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Berkeley City College

**COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING**

Monday, March 9, 2015

**MEETING MINUTES**

*Chair: Dr. Debbie Budd, President*

**Attendees:** Fabian Banga, Antonio Barreiro, Joseph Bielanski, Nancy Cayton, Carlos Cortez, Roberto Gonzalez, Brenda Johnson, Jenny Lowood, Carolyn Martin, Linda McAllister, Danny McCarty, Catherine Nichols, Shirley Slaughter, Emma Carlblom, Noelle Atkins, Cleavon Smith

**Review of Agenda and February 23rd Roundtable Minutes**

Dr. Budd reviewed today’s agenda. Committee members were requested to review the February 23rd minutes for approval at the end of today’s meeting. She noted that she will be responding to a question posed at the last meeting regarding non-tenured track faculty. Along with new faculty positions, Dr. Budd reported that we will also get new classified positions but she does not have information on the number of positions. However, unlike the 6-8 faculty positions, she believes we may be getting 1-2 classified positions.

Dr. Budd noted that the accreditation team will come today at 2:00 p.m. for a meet and greet in Rooms 451 A&B. They will tour the campus and will return tomorrow to conduct many interviews throughout the day.

The agenda was then opened to add discussion topics. No requests were made to add additional items.

**New Faculty Positions**

* *Timelines submitted by prioritized positions*
* *Hiring Committee Formed*
* *Finalization of postings and Timelines*

Dr. Budd discussed positions previously recommended to Roundtable and reviewed the prioritization order. For faculty positions she reminded everyone that we received six new positions and we have two retirements. These positions are out of general funds. With all of the interest from what’s happening with our Learning Communities and the SSSP funding, also discussed is that we will go ahead and go out for the two counselor positions. She noted that in reviewing the minutes, we had talked about the positions being non-tenured track because they were from SSSP. There was a question about the definition of that. Typically, if you do a non-tenured track position, the definition of this is that it is like a grant or something that starts and ends. An example given was our Title III grant or TRiO, or some of our different funding that has a time to end. The SSSP funding is a new development, or expansion, of matriculation funding. Therefore, that won’t end. It could, however, increase or decrease depending upon how many students we serve. Because that is ongoing with grant funds, it was decided that we would still hire the two counselor positions, but they should be tenured track positions. This actually brings the faculty hiring count to 10.

Dr. Budd noted that there are only two positions that will not be posted at the present time. She reminded everyone of the justification for getting these positions which is to meet our faculty obligation number. If we do not get all of the job postings done and be able to hire for a Fall start then they won’t really count for that obligation number. They have asked that everyone have those turned in by Friday. Everyone has not turned those in and Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto is reaching out to the various departments to make sure that those are completed. It is very possible that they may go deeper in the list if the others are not ready to post for hiring in the Fall.

 *Q. How long is the wait before moving on to other positions?*

*A. The goal is, by the end of next week we will have determined whether we are going with those top eight or moving further down the list if people are not able to make those timelines.*

**First review of Classified Position Requests from APU planning process**

*Discussion of Prioritization Process*

Dr. Budd reported that she was really pleased with the work of the department chairs in looking at the rubric that was developed for faculty prioritization. She applauded the open discussion that happened at roundtable when we first looked at the faculty prioritization in discussing what worked well with the rubric and what we can improve. She is hoping we will be able to do something similar with the classified positions. She referenced two classified lists, one from Student Services and a combined list from Student Services, Office of Instruction, and Business Services. In addition to this she referenced documents that had been distributed highlighting procedures used in the past. This included a prioritization rubric previously used and forwarded by Classified Senate President Roberto Gonzalez. Also distributed was a document that came from Chabot College which is also in its draft version. Dr. Budd stated that what is evident is that the process is not perfect for anyone. She believes a piece of it is because rarely do you get to higher large groups of classified staff like we do with the faculty.

Ms. Lowood asked about the deadline in getting this done and also noted that Student Services was able to provide rationales for certain position. Also noted was that some of the positions came from APUs from Instructional departments but, as far as she knows, they were not given an opportunity to provide rationales, and it would be nice to have that opportunity as well. Also discussed was that some of these positions were cut during the time of budget cuts and she thinks that should be taken into consideration.

In regards to timing, Dr. Budd indicated that she pushed on the faculty hiring in order to meet our faculty obligation number. The timeline for classified was for them to be turned in on Thursday of last week. She sent an alphabetized (not prioritized) list to the district. Her goal is to go through a process for prioritization within the next month and come up with a rubric.

Mr. Gonzalez indicated that he appreciates receiving the document from Chabot. His perception is that we have an accumulation of needs based on things that are happening like new programs, new staff positions, as well as positions left open due to attrition, retirements and so on. He is not sure this process will address the gaps. One of the points that the Chabot document points out is that this is basically recommendations out of general funds and not categorical. He wonders how we can address the two with three positions being listed in DSPS. He feels we need to distinguish between replacing what we lost and then moving forward. It seems like we have a lot to deal with and it is a little discouraging to have possibly only one or two classified positions available to us.

Dr. Budd indicated that Mr. Gonzalez made an excellent point in regards to addressing positions lost due to retirements such as the Public Information Officer. In a perfect world and in past experiences she has always divided up the two between general fund and categorical. As an example she referenced the TRiO staff assistant position shown on the classified list. If there were categorical funding for that then that would be a different process. We put that in there to show department needs. The big question that they need to look at is DSPS funding. It has tended to go down instead of up. She believes Mr. Gonzalez has made great points and we really should have two areas, one could be categorically funded and one could be general fund. The question arises, in regards to DSPS, on whether there are enough funds in that area.

Ms. Emma Carlblom commented that during the Town Hall, there is a need for a writing center and also asked why the DSPS funding is decreasing.

Dr. Budd explained that this was due to the state’s budget cuts that have not gone back up.

Ms. Carlblom also noted the need for a peer or staff person who could do harassment counseling. Dr. Budd indicated that there are processes in place for harassment. It was also stressed that any issues should be brought to Dean Brenda Johnson’s attention as she is the administrator in charge of various student issues, including issues such as harassment.

Mr. Antonio Barreiro stated that the timing is great to develop a new process for classified hiring because right now we are in the final stages of our Ed Master Plan. As we look at our primary strategic goal from an Ed Master Plan standpoint, to eliminate the achievement gap by 2024, as we are going through our prioritization process that should be one of our compass points. Also, referencing the Equity Plan and SSSP, he noted that we have done an enormous amount of work to look at how we are prioritizing our efforts in the next 10 years. He recommended a task force to take input and develop a rubric for classified prioritization.

A motion was made on the recommendation noted by Mr. Barreiro.

Second by Dr. Fabian Banga

All in favor

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

From this approved recommendation a task force was identified from volunteers/nominees.

* Mr. Antonio Banga
* Ms. Jenny Lowood
* Mr. Roberto Gonzalez
* Ms. Nancy Cayton
* Dr. Fabian Banga
* Dr. Linda McAllister
* Danny McCarty (ASBCC)

The goal will be for the group to meet once or twice and come back to Roundtable and report at the next meeting.

Mr. Danny McCarty will bring the survey results from their town hall to Ms. Vo-Kumamoto. Voiced during their town hall was in the realm of assistant tutoring and counseling. There were a few other specifics like the hourly times that the Student Learning Center is open. He also noted that he wanted to speak to Dean Johnson regarding the step-by-step process for harassment. He asked for clarification on the timeline for how the classified position requests will take place and feels that it is important to get student feedback. He will try to create that connection to find out what they feel is most important on the list.

Dr. Linda McAllister indicated that it is also important to have the job descriptions and not just the title of the job.

Responding to Mr. McCarty’s question Dr. Budd indicated that her goal would be by the end of April to have those prioritized. She noted that it is different with classified as classified staff are here year round so the push of getting it done in the spring is not quite as difficult.

**Institutional Effectiveness through integration of Planning and Resource Allocation**

A lot of the accreditation focus will be to ensure institutional effectiveness and to validate that our planning processes are data driven and that the planning process drives the resource allocation. And, they want to ensure that we look at how our students are doing. As we look at our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Assessment, that when we make changes we use our resources to help fund those changes. That whenever we are using funds and in the planning process, we are always looking at continuous improvement.

Dr. Budd reviewed the questions from the *Institutional Effectiveness through Integrated Planning and Resource Allocation* handout. The other piece that is important was related to the Program Review and Annual Program Update. She reported that they are looking at updating the Program Review process. This became very evident with the SSSP data and our Equity Plan. As we are looking at this, are we disaggregating the data? Are we looking at the success by student groups, by age, by ethnicity, and by different programs? The last two pages of the handout show some of the suggestions of the Core Data Elements that are being recommended, much of which was pulled from the Equity Plan.

Dr. Joseph Bielanski commented that when we meet with the teams and are interviewed to be mindful that accreditation is about whether we meet the standards.

* Do we have a Program Review process?
* Does that Program Review process provide us with resource requests?
* How are those prioritized?

He stated that the interview is a time to provide information about what we have shared in the institutional self-study and show the accreditation team what we do from your varying perspectives to demonstrate that we are an institution that is effective.

Dr. Budd added that the team has written most of their report already and are here to validate and confirm some of the things they have written and ideally be able to highlight some of the great things that they see. She encouraged Dr. McAllister to have her colleagues join in the interviews and assured that the accreditation report does not have to be quoted.

Dr. Banga commented that they are looking for data and we have tools to find data, for instance in success and retention.

**Accreditation Visit Schedule**

Dr. Budd indicated that the team is here now and they are coming at 2 o’clock for the meet and greet, with a tour of the campus at 3 o’clock. She did reach out to them to let them know that we had a Roundtable meeting scheduled for today and invited them to attend. Since it was their first meeting together as a team, they did not want to shorten their time together. As a result, they will be meeting with the entire Roundtable on Wednesday at 11 o’clock in 451 A&B. Attendees were asked to block out the time on their calendars.

The visiting team’s schedule of interviews was reviewed with Roundtable attendees. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto will be working with Mr. Cleavon Smith, Mr. Scott Hoshida, and Dr. Carlos Cortez to identify classrooms for team member visits.

Dr. Banga indicated that for the visit we have 30+ online courses offered and they will access as a student.

Dr. Budd indicated that for Distance Ed there were a couple of times that different members wanted to meet and they were not available. She requested that Dr. Banga, Mr. Smith and Mr. Hoshida help get the word out regarding the Distance Ed schedule.

**Review of 2014-2015 Goals and Outcomes and Initial Review of Accomplishments**

Dr. Budd reported that typically in April and May is when we look at where we are on achieving our goals and our outcomes that we identified for ourselves in the Fall. They don’t change a lot as for as overarching goals but the outcomes that we are trying to achieve certainly do change. These tie in with our Educational Master Plan and the work of the Equity Report.

The real piece that Dr. Budd hopes that we are all focused on for the rest of this year and in the Fall is how we are doing across all groups; really looking at the data that was in the Equity report.

Dr. Carlos Cortez shared that Berkeley City Scholars is one of the initiatives that we are moving forward on and the planning meetings are in place and recruitment will begin next week. In math, he reported some embedded tutoring in Math 206 and Math 13, online tutoring in the LRC and extended hour tutoring. No measuring has been done.

There was a statement from Ms. Carlblom on a suggestion that math have consecutive classes. Dr. Cortez requested that she please have students come directly to him so that he can get clarity as a lot of work is being done around strategic scheduling.

Ms. Johnson reported that in regards to foster youth, a meeting was scheduled but was postponed. They have, however, begun meeting about the foster youth and have connected with the Marcus Foster Fund organization and are looking at ways to help students in terms of stable housing, mentoring, and career planning. She indicated that she will include Ms. Carlblom in the next meeting as she has expressed interest in being a part of that task force.

Dr. Budd requested that attendees take the two documents that were also sent electronically and start to jot down from their areas some of the measurable outcomes on the different activities. She requested that it be sent back ideally by Friday, March 20th so that we will have that available to start some of the conversation at our next Roundtable meeting. At the next meeting we will begin to review some of the measurable outcomes and activities as well as have the classified rubric available for a first blush look.

Mr. Smith asked if there is a timeline that we have for next year’s goals because with the faculty prioritization one of the things that will need to be determined in the Fall is ranking based on the goals. Also last year when the Senate endorsed this year’s goals the request was to have next year’s goals endorsed prior to the beginning of the year.

Dr. Budd noted that our goal will be before we go away for the year to have identified what our plans will be for going forward next year.

The last Roundtable meeting, according to Mr. Smith, may not provide enough time for the Senate to endorse the goals and, if it can be done prior to the end of April then they will have time to review and endorse them.

Dr. Budd thought that to be a great idea and will strive to have these on the March 23rd and April agenda after spring break. They should then be fresh in everyone’s mind; looking at the goals we identified, and accomplishments, so that we can come up with our draft goals for the following year at the end of April.

She also would like to plan on an update of where we are with our Equity Plan and this will go hand-in-hand with our accomplishments and goals for next year; closing the education gap through access, equity and success of exemplary programs and ensuring 70% course completion for all students.

**Other**

Supplies in restrooms were discussed by Ms. Carlblom, as well as the gender neutral restroom. Ms. Johnson encouraged Ms. Carlblom to bring questions or issues to any administrator, at any time, noting that it is not required for her to wait for a meeting to report on issues. Dr. Budd also suggested that these issues be brought to the attention of the Health and Safety Committee as well as the Director of Campus and Student Life.

The Safety Committee will follow up on the braille issue for the gender neutral restroom.

Dr. Budd noted that the College Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting is where the other committees should come up and report.

*Technology Committee Report*

Dr. Banga reported on the Technology Committee noting that they have rewritten the 2014 Action Plan and shared it with other committees, such as the Academic Senate. They now have a draft that they will bring to the Technology Committee one more time for review. It is also online. When they have finished the review, they will bring it to Roundtable.

*Academic Senate Report*

Nothing to report.

*PIE Committee*

Ms. Lowood reported that all of the courses at BCC, except for those under revision and new, have been assessed. Also not assessed were courses that haven’t been offered because they were cut during a period of budget cuts but are now coming back.

Additionally, they have done some work on program assessment including mapping of the outcomes to courses, in all of our programs, except those courses that are new or under revision.

Also completed are three of the Institutional Learning Outcomes assessments and the Information Competency Learning Outcome Assessment is in progress.

*Facilities Committee*

Ms. Shirley Slaughter reported that the Facilities Committee did a site visit of the new facility at 2118 Milvia Street that went very well. Also discussed at the meeting was the Facilities Committee’s participation during the accreditation visit.

Dr. Banga stated that the Chairs would love to visit the building and wondered when that could be arranged. Ms. Slaughter noted that they will have to get approval. She will get back to him on the request.

*Ed Committee (and update with accreditation team)*

They had a wonderful meeting and discussed several major issues. She provided updates on SSSP and provided statistics. Ms. Lowood noted that the team was very impressed with the Teaching Learning Center (TLC) and the participation of faculty in the various activities in the TLC.

Dr. McAllister reported that they finally have some resources coming out of faculty advising and are close to some model templates for students.

*(February 23rd Roundtable meeting minutes will be submitted for approval at the March 23rd meeting.)*

No additional topics discussed.

-End of Minutes -

Minutes taken by: Cynthia Reese, creese@peralta.edu, 510.981.2851