Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee

MINUTES
Thursday October 26, 2017; 3:00-4:30pm A 213

Committee Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSC (2)</th>
<th>FACULTY (4)</th>
<th>CLASSIFIED (3)</th>
<th>STUDENT (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takeo Kubo</td>
<td>Judith Bell</td>
<td>Dee Davis</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Lui</td>
<td>Mary Cook</td>
<td>JoAnn McGowan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(absent)</td>
<td>Lucas Randall</td>
<td>Jasmine Phan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Welcome/Introductions
   a. JoAnn McGowan was absent

2. Public Comments (2 minutes each)
   a. Edina Rutland expressed concerns related to District Strategic Prioritization
   b. Michael Berke echoed similar concerns

3. Review and approve minutes (no minutes to approve-deferred to next meeting) Motion to approve is not necessary. Minutes are either approved “as read” or “as corrected” using the phrase “If there are no objections…”
   a. Approve minutes from October 12, 2017

4. Action Items—(Includes special orders, which are motions that must be decided before adjournment, and unfinished business, such as tabled items from previous meetings.)
   a. No Action Items

5. Old Business—(Includes only items which were previously decided and have been placed on the agenda for review and/or reconsideration.)
   a. Continue to provide feedback to various committees self-evaluations (dependent on other committees)
      i. No additional committee self evaluation
   b. Discuss Charge and PIE Committee activities (tabled)
   c. Discuss strategies for Accreditation: College Recommendation 3
      College Recommendation 3 (Compliance): In order to meet Standards, the team recommends the College create and implement a process to demonstrate its substantive and collegial dialog about student outcomes and institutional effectiveness through committees, advisory committee meetings, workshops, and professional development activities. The team further recommends that the College develop and implement a process to broadly communicate this dialog to support continuous quality improvement across the College. (I.B.1, II.A.2, and II.A.3)
      i. PIE can bring plans from program review to others
   d. Update on Identify actionable tasks for sharing accreditation standards to specific committees
      i. Joyce gave update that standards may evolve so this was tabled.

6. New Business—
   a. PIE Committee members expressed concerns related to District Strategic Prioritization process
   b. PIE Committee members documented concerns from within the committee and other colleague’s concerns

7. Adjournment
The Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee would like to express to the Chancellor our concerns for District Strategic Priorities and Measurable Objectives Planning Process. At the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee meeting on October 26th, we had a very robust conversation about the October 25th Focus Groups related to District Strategic Priorities and Measurable Objectives.

- **Purpose of the District Strategic Priorities and Measurable Objectives are not stated in the document.**
  - How will it be used in connection to Resource Allocation Modeling?
  - Several individuals were unclear and unaware of the Hayes Mansion event - only certain people were invited.
- **Process was not transparent**
  - For those who attended Hayes Mansion, it is unclear how the document was created out of the conversations that occurred that day.
  - It is unclear who attended the training at Hayes Mansion.
    - In particular, how many faculty members were included?
    - How many faculty and classified members attended relative to the number of faculty and classified staff that work within the district and the campuses?
  - **Timeline**
    - How much time will faculty and staff have to respond to proposed strategic priorities?
    - How much time was allocated to ensure all voices are heard?
- **Activities and goals were established and district leadership was identified to lead the efforts without considering faculty and staff contributions.**
  - Names were included in strategic priorities, when it should be an all-district effort.
  - It is unclear how the colleges should collectively meet the goals or individually identify college-specific goals.
- **Consultants**
  - What are the consultants’ goals?
  - How much money was spent on the consultants?
  - It is unclear why the consultants were brought in to facilitate dialog rather than district leadership.

Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee would like to be part of the process and ensure that more voices are present. The college has a planning process. It may be lengthy, but voices are valued. For example, within Program Review process, planning takes place at the program level and it will play a larger role campus wide. The committee would like to see more collaborative leadership. At San Jose City College, we value the relationships and dialogue between faculty, staff, and administrators. More importantly, this activity demonstrates the need for the District Office and San Jose City College to have a more collegial relationship with clear delineation of roles to best serve our students.

How can we collaborate?

Thank you,

Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee