****

Berkeley City College

**COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING**

***MINUTES***

Monday, February 9, 2015

*Chair: Dr. Debbie Budd, President*
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**Review of Agenda and January 26th Roundtable Minutes**

Dr. Budd thanked everyone for their attendance. She noted that Roundtable is an open meeting with committee appointees. The structure is very similar to meetings at the district level and voting is conducted by committee members. The members are faculty, classified, and student leader appointees, and administrators.

Dr. Budd reviewed the agenda and noted that the last meeting’s minutes were quite lengthy. Members were asked to review the minutes during the course of the meeting and ideally they will be approved at the end.

The order of agenda topics was restructured due to other commitments by facilitators. The reporting and discussion began with highlights from the Facilities Committee meeting. Ms. Shirley Slaughter was thanked for her great work with the February 6th Facilities Committee meeting.

**New Facility Survey and Preliminary Results/Highlights from Facilities Committee Meeting / Next Steps**Ms. Slaughter reported that along with committee members, present at the February 6th meeting attendees included Ms. Sharon Millman and Ms. Atheria Smith, our District Facilities Planning and Development Manager. Ms. Smith discussed the 5-year construction plan which, in alignment with the California Government code, requires that the governor annually submit a 5-year infrastructure plan to the legislature in conjunction with his budget. Additionally, the Ed Code requires the California Community College system to also submit a 5-year capital outlay plan.

In recent years funding had not been available to the California community colleges. The total unmet funding needs for California Community Colleges currently amounts to about $29 billion.

Even though funding is not available it is still important that we submit our annual space inventory plan to the state as we fully expect to be funded once those monies become available to us. Our five year construction plan is due July 1st and Ms. Smith will be helping us with that plan. With our new building coming online, hopefully, we are poised to receive funding. Ms. Slaughter noted that Ms. Sharon Millman is here to talk about the survey results from Flex Day. At that time, three important questions were asked:

1. What are the three most important things to get right when we add our new facility?
2. What is your favorite thing about the existing main building?
3. What is your least favorite, and why?

Ms. Millman began her reporting on the facilities topic by adding to Ms. Slaughter’s discussion on funding. She noted that for her line of work there are two types of funding:

1. State Funding
2. Local Measure Bonds

There is still Measure A money supporting the Milvia Street acquisition.

For the survey results there were two students attending flex day, which is not a really strong student voice, so what she is reporting is faculty, staff, and administrators feedback.

When looking at clusters and themes from all three questions there were two topics that have the greatest potential; informal spaces*,* and natural light and windows. She reported that for informal spaces the most frequently identified item was the need for more student space. The next themes were focused on offices and classrooms,and correcting deficiencies. There was not a consensus on what those deficiencies were. There was a sub-cluster in classrooms on flexibility in furniture arrangement.

The next theme was strong IT; access to computer classrooms and signal strength. Two additional major themes were on planning and public display of art. The art theme came up in survey questions 1 and 2. Ms. Millman added that there were both positive and negative comments regarding the atrium. Specific negative comments regarding the atrium were about the usefulness of the space and sonic issues/acoustic separation for neighboring classrooms.

When looking at the “Get it Right” question by itself, having informal spaces was identified as the most important, by far. The themes that came out of that as really important aspects to be kept in mind was studying, collaborating, and socializing.

Ms. Millman provided additional results from the survey noting also that the atrium was identified as the most favorite space, by far, with the basement being the least favorite.

She indicated that she would like to get more student input as their experience in regards to the use of the facility and what they need from it is different than what we would need as faculty, staff and administrators.

Dr. Budd indicated that the goal for the new property was to ensure that it was a close location that students could be able to go back and forth, whether for additional student support space or classrooms. This will all be determined from work through our shared governance groups in looking at the needs.

The goal will be to close escrow at the end of this spring. Usually, it takes well over six months to go through the Department of State Architects to look at all of the designs.

**Accreditation / Town Hall – February 11th, 2014, 12:15 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.**

Dr. Chen encouraged everyone to become familiar with the accreditation self-evaluation report and reminded attendees that the accreditation team will be on campus Monday, March 9 through Thursday, March 12.

She reviewed the discussion topic handouts and stated that the document “Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with Federal Regulations and Commission Policies” highlights the goals of the team members. Their visit is to confirm the information in the report that they are writing. She also reviewed two draft sample documents that she is putting together, which are still in development; “BCC Follow-up and Outcomes” and “2012-15 Student Services Program Planning Summaries.”

Everyone was invited to join the Accreditation Town Hall meeting on Wednesday, February 11th in the auditorium. She extended her appreciation to ASBCC members who asked how they can help. She will work with Mostafa to schedule a meeting with them.

On the checklist form, Dr. Chen referenced the highlighted “third party comment” line and asked that it not be mixed up with voicing complaints. It can be used for compliments.

Ms. Jenny Lowood reported that she was going to create a PowerPoint accreditation report summary, but she instead will be working with Ms. Shirley Fogarino to create short highlights. She reminded attendees that if the team happens to talk to them about the college, to be honest and say what’s going on here.

A final point added by Dr. Chen was a request that the co-chairs for all of the Standards schedule a meeting within the next two weeks with their committee members so that everyone is familiar with their Standard’s contents. Office hours and classroom schedules have been provided to the visiting team.

**BCC Wireless Network**

Mr. Antonio Barreiro indicated that for the better part of the fall semester we have been doing a comprehensive assessment of the wireless service in the building. A team has gone throughout the campus to create a usage map to determine where signal strength was weak, where it was strong and the usage density, in order to be able to create a next-generation wireless network. The current wireless network is almost 8 years old and designed at a time where the expectation was that each individual in a classroom would, on average, have no more than one device. The mapping was done with the estimation of every person in a particular area having as many as three wireless devices. The group NE Systems was brought in to create a plan for improving the wireless service with that new information. They took into account densities far beyond what was originally planned. An example given was for the atrium level being able to support 500 people with three devices each. With all of the equipment; the routers, switches, access points, antennas spread around campus, and installing new equipment in dead spots, the proposal is right around $300K. This is a very good price for what we will be getting for the money. It will require a different type of equipment (Aruba) than the Cisco equipment we are currently using.

The next steps are identifying funding for this and scheduling time when the work can be done. Because it is a comprehensive replacement of existing equipment we have to time it in a way that minimizes disruption. The gap between the end of spring classes and the beginning of summer classes was given as an example timeframe.

Mr. Barreiro clarified that the wireless system is one part of our computer network and separate from our current telephone system. They are looking at the network improvement in two phases. Wireless is the first phase and the phone system is phase two. It is likely when they do that part of the network they will be going to Aruba as well.

Dr. Budd indicated that Mr. Barreiro will also be presenting this information to ASBCC. There was a brief discussion on the campus student use fee and the types of classes students take on other campuses.

It was brought up that it would be better to have classes that go in a row so students don’t have to wait a semester, and also have the same instructor walk along with students. As an example, through Calculus 1 and 2 so students don’t have to learn a new teaching style and they are comfortable with the material. Dr. Budd stated that this is a really valuable conversation for the Education Committee.

**Planning, APU Results and Faculty Prioritization Results**Dr. Budd began this topic by stating that every three years we do our program review and annually we do a program update where the faculty and administrative team and staff look at what’s happening in the different disciplines and programs and come with priorities for the following year. These priorities can be in the areas of resources, technology, facilities, supplies and equipment, and/or personnel. One of the first steps is to go through personnel needs because of the length of time with the hiring process. She indicated that a preliminary review has been done with department chairs and the Office of Instruction. The discussion was then turned over to Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto started off by revisiting the prioritization process that everyone was introduced to at the last Roundtable meeting. A discussion document was distributed for reference. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto then provided a summary of the prioritization process with Department Chairs. She noted that at the narrative meeting held last Friday, they talked about college-wide needs and discussed external and internal needs. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that they started off with the Ed Master Plan goal which is to eliminate the equity gap and advance student success with exemplary programs. The goal of increasing completion and eliminating the gap is because in 2025 students will need to have degrees in order to be well-positioned for living wage jobs. The student needs chart is extracted from our equity plan. She continued her review and highlights of a second handout, which contained information provided to department chairs prior to the position narratives.

As they went through the process for the initial ranking, according to the rubric under part-time/full-time ratio numbers, to receive a “3” an area needed to have no full-time faculty at BCC and more than 20 units per semester. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that the chairs did a really great job in having this criteria included as the 20 units per semester ensure that if they hired a full-time faculty member there were enough units for them to teach a full-time load plus a little cushion in case something happened and a class had to be canceled. For clarification the 20 units per semester could count 20 units in which a faculty member can teach in an alternate area that they would qualify for. As an example, the Business Econ instructor could also teach business courses because they potentially have the qualifications for both. The narratives provided were based on the list of positions on the chart and are in alphabetical order.

There was a brief discussion on the foster youth data which came from the Equity Plan. It was noted that this data has been limited as foster youth have to self-identify but, there is a task force within the Equity Plan committee working to address this area.

The discussion then focused on the faculty prioritization list. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto read through the list by highest priority.

* Computer Science/Engineering
* American Sign Language (ASL)
* Mental Health Counselor
* MMART - Animation & Gaming
* Geography - GIS
* Librarian
* Political Science - International Relations
* Business/Economics
* Art History
* Psychology
* LC Counselor #1
* LC Counselor #2

There was a question asked about the ranking of counselors on the prioritization list and why the LC counselors were lower. It was explained that there are currently eight full-time counselors with the Mental Health Counselor shown 3rd on the prioritization list. The need was supported by the narrative of Department Chair of Counseling who presented the case. Also noted was that the number of counselors over the last three years has tripled.

Dr. Budd acknowledged three important points brought up during the discussion:

1. Counselors having the expertise.
2. Availability – when students need help before classes start and ongoing during the term
3. To support different groups – there is funding through special funding for counselors; some for part-time, some that might be moved into non-tenured track.

Ms. Lowood added that as a department chair present during the narrative presentations and who also deliberated with her co-chair on the positions, they discussed the greatest needs of the students at BCC and what would serve the most students. They felt the mental health counselor was an important position with a serious need here for someone like that. She also stated in support of the librarian position we have the most frequently used library than Merritt and the College of Alameda combined, but fewer librarians than either one of those colleges.

There was in-depth discussion on the rankings of the Learning Community Counselors and the ranking. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that while the positions were put forward through the annual program review process and annual program updates, no narratives were submitted on Friday, in order for them to move forward. She added that on the student support side, one of the things realized through their conversations in the fall is that students are in need of different levels and types of support. She stated that our counselors do a lot of work and to be able to have that breadth across all of the areas is very challenging. One of the things they are looking at is building a faculty advising component as well where all faculty brought on will be able to support students to a certain level. Counselors, of course, will be working specifically with targeted students who are in need of that extra support.

The group discussed the rubric and possibly refining it in the future specifically discussing all positions getting a three in alignment with the mission statement. Suggested for future rankings was to perhaps identify specific pieces of the mission to prioritize, whether that is CTE or degree completion, in order to create some differentiation. Ms. Lowood noted that the rubric used was not the initial rubric and it does change. The next step is to look at the rubric again and then refine it.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto shared how the process will possibly unveil itself with regards to the rubric and the entire process. She is going to suggest that the Senate look at the process and provide recommendations. She hopes to work with them in the next few months to look at the different areas. She does not feel we should get rid of college mission criteria as it is critical to the ranking and stated that it is just a question of how we help the category in a way that we can prioritize within that segment. The other area she mentioned was the conversation on the maximum 20 units for part-time, full-time ratio for areas that had no full-timers. There was discussion on whether it should just be 15 because that is a full load. The next piece she mentioned was addressing the following questions:

1. What was the initial ranking for the prioritization based on the rubric?
2. How much aligned was the position to our college-wide needs?
3. How much aligned were positions to external and student needs?

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that those are three categories that she feels can be brought in to help refine the final Chairs voting and recommendations for future years.

Dr. Budd indicated that this will be shared with the Senate and voting members of Roundtable will make a recommendation. We are waiting now for the district to see how many new faculty positions we will have. We should be able to make that recommendation at the February 23 meeting. The ultimate goal is to have full timers on board by the fall flex day in August.

There was a question asked about adding a numerical measurement for the narratives that can be added to provide a better understanding of how much weight the narrative has on determining the votes of chairs.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto believes that there is some movement that can be made that way to make it less subjective.

**Approval of January 26th Roundtable Minutes**

A motion was made by Ms. Katherine Bergman to approve the minutes:

Second by: Ms. Brenda Johnson

All in favor

Objections: None

Abstentions: None

**Other**

No additional topics discussed.

-End of Minutes -

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