Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
October 16, 2013
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Joe Geissler, Roberta Tragarz, Lana Wong, Craig Rutan, Aracely Mora, Rudy Frias, Steven Deeley, Scott Howell, Corinna Evett, Aaron Voelcker, Leigh Ann Unger, Mary Mettler, Steve Kawa, Rudy Carrion, John Hernandez, Craig Nance, Lana Wong

Absent: Nena Baldizon-Rios, Rudy Tijptahadi, Jose Vargas,

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 & Approval of Minutes of October 2, 3013		**Craig Rutan** moved to approve the minutes, with corrections; **Joe Geissler** seconded the motion; the minutes were unanimously approved.
2. Mission/ Responsibilities/ Goals Votes	Corinna Evett: The Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee page for the governance handbook was presented and reviewed. Craig Rutan: Is Enrollment Management Chair to be added? Scott Howell: A question regarding the Honors Committee Chair, do the chairs represent and vote from a particular interest or committee as a whole? Craig Nance: Members represent college as a whole. Corinna Evett: Twofold - representative for the committee and a broad prospective (not just yourself) Craig Rutan: Each committee chair represents the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate represents the whole college. Each chair should raise all questions of interest from their committee but should vote and represent at PIE with a broad interest..	**Steve Deeley** moved to approve the addition of an Enrollment Management Chair**; Scott Howell** seconded the motion; the motion was unanimously approved. **Leigh Ann Unger** moved to approve the *Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee 2013-2014 Goals*, with revisions; **Craig Nance** seconded the motion; the motion was unanimously approved.

| | **PLANNING & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE** **2013-2014 GOALS**: | |
| | | |

PLANNING & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE
2013-2014 GOALS:

Corinna Evett: Goals were set for the Planning Process, Rubric, Governance Request Forms and Interim Process.

RUBRIC

Craig Nance: Missing a safety component in the rubric, i.e., science classrooms, campus buildings

Craig Rutan: Need to include safety

Corinna: The goal is not to create a rubric yet, maybe goal is too specific and needs to broaden.

Aracely Mora: The goals need to be broad.

John Hernandez: Need to add state and federal mandates.

Mary Mettler: Need to add student success

Aracely Mora: Need to question "How does what we do impact students?"

Craig Nance: How is the *Create a ranked recommendation list for allocations in human resources, technology, and instructional equipment, and program expansion* (3rd bullet) different from *Develop a rubric to evaluate and prioritize request*(1st bullet)?

Craig Rutan: The former (1st bullet) is to create a rubric and the latter (3rd bullet) implements how that rubric will used.

Mary Mettler: The 3rd bullet needs to include instructional equipment.   What about non monetized?

Craig Rutan: Create a ranked recommendation list for resource allocation.

Lana Wong: Are there any programs required by outside accrediting bodies for other requirements?

Aaron Voelcker: Some grants have to follow rules.

	John Hernandez: Yes, some departments must comply with grant language.

Aracely Mora: If something is mandated as a condition of a program, then PIE must consider for prioritization.

GOVERNANCE REQUEST FORMS:

Aaron Voelcker: Each group makes its own prioritized list.

Craig Nance: How detailed do the list need to be?

Aracely Mora: An outsider needs to be able to look at the goals and be able to understand them.

Craig Rutan: If we chose to rank the priority list,   then we need to outline the ranking process.

Steven Deeley: Change title from Governance Request Forms to Governance Resource Request.

INTERIM PROCESS:

Aracely Mora: We don't need an interim process.   We need to follow an established process, even its interim. | |
| 3. Planning and Budget Timeline / "At A Glance" | Aaron: There is a debate about who was responsible for creating this document. The PIE Committee will review the planning documentation from the Educational Master Planning (EMP) Committee. The original documentation was updated   to align with the accreditation schedule.   Program reviews are due March 17th.   The problem with program review is it is only completed by Academic Affairs and not Student Services or Administrative Services.   The college needs to document entire College program review process.

Aaron Voelcker: The Program Review process will need to be less specific to accommodate all divisions.

Aracely Mora: Why was only Academic Affairs the only division undergoing program review?

Leigh Ann Unger: Leigh Ann created the document many years. It only | . | **On Whiteboard:**

Chairs
|
Deans
|
V.P, review & prioritize
|
PIE, prioritize
|
Budget, consider fund/funding
|
PIE, re-evaluate
|
College Council |

	included Academic Affairs. Student Services program had not been developed yet.

John Hernandez: Student Services has undergone two program reviews (6 years).

Leigh Ann Under: It is not known why   Student Services and Administrative Services were not added later.

John Hernandez: Program review was only built for instructional services.

Craig Rutan: The omission of Student Services and Administrative Services was not an oversight.   Originally, the document was drafted because of an Accreditation sanction.   The College was addressing deficiencies stated in the team and commission recommendation.   Since then, the document hasn't been updated.

Leigh Ann Unger: No one took over ownership.

Aracely Mora: If recommendation about integrated planning, focus on single area. f not about integrated planning, then the current form should suffice.

Aaron Voelcker: Need to add Student Services and Administrative Services

Craig Rutan: We should create three documations: Academic Affairs, Administrative Services and Student Services. Not all division deadlines line up.

John Hernandez: If there are enough discrepancies among the divisions the separate documents are OK.,   If the divisions are aligned, then we only need one document.

Corinna Evett: What role does PIE play in resource allocation.   What are responsibilities for all constituents in the Year At A Glance.

Aracely Mora: The purpose is to visually display long range planning for the College.

Craig Rutan: If PIE is in charge of planning cycle, then yes The Year At A Glance should be maintained by PIE.

Lana Wong: The PIE mission statement includes central planning.   The Year At A Glance should include all three divisions. | President

Priorities:
- Mission
- Institutional goals
- EMP document
- Safety
- Mandates
- Student Success

Steve Kawa and **Steven Deeley** will forward a request to the **Budget Committee** to review budget request forms. |

Aracely Mora: We need to use documents consistently.

Corinna Evett: The document will include Students Services and Administrative Services to program   review but with the notation of "not at this time," for these divisions only during years of program review.

John Hernandez: Academic Affairs Program Review (Year 2 of 2)
                         Student Services Program Review (Year 2 of 4)
                         Administrative Services Review   (???????????)

Steve Kawa: Many departments are bothered by the current method of allocating resources.

Corinna Evett: The recommended revisions to the Year At A Glance are only to get us through next year.   We need to increase number of people using the request form first.   She recommended PIE update the document and give tool for the College to use.   We still need to answer "Where does PIE fit with the Budget Committee?"

Aaron Voelcker: Recommended to keep current structure. Shouldn't integrate PIE with budget until PIE is established.

Craig Rutan: The current request forms are incomplete and only cover equipment requests and does not include other line requests such as classified staffing.
Corinna Evett: Implied through VPs

Aracely Mora: We need avoid the word "interim" in our planning process. The EMP document was used to address the accreditation team recommendations of planning process   to get off warning. It is no longer authentic for us as college to have.   Divisions need to   prioritize resource requisitions. The College was cut $1.5 million. Need to adopt concentric circle model.   We learnedwhat served us well as general planning but still need to fill in gaps for institutional planning. We need to develop a legitimate transition,   returning to a process and and making modifications.   EMP done in 2012

Corinna Evett: We should change our reference of equipment request to resource requisition.   At this stage, we have flexibility to change. We can augment the College from an interim process to a temporary process.

Leigh Ann Unger: The At A Glance was a reflection of what happened at time of warning.

Corinna Evett: The At A Glance was incorporated in our EMP per Aracely

Craig Nance: The "temporary" decisions need to evolve into a model.   It is a re-evaluating process.

Craig Rutan: Agreed with the term "transition" process

Lana Wrong: Agreed with the term "transition" process

Aaron Voelcker: Agreed with the term   "Planning cycle transition"

Corinna Evett: Academic Affairsand Student Services to be added to the program review column.

Aaron Voelcker: Accreditation column is ok; EMP is ok. EMP implementation-needs to update status on achieving goals.

Craig Rutan: Suggested replacing equipment request to resource allocation. I am concerned with chairs not being aware of October deadline.

Aaron Voelcker: The timeline needs to be shifted. The September DPP will be moved along with everything or compressed into a November deadline.

Corinna Evett: PIE needs to consult with the Budget Committee to see if   funds are available.

Aracely Mora: Suggested shifting or merging deadline based on feedback from chairs

Corinna Evett: It won't go over well with department chairs.   They are extremely taxed.

Craig Nance: Agreed with shifting September deadline to November.

Joe Geissler: What is the prioritization?

Steve Kawa: A change occurred in the State allocated funds for scheduled. maintenance   and instructional equipment.   For scheduled maintenance, the

	district is to match SCC. For instructional equipment, the district is to double SCC. SCC is to receive $38,000 for instructional equipment and the district is to $76,000. The funds carry over. Over $100,000 can be carried over. Measure E fund, but not all; D building – how Peter to give up? Aracely Mora: Need to develop institutional priorities andtimelines. We should pool funds from when available. Vice Presidents took priorities from categorical pots. Steve Kawa: Need to look at two posts. It must be instructional equipment. John Hernandez: The Budget Committee has new funding request of $500 million for funding positions. Aracely Mora: The feedback deans and faculty is confusion as to how departments/areas get in line for funds. The college is seeking procedures from the PIE Committee. Corinna Evett: The prioritizationspecifics will be a later discussion. Lana Wong: Some requests go through departments when it really should go in as a college request, i.e., technology – some departments may update computers completely, but not the college as a whole Corinna Evett: Request start at the Academic Senate,goes through Governance Committees (new), goes through Deans to Vice Presidents who forwards to College Council. John Hernandez: Vice Presidents are tied to governance structure Aaron Voelcker: Need to map from governance committee chairs. Craig Rutan: Request PIE to be omitted from the process until a rubric forchairs isc created. Mary Mettler: Suggested requisitions go to Vice Presidents before PIE Committee. Aracely Mora: Concerned with confusion from different areas using different processes. The current process is open-ended without guidance. Some departments are self-prescribed and some are open.	

John Hernandez: Faculty requests and ranking is a separate process.   Need to develop process forall other resource requests.   Need to come up with new funds for faculty

Aaron Voelcker: Suggested a potential step between PIE and Budget such as a Human Resources Committee.

Craig Rutan: The reason why faculty request are separate are because of the mandate to have 50% spent on instruction.   Doesn't mean we can't hire more than 50%.

John Hernandez: The most important step is to align the timing.

Aracely Mora: We cannot stop the planning.We still need to meet faculty obligation while reviewing other requests.

Aaron Voelcker: Suggested rubric analysis. How many cycles? New vs. old?

Mary Mettler: When will PIE get dates?

Corinna Evett: College Council to review and approve the timeline.   November dates will be shifted to December.

Aracely Mora: Interested in accelerating the process to bid for competitive faculty hiring.   Academic Senate to vote on October 29th and the November 4th meeting will be approved.

Corinna Evett: Need to bring awareness

Craig Rutan: Are we changing yearly goals in February?   Do we still need to fill out budget workskeet request?
Steve Kawa: No, there are no funds.

John Hernandez: The budget worksheets are only for new dollars

Aracely Mora: Still can submit, revise or delete worksheets.

Craig Rutan: Suggested not changing the process for budget worksheets since we haven't done them in a while.

Aracely Mora: Agreed to hold off on budget worksheets.

	Corinna Evett: Need to clean up At A Glance. The committee will vote on the changes. Copies will be distributed but are subject to change. Aracely Mora: Current month and November deadline, AV and CD to fix, email vote/discussion respond ASAP; high priority	
4. Interim Process	Aracely Mora: We don't need an interim, we can follow the process already established. Corinna Evett: Sufficient goals Craig Nance: If not an interim, why leave it? Steven Deeley: Change our governance resource request.	**On Whiteboard:** • Safety • State and federal mandates • Student Success • External accreaiters
5. Request Process: The What and the Whom	Aaron Voelcker opened the discussion: The Committee needs to figure who does, to whom and what; communicate with constituents and see what thert devl how to transitional process	
6. Questions/Others		
Next meeting:	**The next meeting will be Wednesday, November 6, 2013, 3:30 p.m., E-206**	Upcoming Deliverables: • Framework • Eventually rubric