

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting  
December 4 2013  
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

**Attendance:** Joe Geissler, Roberta Tragarz, Lana Wong, Craig Rutan, Aracely Mora, Rudy Frias, Steven Deeley, Aaron Voelcker,, Mary Mettler, Steve Kawa, John Hernandez, Craig Nance, Rudy Tijptahadi, Jose Vargas, Janis Perry, Leigh Ann Unger

**Absent:** Rudy Carrion, Scott Howell, Corinna Evett

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. Approved minutes of the November 6, 2013		<b>Leigh Ann Unger</b> moved to approve the minutes, with corrections; <b>Joe Geissler</b> seconded the motion; the minutes were unanimously approved.
3. Committee Communication	<p>A. Educational Master Planning Committee: DPP Discussion:</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: When Debbie Brooks was researching the department mission statements in the DPPS, to confirm their alignment with the College’s mission statement for <i>Standard I.A. Mission</i>, she discovered some issues with the DPP Planning Portfolios--not every department has a DPP. The obligation to develop a DPP plan for the coming year has not been clearly communicated.</p> <p>Lana Wong: The DDP is not consistent when it comes to equipment replacement; new equipment is included but not a replacement plan.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: There is no budget in place to upgrade computer technology; if there is a technology plan included in the DDP, we don’t budget for it.</p> <p>Lana Wong: The Colleges can’t afford to fund technology replacement and we must look to the District.</p> <p>Steve Kawa: We have overrun the budget the last 3 years by \$800,000. If we</p>	.

budget for technology replacement, we will dig a deeper hole.

Joe Geissler: There should be DDP training for new Department Chairs.

Janis: The DDP format was developed in 2008 and is dated, cumbersome and difficult to use. In EMP's review of the DDP, could they streamline the format?

Aaron Voelcker: IT is developing additional forms for the DPP.

Roberta Tragarz: Leigh Ann, do you remember learning that there is a 3 years wait for asking IT to work on new projects?

Aaron Voelcker. *Taskstream* will transition away from the DPP format. In speaking with the *Taskstream* representative, she thinks that the DPP form can be incorporated into *Taskstream*. However, this is the form we will be using through our site visit.

Aracely Mora: What is our common understanding today of the Department Planning Portfolio? As a Dean, I never did a DPP, neither did the Dean who followed me. Hopefully, the EMP Committee will look at who needs to have a DPP, not make it a blanket requirement, regardless of value or purpose. When I was a Dean, the Vice President, Academic Affairs, had a DPP. Let's be specific about the expectation—does everyone need a DPP? Let's make the work meaningful, not just for accreditation.

Craig Rutan: In the past, requests were extracted in a report for the Chairs that went up the chain to the President, however, past years can be edited, items can be added in 2013 to the 2008 DPP and every DPP up to 2013. The DDP planning is to get "stuff," not for other purposes.

John Hernandez: We say in all of our Accreditation documents that the DPP is our primary planning document, necessitating that we updated the DPPs.

Leigh Ann Unger: For those departments that didn't have a DDP, Is it possible that they developed a DDP but didn't submit it in the form?

Aracely Mora: Our accreditation offers an opportunity to self-evaluate to find imperfections. There is a universal understanding that if a request wasn't in the DPP, the request wouldn't be considered or funded. We have been in survival mode and have sustained losses. Placing suggestions on the DPP wasn't a priority when we were making cuts. Basic supplies, pen and paper, aren't appropriate to place in DPPs.

	<p>Jose Vargas: DDPs are core documents for planning but the mission statements are the core.</p> <p>Janis Perry: The mission statement is the collective direction of the College, DPPs and SLOs. What influences the mission statement?</p>	
<p>4. Review final draft of 2013-2014 at a Glance Document</p>	<p>Aaron Voelcker: There have been a few additions and some shifting to the <i>at a Glance</i> document. Corinna and I would like to bring one detail to the attention of the Committee—in the April box, which states that the President will consult with College Council; Academic Senate has been added.</p> <p>Craig Rutan moved and Craig Nance seconded <b>WHAT??????</b></p> <p>Lana Wong: Technology Committee is not included.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: The Joint Chairs submitted one prioritized list to Aracely, as Vice President, Academic Affairs, and collegial government submitted a list, as well, which included technology from Steve Kawa, BSI from Aracely, and student services from John Hernandez.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: Vice President’s don’t prioritize, that is the function of the Planning Committee.</p> <p>Aracely Mora: <i>We need to discuss the role of PIE vs. Academic Senate in the at a Glance document.</i></p> <p>Janis Perry: . . . and, College Council.</p> <p>Aracely Mora: PIE may approve planning that is not academic or professional. In the April box, it shows the President consults with Academic Senate.</p> <p>Lana Wong: That diminishes the role of PIE.</p> <p>Continued discussion followed . . .</p> <p>Craig Rutan: I call the question, which will stop the debate.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: How many are in favor; how many oppose; how many abstain?</p>	<p>Vote:</p> <p>11 in favor</p> <p>2 oppose</p> <p>4 abstain</p>

5. 2013-2014 Outcomes Assessment Calendar for Academic Areas	This is informational with deadlines for Academic Affairs and Continuing Education.	<b>Aaron</b> will split the charts into ½ year per page for easier viewing.
6. Review feedback and suggestions for planning process		
7. Review feedback and suggestions for prioritization rubric	<p>Craig Rutan: The samples are too expansive; the rubric should be limited. The document distributed to the chairs did not mention that requests need to be tied to goals. If that is the case, that needs to be communicated.</p> <p>Lana Wong: The Technology Committee has to have criteria to evaluate requests.</p> <p>John Hernandez: We need something to begin the dialogue. In Student Services we should use what was developed by Academic Affairs.</p>	<p><b>Written on Whiteboard</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple at first</li> <li>• Start with another example at first, and then modify as needed in future cycles</li> <li>• SCC goals: Mandatory (filter at the division level)</li> <li>• Learning Outcomes</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Legally mandated or regulatory requirement</li> </ul> <p><b>Aaron Voelcker</b> will send out the Academic Affairs form.</p>
8. Questions/others		
<b>Next meeting</b>	?	