventory and to identify common platforms across agencies
  + Notes from Nava: We had an inventory in earlier versions, but we wanted to move away from sequencing, so we removed this. Please advise, we propose keeping as is.
  + Ashley response: Pretty sure there is an action step to create an application inventory, if so, please leave as is, if not, please add
  + **Action item:** we will add inventory back in
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete
* Feedback on strategy 12: Provide training and tools, another person to review as a process
  + Notes from Nava: Will do
  + **Action item:**  add language
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy
  + **Status:** Complete

### Appendixes

* Feedback on Appendix D: Second block, capitalize p in SharePoint for consistency
  + Notes from Nava: Will do
  + **Action item:**  update
  + **Assigned to:** Yuleidy

1. **BOARD REMARKS.** None.
2. **PUBLIC REMARKS.** None.

**Motion to Adjourn by Ashley, second by Maria Michalski.**

**Meeting ended 4:01pm.**