Facilitator: Antonio Barreiro

Attendance: Josh Boatright, Roberto Gonzalez, Theresa Rumjahn, Siraj Omar, Dave Ivan Cruz (ASBCC)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Follow-Up/Action
Meeting Start	12:30 pm	
I. Review Past Minutes	Dean Barreiro asked for any comments or changes to the draft 12/15/2015 minutes. Roberto Gonzalez recalled saying that there should be platform accessibility on the Peralta Student App. Ranell Holmes is the District staff overseeing this PeopleSoft project, and he should be made aware of this comment. Dean Barreiro will ask Ranell for an update at the next DTC meeting and Roberto Gonzalez may want to attend. With these changes, Dean Barreiro moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Roberto Gonzalez.	Contact Ranell Holmes for an update of the Peralta Student App and request accessibility across all platforms.
II. 2016 Technology Resource Requests Prioritization Process	A. Dean Barreiro distributed a preliminary summary of technology requests compiled from 2015-16 Program Reviews received so far. • OOI Academic Departments have all submitted their program reviews. • Nothing has been received from Student Services or Business Services this year or last year. Roberto Gonzalez asked about EOPS and Transfer Center. Dean Barreiro said these are functional units and are included in Student Services. Dean Barreiro said he would get in touch with Brenda Johnson and Shirley Slaughter about their requests. • For the Science Dept. requests, Siraj Omar observed that only the desktop and laptop computers and the software and printers should be included in the summary. Labware and supplies should be omitted from the tech request summary because they are covered by other department funds or some other funding source. • Dean Barreiro indicated we have roughly $35,000 of CTE enhancements to pay for MMART and CIS tech requests, and we are working with CTE staff to determine how best to use this money. • We have roughly $100,000 to spend on tech requests, and of this, $15,000 is earmarked for the library. That leaves roughly $85,000 to spend for everything else for this year's purposes. This is significantly less than last year's requests for $1.1 million, and this year we already have more than $1 million in requests so far, so what we have is clearly not enough. However, unlike last year, we know how much we have this year, so we need to go through prioritization and make decisions and recommendations to Roundtable. There was discussion about college refresh rates and costs. B. We need more participation from the departments to fill in the missing information on the tech requests they have submitted. It was agreed to set up a block of time when department chairs could meet with the Tech Committee to make 5-min presentations, perhaps at the	A. Dean Barreiro will contact Student Services and Business Services about submission of their program reviews. B. Consider obtaining the missing tech request info at the Chairs meeting.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Follow-Up/Action
	Chairs Meeting. We should let them know ahead of time what information we need to use in the prioritization rubrics. For example, if computer hardware is requested, there should also be an estimate for peripherals and instructional technology. Some software renewals can be omitted from tech requests, such as Turnitin, if the licenses are covered under another budgeted program. Nothing has been heard about whether or not Turnitin will be a District license. • There is no technology budget at the District level, therefore the campuses cannot prepare local budgets. BCC Roundtable sends tech recommendations to the PBC but nothing happens. This is a serious recurring problem. • Dave Ivan Cruz indicated he spoke with the Chancellor last month about the tech needs of students on the campuses. C. Dean Barreiro distributed the two rubrics used last year for prioritization for Student Services and Office of Instruction. Roberto Gonzalez said the rubrics were instruction-oriented and were not clear on how tech requests in student services could demonstrate improving student success. Terminology was discussed about "meeting" vs "sustaining" or "improving". It was decided to incorporate SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes) for OOI and SAOs (Service Area Outcomes) for Student Services into the respective rubrics. Roberto Gonzalez said we needed a risk category in the rubrics. Dean Barreiro said he would draft revised rubrics according to this discussion and send them to the BCCTC committee via email for review and approval. D. The BCCTC will meet to review the tech prioritization requests next Tuesday, 2/9/2016	C. Dean Barreiro send draft revised rubric (for SLOs and SAOs) to BCCTC for review and approval.
III. Adjournment	1:30 pm	
Next Meeting	Tuesday, March 3, 2016, 12:15 - 1:30 pm, Rm 451	

[Notes taken by Theresa Rumjahn]

Handouts:

- Agenda for February 2, 2016
- Preliminary Summary of Technology Requests compiled from 2015-16 Program Reviews
- BCCTC APU Technology Request Prioritization Rubric – Office of Instruction
- BCCTC APU Technology Request Prioritization Rubric – Student Services
- Draft 2014-15 APU Technology Requests Review – Office of Instruction (Wed., Feb. 11, 2015) as Example