Santiago Canyon College

Agenda
Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE)
Committee Meeting
Wednesday, 20 May 2015
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Room E-206

1. Welcome

2. Announcements

3. Reports from Governance Committees

4. Approve 15 April 2015 Minutes

5. Approve 6 May 2015 Minutes

6. Annual Committee Evaluation Form

7. Committee Assignment and Workload Survey

8. Discuss and Make Any Resource Request Form Revisions

9. Discuss Any Rubric Revisions

10. Update Year at a Glance Document

11. Questions/Other

Next Meeting: 3 June 2015
For that meeting, please consider the following:
- **Suggested Revisions for the Facility Need Form**

PIE Minutes of 4/15/15

Reports: Arlene's and Corinna's- shared list with recommendations and decisions (president). John W will share with community. Latino American Grant to Marilyn and Steven Reed.   - discussion.

Meeting matrix: conflict with Sustainability Committee. PIE could move to meeting on first Monday instead of third. Joyce doing online vote for EMC.

Rudy T. did great job of sharing with college council. Rudy demonstrated survey questions. Marilyn asked if we could split the fair/equitable question. Committee agreed change was okay. Survey link should be going out soon, maybe Thursday, so we could have enough time to receive and compile results to discuss at next PIE meeting.

Next meeting is a working meeting.

4. Approval of minutes postponed, no quorum

5. Jose suggested 3 categories (Instructional/Classroom, Non-instructional, Technology) with sub categories of supplies, equipment and technology each). Arlene - have a caveat to specify administrative in nature. Make it clear in the instructions to specify administrative need. Aaron - issue is how to prioritize the things critical to classroom instruction. Most members agreed three categories would work. Joyce - question of MUN request - where would it go? Non instructional or instructional. Could be either/or/both. Corinna - we need to come up with definitions of instructional, non-instructional. Supplies are consumable, and equipment is w-4 years (Arlene). Jose - good to separate because of 50% rule. Anything not directly in classroom is 6000 and falls under non-instructional. Some things like field trips or not generating FTEs then it probably isn't instruction. But could be instructional if part of course outline. Arlene - Clarify Athletics, tutoring, etc. Jose - look at topscode to see if instructional. Anything below 6000 could be instructional. Aaron - what happens if a request covers both instruction and non-instruction? Jose- if it's a blend (grey area), then put it in instruction for 50% rule. Joyce - need to add a prompt to describe what item will be used for.

Rubrics: will review rubric next semester or spring. We should let VPs know how we will rank the lists according to new three lists. They can submit lists already separated by instruction, non-instructional, and personnel. Joe will let joint chairs know. Rudy T - how will we know that the lists submitted are submitted in appropriate category? Corinna - VP will be the last level and best understand the categories.

Joyce - facility requests- some confusion as to process. Corinna reviewed Facility Need Form Process. Most of facility requests that came through this year had money attached - shared specifics. Facility need requests with no dollars attached can come through at any time. Facility requests with dollars attached need to come through the PIE resource request process. Need fourth column for facilities. Corinna - explained how this came about by different departments wanting same materials or space and it was promised to different people. It needs to be more fair and equitable in case more than one person/department wants same thing. Needs to go through Facility prioritization. Aaron - one might be contingent on the other. Resource requests related to need. How do we determine if it has gone through other approvals (like facilities)? Jose gave examples of needing all requests to be approved or it won't work. Only getting one of

requests isn't enough. Aaron- pre-prioritization should be done. Needs a flag on other requests contingent on a request that wasn't approved- they should be pulled. Jose - if you can't take it with you, it's a facility need. Corinna - does your facility request require any funding? Then it needs to go thru resource request process. Can use same form but someone needs to look at form to make sure it has all components of resource request form.

Mary - how do we make the transition to using this process? We need to tell our people that it is a facility need and needs to go thru the process. Joyce - no confidence that things need to go through process (back room deals). D building designated for art gallery. Arlene - what's going on in U and D buildings. Various departments are using the building. Discussed move of MASH and math and history with architects.

No deadline for facility requests.

Joyce - needs to be the same process for everyone. Corinna will bring up to college council as co chair or academic senate president.

No vote on above- just consent

6. Corinna - Spend meeting in fall looking at documents to determine priorities?
Aaron - if we have general fund dollars, how to do go from four lists to one single list? How do we use all the information to see what are our priorities? How do we determine what comes first?

Corinna - we need to be visionary and could be a group to help the college as a whole by looking at whole picture. We would be much more purposeful and meaningful. Arlene- first fall meeting in more informal setting to inspire creative thought.   Everything should think about this and what we want it to look like.

7. No other

Next time: review and make copies of survey results and resource request revisions (with feedback already received) and facility need revisions - can finish up at following meeting. Leave Year at a Glance for later meeting.

Present: Corinna, Aaron, Arlene, Jose, Mary W. Rudy F, Jose, Scott, Rudy T, Mary M, Joyce

Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
May 6, 2015

Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chair

Attendance: Joyce Wagner, Mary Walker, Pat, Rudy Frias, Rudy Tjiptahadi, Mary Mettler, Roberta Tragarz, Scott Howell, Steven Deeley, Craig Nance, Arleen Satele; Aracely Mora, Alice Ho

Santiago Canyon College
Mission Statement

Santiago Canyon College is an innovative learning community dedicated to intellectual and personal growth.   Our purpose is to foster student success and to help students achieve these core outcomes: to learn, act, communicate and think critically.   We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing an accessible, a transferable, and an engaging education to a diverse community.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome		
2. Announcements		
3. Reports from Governance Committees	Budget Committee/Steven Deeley: • There is a structural deficient • If there is any categorical funding that can offset the deficient the Budget Committee will make the recommendation. • Next meeting is May 26. Facilities Committee/Craig Nance: • No money to remodel the D Building. • Signs have been placed on the Gym, Library, and Humanities. • Parking issues were discussed. POE/Aaron Voelcker: Evaluating the District planning and resource allocation process: • District does Department Portfolios every 2 years • Corinna introduced PIE's survey • POE will modify that survey to evaluate the District's processes and potentially other District Governance's committees. • This integrates SCC into the District's planning processes which is a	

		positive for Accreditation.	
4.	Approval of April 15, 2015 minutes Approval of April 1, 2015 minutes	Tabled	
5.	Discuss Survey Results	The results of the survey were discussed: • 75% positive response would have been the best outcome. • These responses will form a baseline for the future. • If more requests had been approved; the positive response rates might have been higher. • How many of the committee members wrote responses? Open ended comments discussion: • Will Taskstream make this process easier? • PIE is the gatekeeper • Some of the comments offers simple ideas that can be incorporated, i.e. #7, checklist for the goals. • #5 and #10 refer to adding narrative to the form that would explain why the requested item is important Impressions of the level of agreement with the planning and resource allocation process: • Coordinate the year at a glance with the flow chart • The comments don't reflect some of the ratings. • If your outcome is good; it is going to color your opinion, as has been mentioned previously. • Our needs are not funded; they are then part of the priority process; what should be prioritized is not needs, but wants. Aaron Voelcker: If we can agree that it is plausible that because there wasn't	

		that great of an outcome to the resource allocation process, we are seeing a larger number of negative responses to the survey.	
		How will we evaluate our process and get information that will allow us to improve our process in a way that it is really improving and not fine tuning to get what they want?	
		• Two concerns from comments: A. Busy work – look at those parts and fix B. Repetition of requested information	
		When the comment responses were filtered for those that completed or attempted to complete the form: • Responses were more negative than those who had not attempted or completed a form.	
		Aaron: Paraphrasing what Arlene shared: stick with what we are doing with simplification, stream-lining; don't make major changes to ensure that there is data to review when comparing year to year for: A. Trends B. If no planning is going on, how will we know how to spend the money we have?	
		Mary: Can you filter open-ended comments to those who have completed a form?	
		After those commented were filtered:	
		Mary: After viewing those results, do we need to educate users?	
		Aaron: Any changes to the process or to the form anyone would like to advocate, that we haven't discussed, that possibly came from other channels of feedback?	
		Craig Nance: Will we add sections where they can explain why the item is important?	
		Aaron: Let's figure out the process before we discuss changes to the form.	
6.	Discuss and Make Any Resource Request Form Revisions	Tabled	==Aracely moved to table agenda items #6, 7, and 8; Craig Nance seconded the motion; it was unanimously passed...==

7. Discuss the Make Any Facility Need Form Revisions	Tabled	
8. Discuss Any Rubric Revisions	Tabled	
9. Questions/Other	What are the changes you are willing to make to the process from feedback you have received? • Deadlines reminders—set up automatic reminder emails. Use subject line, not body of email. • Send reminders to heads of the four areas and let them filter it down.	
Next meeting	The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. For next meeting, please review planning documents, including request forms, year at a glance, etc. Wednesday, May 20, 2015, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., E-206	<mark>Craig Nance moved to adjourn the meeting; it was seconded by Steven Deeley; the motion was unanimously passed.</mark>