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Berkeley City College

**COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING**

Monday, May 11, 2015

**MEETING MINUTES**

*Chair: Dr. Debbie Budd*

**Attendees:** Antonio Barreiro, Rich Berberian, Katherine Bergman, Joseph Bielanski, Ramona Butler, Nancy Cayton, May Chen, Paula Coil, Carlos Cortez, Brenda Johnson, Carolyn Martin, Linda McAllister, Gail Pendleton, Cynthia Reese, John Saenz, Shirley Slaughter, Cleavon Smith, Tram Vo-Kumamoto, Hermia Yam

**Agenda Review & Review of Minutes**

Dr. Budd opened the meeting and thanked everyone for being in attendance during this busy time of the year. She noted that this will be the last Roundtable meeting for 2014-2015. Attendees were asked to review the Minutes with the goal of approving them at the end of today’s meeting. The meeting agenda was then reviewed.

Dr. Budd commented on the great work of our Dean of Special Programs and Grants, Maeve Katherine Bergman, who helped write a grant for mental health.

*New Grant*

Ms. Bergman stated that we had a grant opportunity brought to us by Alameda County Behavioral Mental Health Services that we have been a long time partner with through public and human services pathway. We received a $500,000 grant for the next two years to fund what are called peer personnel. These are folks working within the behavioral mental health system as volunteers or paid positions that have lived experience as consumers in the behavioral and mental health system either as the recipient of those services, as the parent of someone who receives those services or as the child of someone. It is an effort to address significant mental and behavioral health disparities for people of color, women, those in the system that are being treated primarily by those that are not like them to not have lived experience. It is a collaborative effort with Alameda County behavioral mental health services, the city of Berkeley behavioral and mental health services as well as some smaller training organizations to recruit students to go through our pathway and their trainings and then to place them in a volunteer, paid position for six months. We were the only community college in the state of California to do this work.

*SAP Grant*

The SAP grant was awarded earlier this spring. SAP is a large transnational corporation focused on data management system and software, very similar to the Oracle system we use; the BI Tool. They reached out to the Irvine Foundation to us expressing interest in setting up the first West Coast SAP 9-14 pathway. They currently have one in Boston and Harlem modeled after the IBM B-tech and P-tech 9-14 pathways. SAP was very interested in the work we have been doing with Oakland Unified and building the multimedia, digital arts and they are excited about the new hires and developments in computer science and have expanded it out to include CIS, computer science as well as digital media arts. We will be providing mentorship to students beginning in 9th grade via online digital platform as well as support for laboratories and curriculum development, if needed. This grant is $400,000 over two years.

The following events:

* Next week, high schools coming and a press conference on May 19th.
* In the evening on May 19th is our scholarship awards reception.
* Luncheon on the 20th.
* EOPS/TRiO event will be held on Friday, May 22nd.

**Strategic Planning comments- from Google Doc**

The Strategic Plan was posted with only a couple of comments that have been given to Linda Sanford on Friday. It is on the agenda tomorrow at the district level. All of the attachments are linked to the Board Agenda, Item #10. In that, Ms. Sanford has posted our old strategic plan and all of the different PowerPoint presentations. She has also tied it into the statewide initiative which was recently updated.

* + ***Ed Master Plan***
		- *Approval of Ed Master Plan Goals and Indicators*

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that the actual document is still being drafted. The initial draft was presented in March and she has since received feedback and continues to collect data. It should be ready for distribution by the end of the semester. One adjustment has been made to the wording, “eliminate the education gap” instead of “eliminate the achievement gap.” The core indicators align to the State’s core indicators for successful course completion and transfer and degree. They are looking at piloting milestone indicators for the first round program review cycle. This was presented to Roundtable on the 23rd as an information item. With the Senates’ and Ed Committee’s approvals Ms. Vo-Kumamoto is now asking for Roundtable’s approval.

Ms. Shirley Slaughter asked for clarification on the “end of semester” timeline. She indicated that in order to have the Facility Master Plan, the narrative from the Ed Master Plan is needed. She asked if the narrative will be ready by the end of the semester. She noted that in addition to this, there is a Five-Year Construction Plan that is due soon which is also based on information from the Ed Master Plan. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto responded, “Yes.” The document that is required for submission to the district is a two-page document that she believes will be completed based on information that is currently in place.

Dr. Budd added that the five year Facilities Master Plan is a rolling five-year master plan and stated that when we have our user group looking at the design of our new building then we will actually create some repurposing of things that exist here, and it will be a much stronger document the following year. As far as the Ed Master Plan, she stated that we have talked a lot about not only that 70% but she thinks it is so important because it ties into our SSSP plan also of ensuring the 20 transferable units; of ensuring a transfer level math, and it all goes into the statewide criteria.

As program reviews are updated, Dr. Budd indicated that she envisions that each of the discipline’s programs will have at least two pages highlighting what’s happening and how they are going to help reach that goal, by really assessing how they are doing with the successful course completion in their classes, not just as a whole but by the different student groups, race, ethnicity and gender. She can see needing more student support space; that also fits into our new building plan. Those details will be fine-tuned in early fall when faculty and department chairs return.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto indicated that their hope is to share, at department chairs meeting, the goals for next year and moving into this first cycle of program review. A lot of the work they are doing is pivoting from being course oriented to being program oriented. Our program review is currently being done by discipline which is leaning towards courses as opposed to the program. When you look at it by program, each program has multiple disciplines within their program so what they are looking at is how do we approach next year’s program review to extract that success information for each of the courses within a particular program. They will start off the last meeting with the chairs to look at that work, going into the next year, and then getting some of their suggestions on how to approach that so that we can collect that information for them to use in the fall. The hope is, in working with senate, and our other shared governance structures, is that the whole first year of our program review will be dedicated to departmental time to support some of this work and development and looking at the program data. The other piece they don’t have is aggregated data.

Ms. Paula Coil stated that she recalls when we looked through the social economic lens we weren’t really talking about ethnicity, race, etc. and she is noticing when students go back to their Passport account there has been a couple of items added. However, they are not aware of the family income and are answering to just get through it. Therefore the data may not be accurate. If the challenge is really around social economic status, the challenge is to start talking about it; that it is not a condition of being of a particular ethnicity, that the gap exists, and that it is a combination.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that they have just receive more disaggregated data by social economic and ethnicity for BSI work and the data from that question is really just poverty or not. When they looked at that, there wasn’t but they realized from the data that the “Not” group is broad. As we start to use certain pieces of data we will find that it is not enough to really gauge whether there is a gap or not.

Dr. Linda McAllister asked if someone could speak about the work base learning opportunities on and off campus.

Dr. Budd replied that our business program has 50 internships developed this year from some of the local businesses. It doesn’t say how much of an internship it needs to be; it could be 10 hours over a semester. She feels it is important to have as a goal as it is something that can help all students when they transfer; they’re looking for positions that have that work-based learning.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that they are looking at working in partnership with the Alameda County One-Stop. They are planning on getting more support on that end on the placements whether it’s internship or job placement. For most transfer programs it is actually research opportunities with our partner of colleges. For us the conversation was that learning inside and outside of the classroom was really critical. Putting it down as something that we wanted to work towards was really the key and is really about making movement. Currently it is in select areas like our biotech program. The biggest piece of work-based learning experiences, is actually our student workers. The Ed Master Plan is really direction giving/framework for things that we need to work in.

Dr. Budd added that she feels it could be defined in many ways. It could be very similar to the workshops we have going on right now in biotech, with people coming in talking about what they’re doing in the field. That is on campus work-based learning opportunities; when they are learning what they can do with water treatment plants, with what they are learning in biotech.

Mr. Smith stated that he feels the evolution of it began with participating in campus activities and then recognizing that a lot of our students can’t participate in campus activities as readily as students who may not be working. Then it evolved into this idea around how do we create an environment where we are inviting students to reflect on their work experiences as it integrates with their classroom experiences. From there it evolved to work-based. The original intent was not so much that it was directly tied to vocational work experiences, but more related to inviting the students to engage in their learning outside of the classroom. As a part of that ambitious plan was that we needed to create mechanisms for capturing that but at some point this evolved and changed a little bit from that.

Dr. Carlos Cortez just wanted to ensure that we are very mindful especially if we’re going to expand these types of program offerings. Currently we have different types of internships and workplace opportunities but in some instances there is an MOU with the placement organization and in other places there are not; in some places they are coordinating the administrative component and in other places they are our duties. If we are going to expand, there are going to be resources and expectations and potentially liability associated with that. He noted to being in other institutions we are centralizing those types of efforts has been beneficial to the institution, students, and partners in particular.

Dr. Budd feels it is an excellent goal to have and she thinks that we will find that it could even be that the first year our goal will be to assess where we are and then measurable from there on.

Motion to approve made by Ms. Paula Coil

Second by Ms. Brenda Johnson

All in favor

Opposed - None

Abstentions - None

* + ***Equity Plan Spring 2015 activities (discussion from Conference)***Tying right into that is the incredible work we have done this year in beginning our Equity planning with not only our plan but activities and laying out what we want to do with the activities going forward into the next year.

Ms. Brenda Johnson provided highlights from the conference she attended noting that not all colleges completed their Equity Plan. Our plans were reviewed this past March. There was a panel of thirty that reviewed each equity plan and we will get the feedback from the Chancellor’s office sometime late this month. This timeline was provided by Denise Nolden who is the interim Vice Chancellor.

Given the feedback other colleges receive Ms. Johnson feels that we did a fantastic job. They gave examples of best practices, about half of which we have incorporated in our plan. Ms. Johnson provided a few examples:

* College wide process for publicizing and monitoring indicator groups
* Improved data collection
* Hiring a researcher
* Conducted a campus climate survey
* Website is updated
* Outreach to faith-based communities (feels this has been done a little)
* Increased the applications and use of financial aid
* Tied it in with our Ed Master Plan

Dr. Budd feels they are very happy with what we have in the plan.

Ms. Johnson noted that there were plans that identified groups but their activities did not address the needs of that specific group or entire population.

Dr. Budd stated that while we have our goal of 70% success rate for all, we are going to get there by disaggregating our data and making sure that all students are successful, including African American, Latino, and Native American.

Dr. Cortez noted that the President has asked him to bring our attention back to the equity plan. In the equity plan for each semester we have distinct goals and measurable outcomes with related activities to help realize those goals. He reminded us to be mindful of those each semester and for that to really be the focus of much of the work that we are doing within our respective working groups.

Dr. Budd referenced the “*Student Equity Plan Activities Timelin*e” handout and noted that the top two we are working on and many of the others are already happening.

Ms. Johnson noted that they will be going over the timeline again at their next meeting.

* + ***SSSP Highlights***
* Dr. May Chen thanked the BCC team for conducting the following:
* They proposed additional multiple measurement tools.
* Our student leaders organized and conducted two student success day events. Over 100 new students attended these events.
* We have implemented a proactive case management counseling approach. They reached out to 1250 new students and 600 major undecided students urging them through email and phone calls, to come in and meet with a counselor and develop/update their SEPs. Between July 1, 2014 and May 1, 2015, the unduplicated counseling services have been provided to 7,146 students.
* Our number of unduplicated SEPs reached 2,678. These two figures are an 11% and 9% increase from last year’s comparable time.
* Assessment and orientation has been given to 3,780 new students. BCC’s count is around 2,000. However, assessment is provided for sister colleges also.

We have about 7,200 students who attend per semester and about 11,000 unduplicated head count. However, when you think that we have almost 11,000 unduplicated headcount and almost 20% of those students attend a four year university, that’s about 2,000 students, so that brings it down to 9. Not all 11,000 need to go through assessment and orientation. Dr. Budd is hopefully that we can have really clear data of that 11,000; how many need to have an SEP and how many needed to see a counselor or were exempt.

**Review of draft accomplishments and outcomes for 2014-15**

These were all posted and distributed. Dr. Budd asked if anyone wanted to share highlights or things identified in their area.

Ms. Shirley Slaughter shared the following:

* In addition to our grants, we increased our facility rental revenue by 72.9%
* More than half of the Business Office’s day shift is current serving on shared governance committees.

Dr. Budd added:

* Certainly with our grants, where $900,000 was received just in the last month.
* Getting closer to the Budget Allocation Model
* Getting additional faculty positions

Ms. Slaughter also mentioned:

* Funds encumbered from non-resident fees
* The additional position that aligns us with the other campuses.

If you look at our goals from last year (Goal C) last year we had 171 students accepted into UCs. This year we had 121 alone accepted to UC Berkeley. Many to UCLA, CSU transfers are up as well as our certificates.

The total number of degrees and certificates are still being tabulated. Our total number could reach 691 for spring, almost 800 in total.

Dr. Budd shared that our resident FTES started at 3950. We did increase it and our target was raised at 4,050 and we are at about 4,010. Our target was about 500 non-resident and we are at about 550. We have certainly met our total enrollment which is impressive.

Dr. Budd is hoping that attendees will still send highlights to her and Cynthia Reese by the end of the week. She added that we really want to highlight the great work we have done with our partnerships with K-12 and are finalizing our partnership that was worked on.

**Discussion of IEPI Visit and suggestions for next steps**

* + *Approval of Recommendation for 64.5% on course completion for IEPI goal.*Dr. Budd reported that Ms. Jenny Lowood wanted to make sure that the importance of including faculty, the Ed Committee and our Institutional Effectiveness Committee was included in the discussion. There were 7 colleges in the state selected and we are the only one that has met so far. There was a lot to pull together and she thanks those who participated.

Dr. Chen indicated that they have decided, with the visiting team that we want to focus on two areas.

1. Enrollment Management
2. Core Success Rate in Conjunction with SLOs

Everything from IEPI has been posted on the website.

As reported by Ms. Vo-Kumamoto, at the April 23rd Ed Committee meeting that talked about a goal; looking at the core success rate over the last five years that was provided by the Chancellor’s DataMart. The committee felt 64.5% was somewhere in the middle of where all of our rates were and felt it would be a good target for us and would move us towards the direction of 70% course completion. The chairs looked at it as well and are in satisfied with that being the target. Some of the concerns that were voiced with regards to the percentage is it is as a campus and not individual areas. However, they realize that under individual areas if big improvements are made it will catapult our overall campus rate.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto reviewed the memo sent to the Roundtable on April 27th noting that the Ed Committee had identified goals and activities to help move the needle for math course completion.

There was an in-depth discussion initiated by Mr. Smith on SLO assessments, core success and intersections. It was stated that the two buckets are two topic areas.

For clarity, as she didn’t want them to be confused, Dr. Budd stated that the approval of the recommendation for the 64.5 is not for the team that came on Monday, it is the state-wide one. She then asked if there is a recommendation for the approval of the 64.5 as the course completion goal for the IEPI goal.

Motion made by Dr. Joseph Bielanski

Second by Brenda Johnson

All in favor

Opposed – None

Abstentions – None

**2118 Milvia - User Group Membership and Meeting Times (open meetings.)**

Dr. Budd noted that a User Group will be forming for our new building. She was hopeful that Sharon Millman could have been here today to talk about this subject. Dr. Cortez stated that there was a request from the facilities committee that representation of the different equity groups are part of the User Group. Dr. Budd asked that Ms. Shirley Slaughter and Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto work together on that to get a broad representation. Dates can then be sent out and times in early fall can be identified for meetings and even early basic meetings of just broad stroke process that can be shared with everyone. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto indicated that the make-up was already decided in Roundtable and for broad representation we probably need to put that out in the right venues for people to know that it exists and for them to put their names in.

She indicated she and Ms. Slaughter need to get more information before they can put that out.

**Review of Roundtable Process for the year**
A survey will be sent out for our shared governance process which will be very similar to what we have done in the past. She welcomes suggestions of questions to ask which can be sent to both Ms. Reese and Dr. Budd.

Look for the survey by the end of May. It will be left open for a couple of weeks for responses.

**Classified Positions Update**We have not heard from the district yet how many positions we will get. This information will be sent out electronically from Dr. Budd once she hears from the district.

**May 21 Graduation 7 pm**

* Rue Mapp is our guest speaker and a PACE alumni.
* Rich Berberian reported that students come daily to pick up gowns.
* Diploma covers are supposed to arrive by Thursday.
* For the benefit of the new bookstore manager, Dr. Cortez shared that collection of regalia was an issue last year.
* Dr. McAllister recommended provided 2 or 3 very clear and different options.

-End of Minutes -

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