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Berkeley City College

**COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING**

Monday, April 13, 2015

**MEETING MINUTES**

*Chair: Dr. Debbie Budd*

**Attendees:** Antonio Barreiro, Katherine Bergman, Joseph Bielanski, Jr., Nancy Cayton, May Chen, Mostafa Ghous, Roberto Gonzalez, Brenda Johnson, Jenny Lowood, Vincent Koo, Catherine Nichols, Cynthia Reese, Shirley Slaughter, Cleavon Smith, Tram-Vo-Kumamoto Hermia Yam, Malique Banks, Kaydee Miller, Bonnie Cherry, Dave Ivan Cruz, Noelle Atkins, Justin Terry, Aman Williams, Rich Berberian

**Review of Agenda and Review of March 23rd Minutes**

Dr. Budd opened the meeting by thanking Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto and Dr. May Chen for facilitating the last Roundtable meeting while she was away at a CEO conference. The new bookstore manager, Mr. Rich Berberian was introduced.

The agenda was reviewed by Dr. Budd after a brief discussion with students in attendance regarding graduation.

Dr. Budd opened the agenda for additional topics.

1. Ms. Kaydee Miller noted that Mr. Danny McCarthy is no longer the ASBCC representative and that she will be taking his place. Dr. Budd responded that notification regarding Mr. McCarthy’s resignation was received previously and they will follow-up as far as the interim representative.
2. Ms. Jenny Lowood indicated that she would like to make an announcement about the new NILOA.

**Technology Requests and Rubric Review**

Mr. Antonio Barreiro reported that there are four technology-related handouts. He provided a brief update from the district technology committee meeting which was held on Friday, April 10th. The district Tech Committee has been working the better part of this year to tackle the issues of getting a global view of true technology requests and associated costs, across the district for all four colleges in the district. Most recently, a subcommittee of the district Tech Committee called the ENG (Engineering Networking Group) met. Vincent Koo is the network coordinator for Berkeley City College. They have been working on our true technology upgrade and request needs with the idea that at some point we need to account for what our true needs are and also take into account the expected lifespan of equipment and the total cost of owning that equipment including service contracts, etc. For the entire district, they have put together their projected expenses for next year. Mr. Barreiro referenced the multicolored handout, “Peralta Community College District IT Capital Needs by 2016.” The estimate right now for all four colleges in the district to bring all of our equipment up to the current lifespan while accounting for various maintenance and ongoing support of equipment is approximately $26 million. This is not an amount that exists within the current budget. Mr. Barreiro reported that this is an informational and first look at budget needs for technology.

Each of the colleges has been asked to create an operating budget. Mr. Barreiro indicated that for BCC he has been making the case for a standardize replacement cycle. Typically, a five year replacement cycle is common. The way organizations usually handle this is that they break that into a percentage of the technology ecology year-by-year that is replaced. In a five year cycle, it would mean that ever year 20% of technology would be replaced. For BCC we would be looking at an annual refresh budget in excess of $600,000.

The next two handouts reviewed by Mr. Barreiro referenced the Annual Program Update technology requests. Department heads are asked to make an assessment of what their current technology needs. BCC’s Technology Committee compiled all of the APU technology requests. Mr. Barreiro noted that one department not reflected is the Business Services Office. This will be added.

In response to Ms. Jenny Lowood’s comments that the English department is not reflected Mr. Barreiro indicated that there were requests that overlapped and multiple departments requested similar needs. It was pointed out that the English department’s need is embedded within ESL.

A rubric was developed by the committee to evaluate requests in terms of priorities. Mr. Barreiro reviewed the rubric with attendees. A subcommittee of the Technology Committee met to review the information for each request. The subcommittee members were Dr. Fabian Banga, Mr. Roberto Gonzalez, Mr. Vincent Koo, Mr. Joshua Boatright, and Mr. Antonio Barreiro. They did a preliminary prioritization using the rubric and reported back to the BCC Technology Committee for input and final ratification. The prioritization document reflected just over $1 million of technology requests for next year.

In reference to the question, “How does the request improve instruction and/or student success”, Mr. Cleavon Smith asked if the PIE or Curriculum committee were consulted to help answer the question. The response was that they were not and it was recommended that they be consulted.

The funding that we will receive from the district is the 50% match of the wireless network upgrade that is in progress. For next year, there has been no funding identified at this time.

Dr. Budd noted that these are huge requests and this is setting us up for the future. If we go out for another bond, it will be important to ensure that we have a technology piece on that bond. She also stated that it is hard to say if there are any dollars remaining as we did pass the recommendation, here at Roundtable, to upgrade the wireless network.

Dr. Budd also reported that we are hoping that our property acquisition will have final approval at the April 28th Board Meeting with the goal of closing escrow on May 7th. Once we close escrow, we will be able to move forward with our planning. Ideally, at our next Roundtable meeting, we will be able to discuss this further. We will bring in all of the work that has been happening with Facilities and we will develop a user group (after the Board’s final approval) that will include faculty, staff, and students as we design that building. A couple of dates will be set to meet in May before faculty’s leaves.

**Strategic Plan Review and Discussion.**The district Strategic Plan was developed in 2006 and approved and is now being updated. There were many open meetings at the district level and the goal was for this strategic plan to be on the Board agenda tomorrow for adoption. This will not be an agenda item for tomorrow’s meeting in order to provide additional time for review.

Dr. Budd noted that the strategic plan is very similar to our Education Master Plan. She requested that it be reviewed and comments be forwarded to both Ms. Cynthia Reese and her. Mr. Smith suggested that it be made a Google doc and distributed for everyone to add their comments. Dr. Budd suggested having the document shared with the Classified Senate and the ASBCC. She also requested receiving the link from Mr. Smith for the Roundtable Committee members. She stated that once Mr. Smith sends it out, attendees look at it and share with their groups.

**IEPI (Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative) Visit and Updates**Dr. May Chen reported that she believes Berkeley City College will receive approximately $150,000 one-time funding from the state to help with institutional effectiveness. She noted that we reviewed the letter at the last meeting. The state has decided to select four indicators for us to work on during the first year.

1. Course completion rate
2. Accreditation status
3. Fund balance
4. Overall audit opinions

Dr. Chen stated that we all should be working very hard to ensure that no audit exceptions will be identified here at Berkeley City College.

She reviewed a student achievement report handout indicating that the report was completed over a year ago and, therefore, the most up to date information is through fall 2013. All of the information displayed in the report is either from the State Chancellor’s office or from our district’s institutional research office. Pages 10 and 15 were identified as important pages to review. She noted that a significant portion of the money has been designated for staff development to look at areas, subjects or disciplines where additional help is needed to bring up the overall course success rate.

We will be asking the outside team to share their institutional strategies when dealing with their tough areas. The team will meet in small groups. Dr. Budd indicated that she will ask them to come to Roundtable to meet everyone and see how we do a piece of our shared governance. They will also be meeting with individual groups.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that it is a partnership review team and the idea is that the state is trying to build a collaborative across the state for all of the different colleges to work together and create a community of practice. We have identified an area that we would like to work on and we have reached out to them to ask for support. They will bring a team that hopefully will have experts in that area to provide suggestions. The more that knowledge is shared, the stronger our system will be. Their goal is to eventually work with all community colleges. The focus is continuous improvement and growth for us as a system, one college at a time.

Dr. Budd added that it is a new initiative and there are 112 community colleges in the state with Berkeley City College being one of the first seven colleges participating.

In response to Ms. Lowood’s question on why accreditation status being one of the indicators, Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that the funds behind this effort is through legislature and they want to make sure that we as a system are accredited and that our accreditation was being renewed and reaffirmed.

Mr. Bielanski added that because so many colleges in the State of California have been put on Warning or some kind of Sanction, the legislature said, why should we not get a head of that prior to visiting teams coming and help colleges resolve their issues so that when a team comes they are in good shape. It was clarified that the indicators were not designed for BCC only but for all colleges in the state.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that at our next meeting, perhaps we will be able to present our target for the course completion for this coming year. For the Ed Master Plan our target is 70% in 10 years (2024.) We are currently around 63-64% and our target goal will probably be 64-65 for this coming year.

Dr. Budd went back to Mr. Smith’s question on a user group for the facility build-out.

Mr. Smith recommended 4 faculty, 3 staff, 3 admin and 3 students as members of the user group. They would commit to working in May and a time or two during the summer.

Second by Ms. Lowood.

All in favor.

Opposed. None

Abstentions. None

The group will meet in May with dates to be identified. She would like interested persons to come forward from faculty, staff and students.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto will forward this information to Mr. Smith.

**Classified Staff Requests Update**

Dr. Budd thanked Roundtable attendees and particular Ms. Vo-Kumamoto for her great work in helping with the faculty prioritization rubric and Mr. Barreiro for his work with the classified prioritization.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto went over the classified prioritization process and positions recommended. She noted the committee composition determined at the last roundtable. She also reviewed the steps that were written out for the committee members’ review.

There was one position identified as already having funding to it. Because that position was a need critical to the campus and had funding, that position was automatically forwarded as a recommendation to fill.

Right now the classified prioritization committee is forwarding recommendations to Roundtable, faculty senate, and classified senate for review and feedback; to be brought to Roundtable again at the next meeting for approval to forward to the President for recommendation.

Ms. Lowood suggested putting proposed positions on the top when the recommendations are forwarded to the district.

Ms. Shirley Slaughter asked if proposed positions automatically move up next year, if the number of positions received from the district will not cover those identified as critical and prioritized as high priority.

Dr. Budd responded, “No.” She indicated that this has been ongoing for years and years with faculty positions. She believes what would happen is that the justification would be reviewed and noted that it was prioritized the year before but it would have to be in that mix.

There was additional discussion on this subject with Ms. Slaughter adding that for support services, it should not be held to the same criteria as faculty.

Dr. Budd noted that this is the first step. Discussed was perhaps giving additional points to positions previously identified as critical but not filled. Noted also was that with the new building some positions would move up on the prioritization list as the need would be changed.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto also noted positions that were put off for a year and not discussed. To give those positions a fair chance at being a part of this conversation again, they would open it up in the fall and go through the process again. She also recommended thinking about going towards a prioritization process that is longer in duration such as a three-year hiring plan to go along with the 3-year program review cycle. This would move the conversation to exception and changes.

At the next meeting she will go through each of the steps and talk about what worked and what didn’t work so it can be refined for the fall.

Dr. Chen noted that she took the prioritization for resources very seriously and went online to research how other colleges are doing it. At many of the other colleges the entire college would go through the Annual Program Review process. In the future we may want to consider having everyone go through the Annual Program Review.

**Faculty Hires and Timelines**

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto reported that they have forwarded two positions, POSCI Instructor and the Librarian, to the district office and hopefully we will see it posted shortly. Two additional positions, Computer Science and American Sign Language are almost ready to go down to the district office to be posted. Three positions are left after that; Business Econ and MMART, are refining their job descriptions before it is submitted. The last position is the Geography. The science department has decided not to move forward on this position this year and they will be moving to the next position. It will be put back into the prioritization list for the next year. They will be moving forward with Art History.

**Budget Updates.  Enrollment/ Budget Allocation Model/ Budget Assumptions**

Ms. Shirley Slaughter reviewed the “2014-15 Integrated Planning Calendar” for budget development. This calendar contains critical timelines and due dates. We are currently down to the April 20th deadline. The second document for review at attendee’s leisure is the current working version for the “2015-16 Budget Assumption Sheet.” This budget assumption sheet contains our assumptions for our general apportionment as well as our revenue and expenditure budgets. These assumptions will assure that our budget is developed based upon data and our planning efforts. As more detailed information is receiving in the coming months from the Office of the Governor and the State Budget, these assumptions will be adjusted accordingly. Given our existing assumptions, we are moving forward with developing our 2015-16 discretionary budget. In the discretionary budget, they have included the student ambassadors’ budget and they have increased our utilities by 2%. The district-wide discretionary budget totals $14 million of which $2,050.000 is allocated to BCC. A good portion (rough estimate is $786K) of this goes towards our utilities and the facility. At the town hall on April 29th, the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) will be discussed and we will have a guest speaker from the district office, Vice Chancellor of Finance, Susan Rinne. Ms. Slaughter asked everyone to come out for this important town hall.

It was noted that there was no longer a bullet for the Budget Allocation Model in the assumptions. Dr. Budd will bring this up at Chancellor’s Cabinet tomorrow.

**Goals and Accomplishments**

Handouts discussed were the Berkeley City College 2013-14 Accomplishments and the college Goals for 2014-15 that are tied into the district’s goals. Dr. Budd requested that attendees come prepared to talk about these at the next to roundtable meetings. Accomplishments will be highlighted and tied into the overarching goals for the year.

**Equity Plan Updates**

Ms. Brenda Johnson reported that there are two remaining Equity Task Force planning meetings for the remaining term. One will take place this week, Wednesday, April 15th 9:30-11:30 in rooms 451A/B and the last meeting is scheduled for May 20th but she is not sure how that will go with graduation being the next day. She indicated that they will meet over the summer as well. At this Wednesday’s meeting they hope to look at benchmarks to gauge if they are meeting outcomes and achieving goals. Successful, to date is the BCC Scholars Program which will be a bridge program for six weeks starting this summer. Also there will be a FELI training this June. They hope to continue having the FELI training so that everyone is versed in that particular training model as it will aid our student Equity planning. There are sub-groups of the Equity Plan Task Force, one being student parents. Dean Johnson congratulated Ms. Bonnie Cherry and Ms. Heather Dodge and others who did a great job conducting student surveys and looking at the needs of our students. They plan to meet with the YMCA director after the 17th. Ms. Johnson hopes the sub-groups have met and if they have not, she encourages them to meet soon.

**Senate and Committee Reports***Academic Senate*

They had their state academic plenary on the weekend. They discussed things around the online education initiative, the education plan initiative, as well as the common assessment initiative. He has been sharing that continuously with our people. The big thing that came up at plenary was a resolution on the table around math prerequisites. The resolution was fortunately tabled but through that conversation our district partners was providing support against the resolution. They discovered an AMADIC (American Mathematical Association for two year colleges) their position around prerequisites for non-stem math courses which stands that those prerequisites should speak to the classes that they are prerequisites to; basically saying our 206 on campus is an adequate prerequisite for statistics. It is very likely we will have district support in getting 206 as an official prerequisite.

The Deans, Dr. Carlos Cortez and Mr. Barreiro are working with the individual disciplines regarding tabling.

*ASBCC (Ms. Kaydee Miller reporting)*

* Elections will be happening tomorrow and Wednesday. They should know the results by Thursday, once the ballots are counted. She believes there is a 24 hour verification period. The plan is to bring the election winners to the AS meeting to introduce them and also bring them to the various shared governance meetings.
* Mr. Danny McCarty, ASBCC President, resigned. Ms. Miller indicates that for the remainder of the period she will be filling his role, as well as her own. It will be discussed at their Executive Board meeting to see if they will fill the role or leave it vacant for the remainder of the semester.
* They are working on the verification of documents to help keep good work going next year.

*Elections (Ms. Bonnie Cherry reporting)*

* Tables will be set up on the first floor
* They will be set up in two shifts to also accommodate evening students
* She confirmed that a staff member will be there at all times
* Ballot box will be locked in the administrator’s office
* League of Women Voters will be assisting

Dr. Chen added that it is her understanding that the district set very standardized election dates but it is her understanding that the other three campuses may not have elections during those dates. She also noted that there is the Student Trustee election and, if that is the case we need to seal our results of the trustee’s election until we learn from the other colleges and send to the district all together.

There was a brief discussion on the confusion surrounding elections and policies/procedures. Ms. Cherry indicated that they are attempted to document procedures to avoid this in future elections.

*Classified Senate*

* Unable to meet last week but largely focused on the prioritization for classified. The overwhelming response seems quite favorable. They will be forwarding observations and recommendations to the process to Ms. Vo-Kumamoto.
* Taking a little longer than anticipated but they are making final edits in terms of the formatting for the constitution which had not been updated in a while.
* They meet a week from Thursday and will start their election process.

**Other**

Student Success Days are happening this Friday, April 17th and next Friday, April 24th. There is a robust agenda and 80+ students are attending from Berkeley High School.

The National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment is featuring the Berkeley City College SLO Assessment webpage as their feature web page for April. She will send something out to BCC and also write something for the News to the Board. This will also be shared with the Dr. Barbara Beno to keep ACCJC informed and up-to-date.

Mr. John Saenz the new Learning Resource Center Coordinator was introduced. He can be reached at [jsaenz@peralta.edu](mailto:jsaenz@peralta.edu)., 510.981.2827.

Approval of March 23, 2015 minutes

Ms. Jenny Lowood approved that we pass the minutes.

Second by Katherine Bergman

All in Favor

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

No additional topics discussed.

-End of Minutes -

Minutes taken by: Cynthia Reese, [creese@peralta.edu](mailto:creese@peralta.edu), 510.981.2851