



Berkeley City College
COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING

Monday, December 7, 2015

MEETING MINUTES

Chair: Dr. Debbie Budd

Facilitators: Dr. May Chen and Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto

Attendees: Diana Bajrami, Antonio Barreiro, Nancy Cayton, May Chen, Paula Coil, Roberto Gonzalez, Jennifer Lenahan, Jenny Lowood, Tanya Moore, Cynthia Reese, Shirley Slaughter, Cleavon Smith, Tram Vo-Kumamoto, Hermia Yam, Linda McAllister, Loretta Kane, Christopher Scott, Natalia Fedorova, Brianna Rogers

Agenda Review

Dr. Chen began the meeting by reviewing the agenda and opening it up for additional topics. Ms. Lowood mentioned that some attendees would be leaving to attend a CIPD meeting. Attendees were then requested to review the meeting minutes of October 26th, November 16th, and November 30th.

October 26th Minutes

Minutes correction noted on page 4:

Based on a conversation at the meeting, they agreed that while the survey is nice, the task force feels that it isn't what they are requesting. She pointed out that they are requesting that we develop and "publish" (the shared governance decision making structure.)

Ms. Lowood stated that the parenthesis should be removed and it was really about developing and publishing the processes for reviewing each of the components.

Dr. Chen stated this to be correct and they would work with Ms. Reese to correct this.

Ms. Lowood moved to approve the October 26th minutes with the changes noted.

Second by Mr. Cleavon Smith

All in favor with the exception of one abstention: Ms. Cynthia Reese

Opposed: None

November 16th Minutes

Ms. Paula Coil moved to approve.

Second by Ms. Brianna Rogers

All in favor

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

November 30th Minutes

Ms. Brianna Rogers moved to approve.

Second by Ms. Jenny Lowood

All in favor

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Ms. Rogers requested a more concrete plan on nourishing students before testing for finals week. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto will follow up with Ms. Rogers after the meeting.

Review of Prioritized List of Faculty Positions

Roundtable Discussion

The handout, "*Faculty Prioritization Results*" was referenced for discussion. The prioritization results are the work of the Department Chairs under the delegation of the Faculty Senate. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto reviewed the results with attendees noting a 3rd place tie for Math and Biology and a tie for 5th with Communications, ESL and Geography. Because we have not been informed about the number of position hires there will be, it is unclear whether the ties will have to be resolved. Taking into account a large number of faculty positions last year along with Dr. Budd's notification at the chair's meeting that we are above our faculty obligation number in the percentage needed as a district, a smaller number of faculty positions are being anticipated this year. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto recommended that we forward the results and a summary recommendation with regards to addressing the ties.

The process was explained to Ms. Rogers who requested clarification.

- All of the requests for faculty were pulled from the program reviews
- They were compiled into a list
- There were three areas that were looked at:
 1. How does it address the mission
 2. How does it address our productivity
 3. Full time and part-time ratio
- Scores were given for each of those categories, for each of the positions.
- The fourth category was a written narrative and a verbal presentation. At the end of the narrative, the chairs ranked 1 to 11. Based upon that, a score was given that was added to the first three categories.
 - Number one received 3 points
 - Number two received 2.8
 - Number three received 2.6 and where ties are showing they received the same score.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that it was a pretty extensive process that they are still working to refine and improve each year.

If the Roundtable chooses to keep the list without any changes, it would be recommending that the list be forwarded to the president for consideration. The president will have the opportunity to make changes with the stipulation that reasoning would be presented to the faculty and the Roundtable.

Roundtable Recommendation

Ms. Jenny Lowood motioned to approve the faculty prioritization list. However, Mr. Smith had a question before it was moved forward asking if there are any kinds of distinguishing criteria between the two math positions.

Ms. Kelly Pernell responded that in regards to Math (1) position, as a number one priority they are looking for someone to take on a leadership role in learning resources and basic skills. The second one would be to teach all levels but probably more towards pre-calculus, statistics and algebra 2. This would allow more faculty to step up and deal with more equity projects.

Clarification was asked about the differences in the math positions as it would relate to the hiring committee and whether it would require two different committees. The response is that they are hoping to have one committee for both positions and this will be confirmed once they know how many positions will be received.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that there is a distinction in the faculty presentation of the positions and also in regards to the college work that we are doing. The distinction would be that they are looking for math faculty that can do the different strands. They would have the calculus strand along with

the non-calculus strand that they are hoping to build and grow. The non-calculus strand would serve students who are not going towards calculus-based majors. She agrees that when they reach the advertisement stage this will need to be addressed for the hiring process.

Believing that the process has improved from last year, Dr. Diana Bajrami stated that she thinks there is still a need to integrate student services better in this process. Also stated was that there needs to be a rubric that leaves room for services with SSSP and equity efforts, and that our practices reflect the student's needs. She expressed to Ms. Lowood that she is happy to hear that she is working on the rubric for the counselors as the current rubric does not lend itself to their work.

Ms. Paula Coil asked if the first math position is basic skills and learning resources then why not stipulate that as we put this forward.

As communicated by Ms. Pernell, the job description and desirable qualifications will stipulate that information but in terms of filling the position they do not want to classify it as basic skills as it might limit that instructor to only teaching basic skills for the next 20 to 30 years.

There was additional discussion on the number of counseling positions hired previously, where the gaps were in the process this year, as well as improvements made in the process from last year.

In regards to the third-place tie, Ms. Pernell offered that if BCC only received three positions she would like to recommend that they fill the Biology position in the third spot. Also if four positions are received, she would like Communications considered as well ahead of the second Math position. This will be discussed further once they get to that point.

Ms. Laura Roberto added that as far as revising the faculty prioritization process the other thing that they did last year was create a subcommittee where they have, multiple times in the last eight months, requested chairs and faculty including counseling and librarians to serve on the subcommittee. She stated that they have not had any counselors or librarians, who have agreed to step up and serve on that committee.

Mr. Cleavon Smith Motioned to recommend forwarding the Faculty Prioritization to the President Second by Mr. Antonio Barreiro

All in favor with the exception of two abstentions: Ms. Jennifer Lenahan and Dr. Diana Bajrami

Opposed: None

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto shared where she thought the process worked and didn't work. She noted that the point that Dr. Bajrami brought up is accurate in a sense that in the room the representatives from counseling represents general counseling only. She noted that if the general counseling chair does not represent all the areas of counseling then they need help in student services to figure out how to get that chair to represent all areas of student services or some other suggestion.

According to Dr. Chen, in the past the department chair of the counseling area served as the chair of all of the counselors regardless of whether it's general counselors, DSPS, or EOPS.

The missing link according to Dr. Bajrami is that the program reviews don't go to the department chair but instead they go to the VPSS. The VPSS, however, was never asked to send the faculty prioritizations. As far she is concerned this faculty prioritization does not come from the chair, it is a management job. She indicated that she keeps hearing there were no counseling requests and, while she does not want to say that it is not true but still she was not given an opportunity to provide input.

There was also mention of departmental vs. Roundtable issues by Mr. Smith in regards to funneling program reviews to department chairs or to the VPI/VPSS.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto indicated that one thing that did come up that was new this year was that there were requests for part-time faculty and non-instructional areas and there is no real process for these requests. This was presented as an area for us to focus on next year.

In the area of the rubric she thought what worked well was that they confirmed the definition for managing maximum enrollments as outlined in the contract and confirmed that the part-time/full-time ratio was defined by the specific discipline in which they were hiring. Not necessarily a cluster of disciplines.

Room for improvement is that in the area of Mission they still need to define and differentiate between a score of 3 and 0. Just about everyone received a score of 3.

She reported that what worked really well with the qualitative narrative part was the common template used.

Room for improvement is that she feels that it would be great to have faculty senate join as guest to the meeting in the narrative portion and in the overall review of all four categories including the narrative ranking for next year.

Dr. Bajrami suggested advocating to the district to start the process earlier and feels we will have a much better process by doing so.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto will forward the recommendations as a document as part of the minutes for today's Roundtable meeting.

Equity Plan Review

- Roundtable approval
- Town Hall on Wednesday, Dec. 9th

Board Submission Tuesday, Dec. 8th. Due to State Dec. 18

Dr. Chen indicated that great process has been made with the Equity Plan. The final due date to the State is Friday, December 18th. All of the college will attend tomorrow's Board meeting to present their Equity Plan. The one shared last Friday is the one sent to the Board. She requested good BCC representation at the Board meeting. She surveyed the sub-committees to see who planned to be in attendance.

- Access: Ms. Brianna Rogers and Mr. Roberto Gonzalez
- Course Completion: Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto
- ESL/Basic Skills English and Math: Ms. Brianna Rogers
 - *Ms. Rogers was asked to invite Ms. Catherine Nichols*
- Degree Completion and Transfer: Ms. Paula Coil will get back to Ms. Chen prior to the meeting.

Highlights and Discussion

At the last meeting, the Executive Summary was shared. Dr. Chen noted that there was a slight change of what was mentioned in the target groups. She noted that the groups are:

- African American Students and Foster Youth. These two groups fell under the 80% index for all of our equity indicators.
- Latino-Hispanic because they fell under access, ESL Completion, Distance Education Course Completion and transfer indicator.
- DSPS students, veterans and dreamers. They fell under access, degree and certificate completion and transfer indicator. These three groups did okay for our course completion for

ESL which means they progress well and are moving along however when they moved to the completion part measured by degree and certificate completion and transfer, they seemed to fall short.

- The next group that they are going to emphasize are the students with degrees, certificate and matriculation goals. Each year there is a small group of students coming to the BCC to get a degree or certificate, with or without transfer. Six years later barely 10% of that group actually receives their degree or certificate.

Dr. Chen thanked everyone who focused on our math students and highlighted the success of math town hall. She stated the math students are also a part of our target group.

She encouraged those who have not had an opportunity to review the Executive Summary which will be posted online at the State Chancellor's level.

She reported that late last week we received our overall budget from the district office. BCC's budget is about \$414,000 however, the district is also going to launch several projects on each of the campuses so the overall budget will be about \$526,000.

There was a question on the 10% that was reported to receive degrees or certificates and the percentage that transfer. Also asked was whether or not the group was too big. It was suggested that perhaps they needed to be split out.

- What are the certificates?
- What are the degrees?
- What are the transfers?

To identify 10% as being low it would need to be determined if they are a much smaller part of that group.

Ms. Paula Coil brought up that students are requested to identify their goals initially and are periodically asked to restate their goals. She asked how is the educational goals tracked if a student changes their path.

Ms. Hermia Yam indicated that when a student first declares their educational goal it will go into passport. When they meet with the counselors they confirm their goals and if there are any changes the student has two options, one is for them to go directly to Admissions & Records and change their educational goal. Also at the beginning of each semester students are requested to answer some questions on the server. Their goal is also confirmed each time they meet with counselor, however, if they do not come to meet with a counselor their goal may not be updated.

Dr. Chen clarified for Mr. Roberto Gonzalez that the draft had been submitted to the Board and will be presented at tomorrow's Board meeting. She added that there will be a small window to make minor changes between tomorrow and Friday, December 18th. In response to Mr. Gonzalez' question on DSPS, Dr. Chen indicated she had reviewed his recommendations several times and they did mention that they would like to be able to serve at least 5% more DSPS students, which is included in the request for increasing the 10% in services.

Mr. Antonio Barreiro motioned for BCC to present the plan submitted to the district office tomorrow night.

Second by: Dr. Diana Bajrami

All in favor

Opposed: none

Abstentions: none

Mr. Smith shared that with those planning to attend the board meeting may not actually be called upon to speak for the Equity presentation.

Dr. Chen plans to prepare a one page summary and along with a PowerPoint presentation for the meeting. She also stated that they will recognize team members in attendance.

The equity plan will be shared this Wednesday at our college-hour town hall meeting.

Integrated Planning, Resource Allocation and Evaluation

Review, discussion, and approval of final draft

Dr. Chen reported that there are two recommendations that came from the ACCJC visit this past March. The first one is that the team wants our college to centralize and to integrate all of our planning and then resource allocation and evaluation. The team also wants us to evaluate our process. The Board asked the four college presidents to report the colleges' progress thus far.

Dr. Chen referenced the document, "RT120715 - Institutional Effectiveness website information 12.4.2015" including charts and tables previously brought to Roundtable for discussion and approval. She stated that this will be a working document and whenever new progress is made, that information will be added. She noted that they plan to conduct a survey to evaluate our processes, sometime in January or February 2016. There are several things that will need to be done between January and October 2016, which is when we need to submit our follow-up report to ACCJC.

Regarding the integration part, which he brought up at our last meeting and requested for it to be an agenda item at the last education committee meeting on Thursday, Mr. Smith requested that we actually look at all of our funding sources that we are trying to integrate. He feels that we are pretty knowledgeable of the process, but he is not sure that as a campus we have a grasp of what it is we are trying to integrate. He is not sure at what point we had the conversation regarding the relationship between Perkins, SSSP, Equity and BSI at roundtable followed by the trickle-down conversation at the different college committees. Mr. Smith is hoping that at some point, in addition to, or maybe rather than doing a survey of how well our process works, that we actually get to the point where we are educating ourselves about what it is we are trying to integrate.

Dr. Chen indicated that this is something that they are working on. As a first step, all of the plans show their purpose and primary goals indicators. Referencing page 8 she indicated that they tried to show that they overlap/integrate each other. She reported that for the second step when developing our PASS funding, they had an oversized chart showing various funding and whichever activities or plans they try to support. She stated that Mr. Smith sent an email sharing how other colleges integrated their plans and they are looking into that also. They are looking for a way to develop these plans jointly and shared that College of the Canyons is going to offer several workshops on how to do integrated planning and they plan to attend that meeting. They are in the middle of identifying all of our funding and trying to match up all of our activities.

Mr. Smith inquired if it is possible to dedicate some time over the next few months, perhaps 10 or 15 minutes during Roundtable, to actually educate ourselves on the relationship of things such as Perkins, BSI, etc.

Dr. Bajrami felt this was a brilliant idea and stated that the State of California wants us to be intentional about this planning.

Another point brought up by Mr. Smith is that we have these different mandates from the State and, at that point, we look to see how much is going to the different areas from each plan and, there is more matching than planning. He stated that what he would hope is that we get ourselves to the point of planning it out, rather than looking at how it is being matched.

Dr. Bajrami reported that for the Access it was a pleasure to write the report because they planned and then they wrote the report. She thanked Dr. Loretta Kane for putting the report together from the six different writing skills submitted.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that what is critical is the budget development piece.

Other

- Save the Date: Holiday Potluck, Wednesday, Dec.16th.
- Mr. Antonio Barreiro reported on the Berkeley City College Technology Committee and the rubrics and corresponding list generated during last year's prioritization process for technology requests. The first conversation about approaching this task for 2015-2016 is scheduled for January 26th during the time block typically reserved for the Technology Committee. A total of six hours has been booked for this conversation.
- Ms. Lowood made a statement for the record as she had to leave and attend the CIPD meeting. She wanted to note that for the technology request prioritization English was not listed. Mr. Antonio Barreiro let her know that the information provided was last year's information and he was just sharing it to familiarize attendees with the previous year's process.

- End of Minutes -