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Berkeley City College

**COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING**

***MINUTES***

Monday, February 23, 2015

*Chair: Dr. Debbie Budd, President*

**Attendees:** Katherine Bergman, Joseph Bielanski, Lydia Boudiza, May Chen, Paula Coil, Carlos Cortez, Windy Franklin, Mostafa Ghous, Roberto Gonzalez, Scott Hoshida, Brenda Johnson, Jenny Lowood, Linda McAllister, Danny McCarty (ASBCC), Malique Banks (ASBCC), Catherine Nichols, Kelly Pernell, Cleavon Smith, Tram Vo-Kumamoto, Hermia Yam, Susan Truong, Riley Predum, Emie Mitsuno Hernandez, Noelle Atkins (ASBCC)

**Review of Agenda and February 9th Roundtable Minutes**

Dr. Budd opened the meeting and noted that the Roundtable membership is now listed on the left-hand side of the agenda. As many guests attend Roundtable it’s important to remind everyone of the charge of the committee and the membership that is part of the Shared Governance manual. Very often there are discussions requiring votes and recommendations of committee members and it is great having voting members noted for those purposes. Today’s agenda was then reviewed.

**Faculty Prioritization**

*Reviews of Recommendations from Dept. Chairs and Academic Senate*Dr. Budd referenced attachments that were distributed with today’s meeting agenda. The prioritization that came out of the Department Chairs’ meeting was shared two weeks ago and forwarded to Academic Senate. Academic Senate voted to recommend the rankings. Dr. Budd reported that it has been determined at the district level that we will need to hire more faculty positions to meet our faculty obligation number as a district, as well as get us to parity in the full-time faculty ranks across the district. It has been determined that Berkeley City College will get six new positions as part of the additional funding that is coming from growth. We will also be able to fill two additional positions due to retirements that have been on the books in multimedia and the library. As a result we will be able to hire eight new faculty. In the last three years we have hired 17 faculty. This eight will bring us to almost half of our faculty being hired in the last five-six years. Dr. Budd added that people have to be working in the Fall in order to help us towards our faculty obligation number.

*Discussion and Recommendations by Roundtable (Action)*Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto proposed, as a recommendation to go along with the acceptance of Roundtable’s priorities, for the Chairs to work with their deans to develop an action plan on hiring and identify the chair for each of the hiring committees along with a timeline for posting, the paper review, first level interview, and second level interview; to see how it maps out.

She also proposed that it be due to the President’s office by March 6th in order to move forward with all of the positions as soon as the district gives its approval to move forward.

Dr. Budd thanked the Department Chairs and Office of Instruction for pulling all of the data together for the faculty prioritization. She also thanked the Academic Senate for making the recommendation to move forward as our goal will be for this body to make a recommendation to the President and President’s Cabinet so we can begin posting in early March and conducting interviews in April in order to have people begin for our Fall Flex day.

The top eight from the prioritization list was reviewed. Dr. Budd noted potential funding through special programs such as SSSP for non-tenured track Learning Community Counselors.

Q. When saying, “non-tenured tracking” does that mean part-time adjunct?

A. No. They can be full-time but out of grant funds.

Q. If we had a full-time person through grant funding, full-time non-tenured track and we wanted to make that tenured track, would that go through the prioritization process or would it just roll over?

A. If it were prioritized it could roll over into that.

Q. What has been the precedent in the district around full-time non-tenured track positions? Have those been granted tenure?

A. District practices are unknown.

Dr. Chen added a footnote regarding using SSSP money which she stated is designed for overall counseling/general counseling, and would be very inclusive, not exclusive.

An overview from a recent retreat, attended by select Student Services department members was shared.

A motion was made by Ms. Jenny Lowood to approve the recommendation forwarded from the Academic Senate and Department Chairs

Second by: Ms. Paula Coil

All in favor

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Ms. Emma Carlblom inquired about student involvement for faculty hiring process. Dr. Budd explained that as far as on committees it has been past practice that students are involved on the hiring committees of administrators but typically not faculty positions or classified.

Dr. Linda McAllister reported that there has been a lot of discussion on hiring committees, particularly in social sciences of trying to create a system where potential candidates can give a teaching demonstration in front of students, that would be a piece of the overall score. She indicated that she would really like to support figuring out how to do that in a consistent way to while meeting hiring and confidentiality standards. Dr. Budd indicated that it is currently not in the administrative procedures but we may need to talk about doing a pilot to see if this would be reasonable. She will mention it at Chancellor’s Cabinet tomorrow.

**Accreditation PowerPoint**

*Key Points*

Dr. Budd indicated that she believes that everyone in attendance will be interviewed during the visit. The team will absolutely attend the ASBCC meeting, they may attend club councils or talk to students individually. They will attend the student clubs and most likely the Black student Union meeting. The key points will highlight things that the team may ask. Dr. Budd stated it’s about being honest and stating what is working and ideally if they weren’t working, stating the things that have done to change it, and make it better.

Ms. Jenny Lowood shared highlights from the Accreditation Town Hall presentation with attendees. She noted that we are not claiming to be perfect nor are we saying that there is no room for improvement. We are, however, saying that we meet all of the Standards of accreditation.

Dr. Chen also shared information to obtain access to district’s institution research data for BCC:

<http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/institutional-research/>

Dr. Budd indicated that this actually flows right into the next piece of our agenda. When all of the departments did their Program Reviews they looked at that data. They looked at how students were doing with their student learning outcomes and assessments. They looked at the success rate and recommended different resources that they needed to help improve that whether it be more tutors, embedded tutors as you see in many of your classes, or new faculty. A piece of that came out of each of the disciplines and then gets forwarded to the different committees; the Ed Committee, the Technology Committee, and the Facilities Committee. When they are looking at that we need to be able to look at it through a rubric on how we rank those requests and prioritize the funding piece on that.

**Discussion of Current Rubric with Recommendations for Improvement**

Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto reviewed suggestions that she pulled together from feedback at Roundtable in different meetings. She indicated she would go through each of the steps and talk about what worked and what didn’t work. She stated that if she runs out of time questions could be submitted to her afterwards.

*What worked well:*

Step 1: Deans compiled all of the positions from the APUs and they were put into a spreadsheet with data.

Step 2: They use the rubric that was already established and because the Dean’s and she had already populated the data the chairs had suggested that they go ahead and implement the rubric. That helped to standardize the initial rubric ranking for everyone as opposed to each Chair doing it on their own. This made it much more consistent.

Step 3: They had included the college wide administrative narrative as well. That helped to complete the whole picture with the departmental needs as well as the college-wide needs.

Step 4: They used a technology tool to compile the final rankings. Communications to the chairs was done before it went to Senate and Roundtable.

*Recommendations for Improvement*

Step1: The initial list did not have the General Counselor position on it. She believes that this was because of the way they structured gathering APUs. For example, they did not pull from Student Services and also the Instructions side had put out the Learning Community Counselors which was not communicated to the Student Services side for inclusion in the APUs for counseling.

Step 2: There is a suggestion for defining and differentiating the rankings between three and zero for the Mission section. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto has asked to get a better definition of mandated maximum enrollments; what does “mandated” mean, what do we want it to mean? Part-time / full-time ratio within specific discipline or discipline cluster.

Step 3: This is a good point for engagement from students and faculty. If we can get more to come and see the narratives it will assist in learning more about our programs and college needs. Recommending that they look at a rubric for the narratives and how they would rank the narrative itself as there isn’t one right now.

Step 4: Need to create a final ranking rubric. Her recommendation is to look at using the initial ranking score as x% of the final and the narrative ranking score as x% of the final and have a final ranking with those two in consideration.

All of the recommendations for improvement will go back to Senate.

There was a discussion on the process going back to Senate and Chairs. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that because this matter is a 10+1 it usually goes to Senate. If Senate feels that it needs to go to Chairs and that to be the place for the discussion to start, she recommended that Senate then make that designation.

Steps 5 & 6 are in process right now and when they are completely done they will be soliciting feedback.

The deadline is to have something new in place by the end of spring to implement for next fall.

Dr. Chen also noted that DSPS had also put in for a full-time counselor.

There was additional discussion on inclusion of Student Services’ needs moving forward.

**Requests of and Reports from Committees:**

*Charge to Committees for Developing Rubric for Prioritization*Dr. Budd recommended that Roundtable give a charge to other committees to be able to develop a rubric for prioritizing items that come forward to them.

Ms. Lowood believes they do have rubrics but they have not come through the Roundtable.

A motion was made by Ms. Lowood to ask the committees to develop and/or share their rubrics, process and timeline for prioritization with Roundtable.

Second by: Ms. Brenda Johnson

All in favor.

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

**Education Committee**

*Faculty Prioritization Rubric*

*Ed Master Plan*

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto reported that at their last meeting they looked over the goal for the Ed Master Plan and the four indicators – recommendation from the Ed Committee is to change the goal slightly to replace “achievement gap” with “education gap.”

Core indicator on the second bullet was changed to say, “Increase by 5%” as that was felt to be more reasonable.

She noted that the indicators may change as we go along but the goal would be the same for the next 10 years. This Thursday, they are hoping to finalize a survey on characteristics of an exemplary program which they hope to distribute by Friday.

Mr. Danny McCarty stated that if it could be forwarded to him they could distribute it. This Thursday, ASBCC is holding their first town hall, themed Access, Persistence, and Completion in alignment with administration.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto will send the link to Mr. McCarty.

**Technology Committee**

*Wireless Upgrades*

Dr. Budd reported that in regards to the estimate reported at the last meeting of approximately $300K needed to allow three devices per person in the area, a proposal was submitted to the district to come up with half the cost and they have agreed. This will be sent forward to the Board. Ideally in June, between Spring and Summer, work will begin on all of the access points.

**Facilities Committee**

*Review of Annual Program Update Priorities*

Dr. Carlos Cortez invited attendees to join committee meetings on the first Friday of each month. He reported that at the last meeting they looked specifically at facilities requests in the annual program updates and APU documents from Business Services, Student Services, and Office of Instruction to identify common themes. The next step in the process is to conduct a site visit of the new facility. Attendees were again encouraged to attend. They hope to make general recommendations at their April meeting on what they believe the priorities should be for the new building and present to Roundtable, and ultimately make recommendations to President’s cabinet.

Dr. Cortez welcomes input from other committees. For those who cannot attend but what like to submit their recommendations please email Dr. Cortez at ccortez@peralta.edu.

**Other**

Equity Meeting to be held on Wednesday, February 25th at 9:30 a.m., 451A

Peralta Scholarships due on March 9th.

Book order requests are out for the summer and fall. Summer orders are due on March 15 and fall orders are due April 15.

No additional topics discussed.

-End of Minutes -

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