

Information Systems and Instructional Technology Committee

Unapproved Minutes

April 6, 2015

3:00 pm – 4:30 PM

SGA Executive Board Room

Attendees: Bill La, Heather Keldgord, Kristin Rabe, Gabi Martin, Reg Autwell, Richard Marquez, Kirk Russell, Tracy Lovelace, Vanessa Bell, Daniel Galvez, Cindy Hubble, Michelle Pena, Bill Moseley

Minutes Recorded By: Cindy Hubble

1. Approval of Minutes

- a. Reviewed by committee members, motioned for approval by Kristin Rabe, seconded by Kirk Russell, no abstentions, approved by all

2. Campus/District Updates

a. Cerro Coso Online Proposal Update (Bill Moseley)

- i. In 2008, Cerro Coso proposed taking over online teaching throughout the district—their suggestion was not well received at the time. Now, CC has proposed creating a “4th” college under their leadership. Bakersfield College and Porterville College are opposed; however, the district is currently more supportive because it may be a way to keep Cerro Coso viable. Concerns with this system (as noted in the March ISIT meeting) include FTES, student success, automatic enrollment from waitlists, and articulation of classes (difficult to gather transcripts).

- ii. Bill Moseley suggests that BC not support this proposal and that we notify him if we hear it mentioned in other campus meetings.

- iii. The proposal may surface at an upcoming board meeting.

b. Annual Update Form

- i. The new form is smaller and more intuitive.

- ii. Program reviewers are happy with the changes.

c. Office 365

- i. Free for staff and students, but not supported by IT.

- ii. Download from office.com by using bc user name and password.

3. Technology Survey Question review

- a. ISIT committee should look over the survey and send any feedback/suggestions by 4/10.

- b. If no changes are needed, the survey will go out shortly after the 10th.

- * Note: Student Affairs uses HERSHEY—that is not listed under software

4. Revise Program Review Technology Request Form

- a. Still looking for feedback from the ISIT committee regarding Instructional and Non-instructional Request forms; the rubrics should be similar—suggestions are due 4/9.

- b. Various changes and possible changes/considerations discussed:

- i. Removed “What goal does this meet?”

- ii. Question “Submitted on time” is not a fair measurement—forms may be completed on time, but held up somewhere in the submission process (for example, in the dean’s office).
 - iii. Should points be assigned to the justification for the request? Todd and Kristen would decide on points for this category.
- c. Submit any suggestions for better ways to prioritize requests before the new forms are unveiled at FCDC, 4/24.
- d. Closing the loop—input is needed from the committee on how to close the loop in the technology request process. People have complained that they do not receive feedback as to why their requests were not granted.

Next Meeting: May 4, 2015, 3:00-4:30 pm, SGA Executive Board Room

Respectfully Submitted,

Cindy Hubble