

Berkeley City College

**COLLEGE ROUNDTABLE FOR PLANNING AND BUDGETING**

Monday, September 14, 2015

**MEETING MINUTES**

*Chair: Dr. Debbie Budd*

**Attendees:** Diana Bajrami, Antonio Barreiro, May Chen, Paula Coil, Roberto Gonzalez, Brenda Johnson, Cynthia Reese, Theresa Rowland, Karen Shields, Shirley Slaughter, Cleavon Smith, Tram Vo-Kumamoto Hermia Yam, Siraj Omar, Jennifer Lenahan, Rich Berberian, Windy Franklin, Jasmine Martinez, Linda McAllister, Joe Doyle, Tom Kies, Dylan Eret

Dr. May Chen opened the Roundtable meeting by requesting that attendees review the August 31st meeting minutes for approval.

Ms. Tram Vo-Kumamoto motioned to accept the Minutes

Second by Ms. Brenda Johnson

All in favor

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Dr. Budd thanked Dr. Chen getting the meeting started while she welcomed students at the first Club Rush Week event. She noted that Ms. Brianna Rogers, Mr. Majuan Franklin and Ms. Paula Coil have done great work to get that going. Also thanked were Ms. Brenda Johnson and Dr. Diana Bajrami.

New attendees to this week’s meeting were acknowledged by Dr. Budd; Mr. Rich Berberian, Mr. Joe Doyle, and Dr. Linda McAllister.

**Goals and Accomplishments - Comments from the field….**

* **Responses to 2014-15 - Additions**
* **Updates and suggestions for 2015-16**
* **Plan for constituents identifying activities for 2015-16 to reach our goals and outcomes**

At the last meeting everyone was asked to go back to their groups and comment on any additions that were not identified for 2014-15 Goals and Accomplishments and to also identify any new thing to add for 2015-2016. A reminder was sent out to everyone regarding the timing and a few additional items were forwarded for inclusion.

An updated copy of the 2014-2015 Goals and Accomplishments documents was prepared by Ms. Jennifer Lenahan. Dr. Chen indicated that two major improvements were made:

1. Switched the 2nd and 3rd columns for ease of reading and reference.
2. Dr. Joseph Bielanski reviewed the entire document for content and accuracy.

Classified Senate was thanked for their recommendations which Dr. Chen will incorporate into the Goals and Accomplishments document.

Classified Senate President Karen Shields provided an overview of the Senate’s recommendations (reference document: “*RT091415 - Classified Senate - Goals-Accomplishments.*”)

Dr. Chen will follow-up to see if the District has submitted an update to the staffing numbers. It was noted by Dr. Budd that this actually is in line with some of the later conversations we will have on the budget. We will be talking about the 4000, 5000, and 2000 accounts. The 2000 accounts are the Classified salaries both full-time and hourly. She commented that Ms. Vo-Kumamoto along with a task force that included Mr. Roberto Gonzalez did great work in looking at the prioritization and a rubric for Classified Staff but sadly enough, after that work, we did not receive any funding at the college level from the district to fill those positions that were identified. This is not to say that it won’t happen it just has not happened yet. She explained that they worked hard on faculty hires to get them hired for Fall, to meet the faculty obligation number. There is not that same number that needs to be met with Classified so she can see how that is frustrating.

Recommendations to the 2015-2016 Goals and Accomplishments were also forwarded by the Ed Committee in regards to the language. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto provided an overview of those areas that they felt would help enhance the goals for this year (reference document: *“RT091415 - 15-16 AnnualGoalsMemotoRoundtablefor9.14.15.*”)

Dr. Chen discussed the district’s 2015-2016 Strategic Goals & Institutional Objectives document. Each year the colleges start with the district goals and from there we identify college goals as part of the district-wide goals. She noted that the district revised some of the wording and the updated document reflects some of the conversations held during the summit. Specifically, noted were:

A.1 Student Access: District target of 20,609 Resident FTES

A.2 Student Success: Using the total 2014-2015 data as a baseline, increase students' participation in SSSP eligible activities by at least 50%

Referencing baseline data from a State Chancellor’s report, (reference document: “*RT091415 - 2014-2015 Baseline Report - State Chancellors Office*”), Dr. Chen stated this is what would be used by the district. We are going to take a look to see if increasing by 50% is realistic. She noted that we can identify our own language for the college goals. Dr. Chen stated that for SSSP the mandate is 100% of the new matriculating student and if you look at all of the numbers/highlights for BCC those are last year’s numbers. The data input was not the greatest however, this is our baseline. Dr. Chen reviewed some of the numbers from the handout with attendees.

There was a question in regards to numbers in the “Service Not Received” column / “Counseling Advisement Services” row. Dr. Chen explained that we absolutely do not have to worry. What happens is that the State has all of our data in their database. These students may not be active. We have a little over 7,000 students each semester and we provide services to almost all of them.

Dr. Budd suggested that maybe this can be one of our goals and ensure data submission on to state is accurate and to have our SSSP goal to serve all matric students; example given is the 2014-2015 directed of 3,159 and the exempted 1362 is approximately 4500 out of 7200 students.

An additional question asked is what are the “Other Services” and what is included in that category.

Dr. Chen noted that the number of students receiving Academic Progress/Probation Services is much higher than 135 (Fall 2014) and 210 (Spring 2015). However, for some reason we report more numbers into other services and that has some funding implications. For the students receiving Academic Progress/Probation Services we could receive around 15% of the funding, for students receiving “Other Services” it would only be around 5%.

To set our goals, Dr. Budd indicated that we have to know where we are for baseline and what we have accomplished in the past.

Also asked was if these are duplicated. Fall/Fall and Spring/Spring is unduplicated. However if a student sees a counselor in Fall and again in Spring they are duplicated or counted in both semesters.

Clarification was further requested on whether it is considered duplicated if a student is being seen for Counseling/Advising (Fall) and also receives Ed Plan Services (Fall). The response from Dr. Chen is that yes, these are duplicated. Ms. Hermia Yam went on to note that they have the reason codes on SARS. If a student comes in to see a counselor for several reasons, they check all that applies. She also explained that for the “Other Services” they worked with Ms. Paula Coil to change those to “Follow-up Career” because most of the students go in to see the Transfer Center to find out additional information on transferring. In the SSSP reason code, there is a “Follow-up Career” code so the specific service is identified, instead of noting it broadly under Other Services.

Dr. Budd is cautious in accepting a 50% increase in students' participation in SSSP eligible activities but instead believes it may be something to strive towards.

Ms. Coil commented on the “Total Baseline” column noting the difference in staffing levels at BCC to support students, as opposed to other colleges of a similar, or even double our size. She aligned this to the big picture of having the goal to increase services but also addressing staffing deficiencies to provide the services.

In response, Dr. Chen stated that she understands Ms. Coil’s comments. On the other hand, according to SSSP, we need to meet the mandate of serving 100% of new matriculating students, and that’s the area we need to work on. The two suggestions presented by Dr. Chen are:

1. To meet the mandate of serving 100% of first year new students.
2. Continue to serve last year’s new students; as that is also a part of SSSP.

This should ideally be our BCC goal.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that what is missing on the chart is the number of students that are new for the first time for the initial assessment/orientation. For us to determine if we will achieve x%, we need to know the number of new students. If we are currently at 100%, then the goal would be to maintain it. If it is less than the mandate then the goal would be to strive for that.

As expressed by Dr. Budd, the most important thing that comes up as goals are being set is that we have to know where we are in order to be able to know where we want to go. That is one thing that was identified with our Equity Plan; to make sure we have more clearer baseline data.

Dr. Budd noted the great work done by Ms. Lisa Gwyn-Liago and Ms. Vo-Kumamoto extracting BI tool data for the faculty, for their program reviews that was disaggregated by race, ethnicity and age, along with the work done by Dr. Orkin and Mr. Nathan Pellegrin from the district. She noted that it is a big task to do but will be really helpful for not only this year but years to come. Ideally, she hopes that this will help with our staff development; looking at who we want to have come speak and help guide us with promising practices.

There was a discussion on a New York Times article highlighting Equity in Higher Education. Dr. Budd noted that there was a great piece in there on Xavier University an institution of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) which graduates more African American doctors than any university in the nation. Xavier University services 3,000 students. She shared that to be an HBCU, you have to have been operating as an institution in 1964 prior to the civil rights movement and Merritt College, along with Laney College were.

Ms. Rachel Mercy added that she actually wrote to Xavier University this morning feeling that it was quite incredible that a small college would have such success. What she took from the article was the importance of collaborative learning and student peers enabling one another. They also have students who are under prepared for college. A lot of the practices discussed in pre-med they also do in multi-media and she feels it helps students enormously when they have their peers coaching them and study cohorts. Also noted was early identification of students who are struggling and having weekly quizzes at the beginning of their classes is a common practice so that they can gauge how the students are doing along with how faculty is doing in providing the skills and information that the students need. Ms. Mercy hopes to learn more about their best practices and also asked them if they accept transfer students. This may be a terrific destination for some of our biology students who are interested in pre-med.

Mr. Siraj Omar noted that in reviewing the document, the focus is mainly on counseling and student services, he asked about the allocation for tutoring, and if there is any funding from SSSP for boot camp.

The question was responded to by Dr. Chen who stated that there are projects within the programs that would be eligible for SSSP. For example, if they wanted to do their boot camp or orientation, that would be supported using SSSP. Anything that has to do with orientation, initial placement, assessment and also counseling/faculty advisement would be eligible.

There are many funding sources according to Dr. Budd, such as the Peralta Accountability for Student Success (PASS) that could help with tutoring along with equity funds. She stated that when Ms. Shirley Slaughter talks about our discretionary funds, this is why it is so important that we look at what we have for these other sources. If it is one of our goals, then we need to find a way to pay for it. As Programs Reviews are written, those funding needs should be included.

Dr. Budd stated that the hope is that as we do these the next step, if everyone is okay with the overarching goals identified from year to year, that we will continue with those and the Ed Master Plan overarching goals, and the different groups’ responsibility will be to identify the activities to help us reach those outcomes. She added that it sounds as if we can begin to finalize the 2014-2015 accomplishments. The next step would be to adopt our 2015-2016 Goals and Outcomes. They will take the few things that came from the Ed Committee and pull those together and distribute them again before the next Roundtable meeting, and approve those at the October meeting.

The first Tech Committee is next Tuesday, and the first Tuesday of the month after that so they will have a version of the Ed Committee’s memo from the Tech Committee.

The next Roundtable was noted as September 28th and Dr. Budd requested that any updates be sent to Dr. Chen and Ms. Cynthia Reese by then. The goal will be to adopt those at the next Roundtable meeting.

Mr. Cleavon Smith asked if one of the goals could be the means to capture activities outside of classroom and counseling. An example given is that we currently do not have the means to capture the number of students who attend the biology speaking series. Is it possible to say that by the end of this year, we have researched the technology to track, “x, y, z” and use that leverage. Technology such as students swiping their I.D. cards was given as an example to creating processes to capture numbers.

Dr. McAllister also added that she wishes a form was available to faculty to note how much they talk to students about majors and course pathways. She indicated that faculty is doing so much advising that is educational planning.

These were agreed to be great points and Dr. Budd is hoping that we can do this on our own and that it should be a goal to make sure we have that accessible for everyone and once we have it to move the needle.

**Budget - Discussion of Adopted Budget – Shirley**

* **Highlights of distribution from last meeting  4000, 5000 and 2000**
* **Highlights from PASS**
* **One-Time Funds**
* **Suggestions for $2.1 Million of undistributed Deferred Maintenance/ Instructional Equipment funds District-wide**

The College Roundtable for Planning and Budgeting is ideally the integration of both items; that we plan and then we ensure there are resources to fund those plans. The Board of Trustees approved the adopted budget at last Tuesday’s Board meeting. Last week a spreadsheet was distributed by Dr. Budd who indicated that Ms. Slaughter has expanded on it further.

Ms. Slaughter presented a very rough draft of our discretionary budget. Our discretionary funds for 2015-2016 are based on 2014-2015 allocations with a 2% increase for utilities, as well as the ambassador budget. The first column represents 2015-2016 discretionary funds compared to a separate column of 2014-2015 actuals from the previous year. Ms. Slaughter indicated that the goal of the exercise was to take a look at our discretionary budget to see if we were being allocated fairly. Ms. Slaughter backed out the utilities for a more accurate view of true discretionary dollars available to allocate to the various cost centers. She reviewed the document noting the changes once utilities were backed out and also noted the comparison between the budget amount and previous year’s actuals. She noted that significant for BCC is that it looks as though we have $1.5M however, unlike any of the other campuses we have the expense for security, parking, and a leased facility, an additional cost of about $749,300. These expenses bring our discretionary funds down to approximately $814K. The $749K should go back into our budget which would allow for us to be able to pay for expenses such as student workers, etc.

Dr. Budd added that the significance in this is that when we are talking about the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) we are supposed to get 21.5% of the budget, the extra $700K is going in to make that to 21.5% but it is spent on required areas. We are working with Mr. Ron Little, the new Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration to say, if we take these off the top it will be more equitable when we see what is spendable. The piece that she does see is that when it shows $2M discretionary that we received and $3M at Laney compared to the others; $1.75M at Merritt and $1.46M at Alameda, last year there were funds identified from International Students’ enrollment fees. To balance the budget, after they adopted the budget, $300K was added to BCC’s, and $650K to Laney’s.

Unlike any of the other colleges, that have had construction with Measure A, we had to prove how we were going to cover the total cost of ownership for the new building and come up with all of the funding. Dr. Budd stated that in her mind, it was to set some of these funds aside for the carryover, but what they are finding is that we had some big overspending in some of the areas last year in the budget that are tapping into what she had hoped would be carryover. These were in the instructional areas. Ms. Vo-Kumamoto has spent time with enrollment management sharing with the ZZ time, reassign time, looking at if productivity is decreasing at all from 17.5 to 17 that is another $300K over the year. There were some expenses that we didn’t get the funding for; when we increased our target by 100 FTES, we didn’t get the extra $130K. In working with the Vice Chancellor we are trying to set up something going forward that will be transparent for all of us.

Ms. Slaughter indicated that the discretionary amounts that will be showing on the spreadsheet Dr. Budd handed out at the last meeting will be less than what you are seeing here. The reason for that is she backed out the 2000 series.

Page 17 of the adopted budget was referenced by Dr. Budd who stated it is important for two reasons:

Books, supplies and services show BCC at almost $2.3M. That is because each of the colleges were allocated one-time funds equally and part of our discussion was, in theory, if we are trying to get to the allocation model maybe we right-size BCC and Laney before that happens. That didn’t happen.

That is the other piece of what we have identified as some of that money ideally for technology, should we need it, and for the new building. For this purchase, we had to roll all of our Measure A into that purchase. Some of the 600 could go for technology this current year; and could also be set aside for some of the other new construction. BCC currently has about 15 square feet per student and the other colleges have about 30-40. Even when we build-out the new building we will be closer to 22-25.

There was additional discussion on the revenue allocation by college. Dr. Budd pointed out that BCC is also pitching in to the district office for security for all of the other colleges and the sheriff’s office in the amount of about $3M.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto stated that she thinks this to be the most important point from Ms. Slaughter’s document and these conversations; the need to request for those funds to be taken off the top as opposed to being deducted once we have received our allocation.

Ms. Slaughter was unable to locate anything that identifies where the district funds are being allocated. She stated that we can say we are paying for police services but for us to really have a clear picture; we need to know exactly what those expenses are.

For those participating a the PBC, specifically, Mr. Smith stated that typically the budget allocation model really sticks at a point of FTES and how we are going to talk about CTE programs, smaller classes, etc. and we never really get to this part. There are completely separate aspects to the allocation model but for whatever reason it keeps getting deflected to we are mandated to have this number of students in this particular program.

Dr. Budd stated we don’t have as large a portion of CTE like a welding or nursing class that may have 20 but even taking that off the top this is where the conversation could go.

In response to Dr. Bajrami’s question about the history of why BCC has these expenses, Dr. Budd stated that we are better off than we used to be. Eight years ago, no one compared us to be at the same size as Merritt and Alameda and it used to be at $5M.

Are there ways that all of us can support this message to the district? What would be effective?

Dr. Budd will ask Dr. Chen to help look at this again. Years ago she looked to see the makeup of CTE at the colleges and how many had to have small class sizes. It was surprising as there was not much of a difference for any of the colleges. Our multi-media is very high cost, for our biotech/sciences we don’t think twice about adding another class when the faculty are available and adding the additional expense. We can get that data again for the CTE breakdown. The big piece is about the discretionary funding how even though we still are underfunded at BCC that’s even adding in those other $700-$800K of cost. The one other piece is that typically when you see the parenthesis it is thought to mean negative but actually that means they are over funded. The other important piece when looking at the last bullet under the budget discussion, the state is funding us another $2.1M of funds that could be for scheduled maintenance or instructional equipment and library. Last year $400K was taken from the top. Each college received $100K, $50K for library and $50K for instructional equipment that other balance stayed at the district for scheduled maintenance. When that comes up in the meetings, if they say they want to allocate that for scheduled maintenance please help chime in to say we want to allocate that to the colleges per FTES, so we would get about $400K for the college to decide. The other colleges have Measure A dollars that they could choose to spend to fix sidewalks as opposed to building another large facility. All of that money can qualify for Measure A.

BCC’s Leadership Team meets one Wednesday each month with the Presidents of the Senate along with the ASBCC President. This Wednesday, they will be finalizing the User Groups.

Mr. Joe Doyle made a suggestion for the $2.1M of the undistributed deferred maintenance and instructional equipment funds, district-wide. He referenced a handout with an estimate of the necessary computers for CIS and Multi-Media. He noted that their computers are over age. He noted that as we replace our computers with the newer high processing computers, they suggest distributing around the college to areas such as English and some Sciences. The computers are good for word processing, spreadsheets and internet access but are obsolete in terms of video processing. The video gaming and movie industry are driving the computer software industry. Mr. Doyle noted additional highlights from the report including grants from industry that amount to approximately $2.1M. This is matching grants from the industries we serve. We don’t have to buy that software so this is a savings to the institution.

Dr. Budd thanked Mr. Doyle and stated that this is exactly why she is hoping we can move the discussion to say that money should be distributed to the colleges and we can choose how we need to spend it; whether it is $300K for technology, $100K for equipment in sciences in the new building, etc. Measure A is a $390M bond and BCC received $29M of that.

Regarding technology needs, Dr. Chen encouraged all departments come forward through the Program Review process as well as BCC’s Technology Committee.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto added that Program Review is the venue in which to address the needs but she wanted to acknowledge one piece that was brought up which is as a college we are on a 5-year replacement plan and what Mr. Doyle described is certain areas programmatically that need to be on a shorter replacement plan. This needs to be put into the Program Review so that a plan can be created that is on a shorter cycle.

Mr. Barreiro clarified that we aspire to the five year replacement plan but in reality we have not achieved that.

We will not be able give as much time to the Equity Highlights as she wanted so Dr. Budd would like to put Equity on the top of the Agenda as well as our discussion for the Goals and Outcomes for the year.

**2118 Milvia Updates**

* **Timeline**
* **User Group Meetings**

The addresses are actually 2118 Milvia and 2120.

Ms. Vo-Kumamoto apologized to Mr. Gonzalez as she was unable to submit the handout ahead of time as she needed to confirm information. A list of volunteers who requested to be on the committee was shared. At the Leadership meeting they are hoping to firm up the User Group Committee. The committee composition is noted and meeting days will be Wednesdays, 3-5 pm with the first meeting tentatively scheduled for September 30th. She is hoping to send out an email shortly after the Leadership meeting to confirm the User Group committee and confirm the first meeting.

Dr. Budd added this will be looking at our needs that we have identified here and then the architects will be joining that group.

**Equity Highlights**

* **Ed Master Plan, SSSP, Equity, Basic Skills all flow together to reach our Goals of closing the Education/Achievement/Equity Gap**

Ms. Brenda Johnson was thanked for her work in bringing together the first meeting last week with the Equity Committee. We developed our plan last year and have some activities that we have initiated but many more to come. There is a new report that needs to be done for the State that is now due in December.

It is not that it is out on the side, it is what we do for our Ed Master Plan, and it is what we are doing with our Student Success and Support Program (SSSP), and Equity.

Dr. Diana Bajrami, our new Interim Vice President Student Services will do a presentation on *“Scaling Up Student Success”* at our Brown Bag meeting on Tuesday, September 29th, 12:15 pm in room 341. She noted she is excited to share the research and is looking forward to feedback as she is working on publishing the research.

**Other**

*Access (Lead: Diana Bajrami)*

They met and have had great ideas about how to increase access to underserved communities. Ms. Lenahan shared great ideas and specific activities for veterans and another group is working on foster youth. There was a representative from Berkeley Unified School District and it was really exciting discussion and we are meeting every Thursday at 10:00 am. She invited anyone interested to join their group.

Dr. Budd stated that maybe we (Ms. Reese) could send out all of the meeting times so people could know to participate.

*Certificate and Degree Completion (Leads: Antonio Barreiro and Alley Hegler)*

Meeting on Thursday morning, 9:00 – 10:00 am.

*ESL Basic Skills Foundation and Course Completion (Leads: Theresa Rowland and Maeve Katherine Bergman)*

Meeting for the first time Wednesday at 2:00 pm

*Course Completion (Lead: Tram Vo-Kumamoto)*

Meeting at 9:00 am on Thursdays.

Dr. McAllister stated that it is frustrating that faculty cannot participate in these meetings as they want to serve but their teaching schedules are set. Dr. Budd noted that this is why we have our college hour every day of the week but those are packed also. She stated that she thinks we need to revisit that and sometimes when we have big/important meetings perhaps also provide another time so people can flex. Maybe we can ask the groups to identify at least one other time for some of that, whether it’s a Friday or evening, until we come up with a solution.

-End of Minutes -

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