**ISIT Committee Minutes**

February 6, 2017

3:30 – 5:00pm

Library 149

Note taker: Tim Heasley

Attendees: Kristin Rabe, Todd Coston, Richard Marquez, Gabriel Fortier, Bill Moseley, Scott Dameron, Matt Moon, Matt Jones, Linda McLaughlin, Fabiola Johnson, Sarah Villasenor, John Giertz, Tim Heasley, Kirk Russell, Judy Ahl, Gabi Martin, Cindy Hubble, Darren Willis, Greg Cluff, Scott Peat, Kurt Klopstein, Erin Miller

**Agenda**

1. Review and Approval of Minutes from December 5th meeting
   1. Minutes from 12/5/16 approved with one note: Task force did not meet as planned
2. Campus/District Updates
   1. BC IT Positions Update – Coston
      1. Todd is fully staffed, all 3 positions filled. New personnel will spend this semester to get up to speed, then they will be fully integrated this summer.
   2. Canvas – Lovelace/Jones
      1. Canvas sessions were held during flex week and there was also a presence at new faculty seminar.
      2. Help feature seems to work well.
      3. There are a couple of options for help. The "?" will allow someone to create a ticket, and the commons area is a useful option for FAQ type info.
         * There was a chat bubble initially available during the switch, but it's no longer available
      4. Canvas' phone number seems very responsive as well.
   3. TIPD – Jones/Moseley
      1. TIPD is mostly focused on Canvas at this time.
      2. There is an academic technology department in development, so the future of TIPD is TBD.
3. Program Review Technology Request Prioritization Results – Coston/Rabe
   1. There were ties even after the tie breaker vote that occurred between ISIT meetings. If funding becomes available down to the tied items on the list, the cost of the items vs. amount available will help determine which would be funded first.
   2. Items on the list are funded as grants etc. become available, and what gets funded will be reported back to the committee.
4. IT Governance – Coston
   1. Some technology projects can be managed locally on campus, but others require district support because of their scope, particularly when Banner is involved.
   2. This raises questions: How do projects get into the district queue? How are they prioritized?
   3. A district-wide technology committee is being developed (3 reps from each campus plus 3 from the district). They will most likely vote quarterly to determine priority., but the specific method for this process is being developed at the first meeting of that committee.
   4. Projects may come to this process from a variety of sources. Currently, VPs are making the decisions. See IT Governance Process document (hard copies distributed) for details of proposed process. Generally, various bodies will have input, and at the President's Cabinet level we would have an opportunity to see what other campuses are proposing to determine where to place our votes.
   5. This process would populate the revamped project management system that is now in place at the district.
   6. Would the program review process function in this campus process? Not likely for the following reasons: Projects may arise more frequently than annual program review process, and some projects span departments.
   7. What will qualify as a project in terms of this process? Projects generally fall into three categories/stages: *Run, Grow, Transform*. Depending on where the project fits into these stages, this governance process would be triggered. Generally, *Run* projects have to happen. Some *Grow* and most *Transform* projects would run through this process. If legally mandated, projects would happen without this process.
   8. The district wide committee would not initiate projects.
   9. The governance process is not required by the district wide committee. Some campuses may opt to not use a system similar to what Todd is proposing.
   10. This system will be proposed to Academic Senate and Presidents' Cabinet. Adjustments will be made based on feedback from those bodies and brought back to ISIT for approval.
5. Call for Accreditation Team Members Marquez
   1. This team will gather data to answer questions and prepare a report for the accreditation process. Volunteers to serve on accreditation team include: Scott Peat & Erin Miller (can't attend meetings). Everyone encouraged to email Richard/Todd to express interest. It's possible committee members will be asked to be available to answer questions when the accreditation team is on campus.
6. Technology Plan – Coston
   1. 1st draft of plan will be sent out later this week. Ideally we will vote on the plan at the April meeting.
7. Student comments from 2016 Student Technology Survey - Miller
   1. The survey is a result of input from the accreditation process. There are 2 surveys per year: one for students, one for staff.
   2. See synopsis of comments on the ISIT: 2016 Student Technology Survey doc (hard copies handed out at meeting)
   3. 90% emphasized wifi as a concern. This is good in that other things are improving, but this continues to be a major issue.
   4. Assistive technology responses referred to systems that are not actually assistive technology (ie Moodle, Aplia). No actual assistive technology (ie JAWS) were identified by students.
   5. Someone suggested a 1 page PDF for tech help.
8. WiFi/Measure J Funding
   1. To be addressed in the first tranche (slice): parking lots and wifi. 1 million dollars in the first tranche.

Meeting adjourned 4:43pm

Next Meeting Date – Library 149

March 6, 2016 3:30-5:00pm