

What was the most helpful aspect of the convening?	What was the least helpful aspect of the convening?	What topics/issues/types of activities would you like to see covered/included at the next event?
Group work time and learning of Whatcom's procurement process	All of it was helpful, just that not every speaker was 'energizing'.	I would like to see communication/change management plans
Time working with my college's accessibility team	The presentation on SBCTC's roles	Time to meet with people in similar roles at other colleges; time with another college team reviewing components of each other's plan and then sharing out with the larger group
The dedicated time with our team and in-person, spontaneous access to expertise on the topic.	Frankly, very little of the content was new to our team except for the details of the Montana experience. Also, the group times really weren't structured in helpful ways, so we subverted the schedule and followed our own agenda for those times.	Well, I expect we will be in a very different place by the time that comes around, so I anticipate issues like this: what's an appropriate budget / budget strategy to support Accessible IT? What are the indicators that a culture has changed? How do you transition from a grant-funded working group to a permanent governance structure?
Hearing about Whatcom's efforts and experiences, and having some time to work with my team on our plan.	We did not have nearly enough time to work together on our plan. This was a golden opportunity for us to be off-campus as a team for two days, but we were not able to maximize that opportunity. It would have been nice to work for segments of time, then take breaks for feedback, sharing out, and gathering input. I felt a lot of the information that was shared were things we already knew or didn't really need, and the activities really didn't move us closer to an action plan. Also, all the "listening" for long periods of time made it hard to stay engaged.	Goal setting, clear advice on steps to take, adequate work time to accomplish goals, fewer "speeches."
Having so many different representatives from from so many different departments & colleges to network with	The lady from Montana, really mono-tone & all over the place on what she was saying, so I was lost & disengaged from the talk	Not sure
knowing we aren't alone in where we are, networking	Hearing why we were doing this many times with many perspectives on the first day. We understand the why, we all drank the kool-aid :)	I'm at a disadvantage here as what I was looking for was covered on day 2 after I had to run out
The structured conversation at the beginning of day two, and Whatcom's presentation on day one.	Very long breaks, unstructured sharing time. The presentation from U of M which was a repeat of the webinar that most of us had already attended. Two days could have been completed in one more structured day.	Some time for sharing with our cohorts - ie: eLearning folks, PR folks, IT folks, etc. to share what each is doing locally to find points of synergy and / or integration.

What was the most helpful aspect of the convening?	What was the least helpful aspect of the convening?	What topics/issues/types of activities would you like to see covered/included at the next event?
The opportunity to spend some time away from campus with a small group of colleagues; hearing questions and collecting ideas from participants at other colleges.	Although the worksheets provided during the session were helpful, I did not find Janet Sedley's presentation to be either engaging or useful. I was also troubled by the Whatcom presentation, which seemed to be advocating a very centralized, top-down, bureaucratic, and compliance- and oversight-focused approach to accessibility planning. Featuring this approach on the first morning seemed to me like a tacit endorsement of this approach. I'm sure that wasn't intended, but at the very least I would have liked to see this presentation balanced with other more distributed or collective approaches that emphasize awareness, education, shared responsibility, communal decision-making, and opportunities for cultivating faculty/staff agency around equity and accessibility.	I had hoped for a more structured, facilitated planning process. There was some of this scattered throughout, but the team from my college would have benefited from a slightly more directed approach. For example, it might have been helpful to structure a series of activities over the two days: assessing where you are as a college, followed by identifying a set of goals, followed by prioritizing those goals, etc. That's not to say we can't do that on our own on our campus, but I think we had been under the impression that the purpose of the convening was to do more of that type of work.
Working with my group on the start of a plan, lots of good ideas from different perspectives.	For me - great, dynamic, presenters are vital for a successful and a truly helpful meeting (that would be only you at this point). You can have the best information ignored because the speaker was dull.	I would like to hear how each college has progressed and how it was accomplished. (e.g. it was suggested that we incorporate language to reflect accessibility as part of the 5 dimensions of equity.)
Time for working with our college group	I thought most of day 1 was too basic for where we are currently. Also not keeping to the schedule was somewhat confusing/frustrating for our group (at least it didn't seem like we were keeping to the schedule).	I would like to hear how people are approaching specific challenges rather than general overviews. Also, time to work with our own college team in a focused environment is really valuable.
Whatcom's procurement. Details/materials were great.	UMT's presentation. Hoping to hear more about the details of their action plans and the ins and outs of their implementation.	An in-depth look at implementation plans down to the small details.
The time to work on our action plan	University of Montana presentation - too abstract	Sharing roadblocks and solutions. Perhaps asking all participants to share what resources they've been able to put together for their campus (distribute before meeting so questions can be asked).
Jess's explanation of the current compliance atmosphere.	Nothing, it was great.	Actual checklists and procedures - like Wade's examples.

What was the most helpful aspect of the convening?	What was the least helpful aspect of the convening?	What topics/issues/types of activities would you like to see covered/included at the next event?
The time spent working on our campus plan in small groups.	The presentations from other colleges. They were too long and could have been summarized in much shorter ways. Many situations may or may not even apply to our campus, so it wasn't very helpful. I did not find the space very accessible, and there was a person with a wheelchair who could not maneuver around easily. I did not find the structure of the sessions to be very UDL in that they were strictly lecture based, with little pair, group or movement oriented interaction. Rather it was lecture and then share out to the large group. I highly recommend making it more interactive and possibly flip the training by having us read things in advance so that we can DO more and hear someone talking at us less.	I'd like to find ways to connect accessibility to Universal Design more. I think that if faculty and staff see the use of something impacting a wider variety of students, they would buy off more, especially in terms of student responsiveness.
Learning from other colleges		More training materials - examples from other colleges
Hearing from Whatcom since they have implemented so much	Hearing the info on day 1 that we have already heard via webinars and other trainings	More work targeted at specific aspects of our plans--the scenarios exercise was very helpful so if we did some work like that to help us work through solutions for testing, training, etc. Also, meeting with our counterparts at other colleges seems critical as some of us are the only person on our team who is knowledgeable about a particular topic so connecting with peers is vital.
Time with our team to work on our accessibility plan and learning about other's successes and examples, such as Whatcom's procurement procedure.	Our team, and likely most of those who attended, were already familiar with Policy 188 and were on board with developing a comprehensive plan. It felt like there was a lot of discussion to convince us that this work is important. More team time and working through the bench marking would have been helpful.	Providing us with specific examples or templates for us to adapt for our college and dedicated work time with our team.
Having our team together for two full days. Hearing from Watcom.	NA	More "how we are doing it" stuff from various stages of a school's journey.
Hearing from Whatcom and getting a little group work time at the end.	Too much lecture, not enough work time. Ryan (or paul?) has done good work, but I could have done without the origin story of WA 188. Guided work time would be much more beneficial.	More of a workshop setting. Give us examples of plans, give us time to work on the plans, have sessions where people present what they've worked on and show their plans. I feel unequipped to create our plan after this training.
I think it was all helpful - presentations, group activities, Q&A ... it was all great!		

What was the most helpful aspect of the convening?	What was the least helpful aspect of the convening?	What topics/issues/types of activities would you like to see covered/included at the next event?
Hearing from the speakers at other colleges about what they find most helpful/successful.	Not following the agenda, very little real work time with real examples of successful practices to discuss and follow. Seem to be a bit disorganized.	
Working with our group.	Lessons from UMT's OCR Complaint session	Procedures needed to implement accessibility policy
Time with my team. Background from Ryan.	The Monday presentations went on a bit long. Once we did break out into teams, the room was too loud to have everyone at the table hear each other.	Hard to say right now... it depends on how far we get as a team during the rest of the year.
having time to work together as a group	the font on the powerpoint slides were too small for me to see	best practices for short and long term implementation of our plans
I didn't find the event to be very helpful. It was too introductory.	We didn't walk away with any sort of plan of action. Instead of huddled together amongst our groups and looked at abstract tables. This all could have been done without making the trip to Tacoma.	I would love to see some examples of how we can tackle the issue. Workshops would have been very beneficial.

What was the most helpful aspect of the convening?	What was the least helpful aspect of the convening?	What topics/issues/types of activities would you like to see covered/included at the next event?
<p>Day two group work, although that left a lot to be desired. See below.</p>	<p>Lack of networking with other colleges. We were promised group work, however, it was only offered on day two and only with our own colleges. We could have met (and we do) as a team on our own.</p> <p>Suggestion: Offer small group topic tables i.e. website, technology, document training, etc. Individuals interested in one of the topics will go to that group/table in the room where questions and best practices can be shared. That way each individual can bring back answers and ideas to their own college teams.</p>	<p>Our college went with the assumption that we would learn specific how-to's at the conference. How best to train individuals on making docs accessible, for example. Or tips and tricks to make a top notch accessible website - specifically. Instead, day one was a history and an overview of accessibility in general. It was very disappointing to be given a grant/funds to implement an accessibility plan at our college, but yet not receive specific advice/tips/best practices on how to do so. Honestly, we did not need to attend the training, nor expend the budget. Nearly all of day one, minus the panel discussion by Olympic (?), could have been a handouts in our packets.</p> <p>Suggestion: offer specific training on things top notch colleges need to move the needle forward on accessibility. Even though we all know the U of M speaker had a wealth of information at her fingertips, the overview was broad. She could have easily been directed to focus her presentation on specific items such as how to address dissenting employees (tactfully, of course), top ten tips to train employees on accessible documents (Office, PowerPoint, Canvas, video captioning), top five tips for developing an implementation team, the best ways to involve students with specific examples, top five tips to transform your websites, etc.</p> <p>Suggestion: The main SBCTC presenter used some offense phrases multiple times. "Drink the Cool-Aid" has a negative connotation. Being asked both as accessibility action plan team members and in general to get others to "drink the accessibility Cool-Aid" is offensive. "Shame the naysayers" is also another phrase used multiple times that several of my team members do not care to hear again. As grantees, we are all on board. There is no need for peer pressure tactics. What we would like most are tactful, appropriate and positive messaging, and tips, tricks and tactics to improve accessibility at our college.</p>