Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
March 5, 2014
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Lana Wong, Craig Rutan, Aracely Mora, Steven Deeley, Aaron Voelcker, Corinna Evett, John Hernandez, Craig Nance, Rudy Tijptahadi, Steve Kawa, Joseph Geissler, Jose Vargas, Rudy Frias, Leigh Ann Unger, Scott Howell

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. Approval minutes of the December 4, 2013		**Craig Rutan** moved to approve the minutes, with two corrections; **Steve Kawa** seconded the motion; the minutes were unanimously approved.
3. Prioritization Rubric	Corinna Evett: I attended the Joint Chairs meeting prior to our meeting this afternoon and I want to share some information from that meeting: • The Joint Chairs do not want to address safety needs, they want safety needs to be sent directly to the Safety Committee. • The Joint Chairs are still breaking down the Prioritization Rubric and are still in discussion. • There was a discussion about general funded items – on-going necessity to run classes, such as: Library database; butcher paper for the art department; pens Craig Rutan mentioned that safety and legally mandated items should be line items. The Budget Committee would have to decide where the money would come from for these line items. PIE's focus should be on planning, not keeping the status quo. • The Joint Chairs were unaware of the priorities set by PIE: Mission; goals; DPP; legally mandated; safety	.

We might consider having either Aaron or myself or one of the PIE committee members report our work at the Joint Chairs and become an agenda item for other governance committees so we get the word out.

Craig Nance: I, myself, was unclear about the priorities.

Corinna Evett: Check the minutes because we set those priorities at the last meeting.

Aracely Mora: I would like to suggest that at the end of every PIE meetings, we take the last five minutes to summarize the talking points.
- Let's make sure we carry the important information back to our constituents as one voice.
- Dialogue in Academic Affairs and Joint Chairs will be part of the process, as a reality check—are we all on the same page.

The confusion may be a result of the evolving process, what was it last year, what is it this year and what will it be next year.

John Hernandez: Folks are unaware of the pieces.   We copied Math and Humanities' priorities to set the priorities for Student Services.

Aaron Voelcker: The PIE rubric was borrowed from Math and Humanities.

Craig Rutan: I would question the points awarded to the criteria.

Aaron Voelcker: It is related to the order of importance.

Corinna Evett: Last meeting, we asked the Committee if the criteria should have equal points and you said, "no."

Aaron Voelcker: The Rubric four fields with numbers needs variability in order to easily prioritize.   70 points allows for more variance.

Jose Vargas: It may be easier to do a ranking of $1 - 5$.

Craig Nance: Ties could be discussed.

Aaron Voelcker: To revise what Jose has proposed, we could do a ranking of 1-10 and weight the columns.   We could modify the 70 points a scale of 1-10.

	Steve Kawa: What is the intent of replacement need? Aaron Voelcker: We can make do for a year or two but it becomes a priority. Craig Nance: An example would be software required for a class as a replacement item needs to be highly ranked. Lana Wong: If we are adopting and implementing the rubric this semester, will the request form provide additional information? Corinna Evett: We are using a modified version for this year. No one is being provided a request form this year: - We are looking to next years' process. - We are voting on a rubric we will use for this year based on the five criteria and no accompanying information. If the requestor writes a complete and thorough request, the higher the item will be ranked. Think about this for the future. Next meeting we will put this on the agenda. We will practice using the rubric with a few items before the requests are submitted. Changes to the four columns:	

Column	Points	Weighted
DPP	10	1.0
Program Review	10	1.5
Outcomes Assessment	10	2.0
Replacement Needs	10	2.5

Steve Kawa: What is the intent of replacement need?

Aaron Voelcker: We can make do for a year or two but it becomes a priority.

Craig Nance: An example would be software required for a class as a replacement item needs to be highly ranked.
Lana Wong: If we are adopting and implementing the rubric this semester, will the request form provide additional information?

Corinna Evett: We are using a modified version for this year.   No one is being provided a request form this year:

- We are looking to next years' process.
- We are voting on a rubric we will use for this year based on the five criteria and no accompanying information.

If the requestor writes a complete and thorough request, the higher the item will be ranked.

Think about this for the future.   Next meeting we will put this on the agenda.

We will practice using the rubric with a few items before the requests are submitted.

Changes to the four columns:

John Hernandez moved; **Joe Geissler** seconded and the motion was unanimously passed.

Can we have a motion to approve this rubric?

Aaron Voelcker: You can use this to review the rubric:

- Which *Master Plan* item was funded?
- Which technology goals were funded?

4. Develop Instructions for Submitting Prioritized Lists to PIE

Corinna Evett explained the Flow Chart in phases.

PHASE 1:
Craig Rutan: Should there be an additional committee for Human Resources?

	Will the Deans' requests go to the Vice Presidents?	
	Jose Vargas: For non-credit, how will we be considered?	
	Corinna Evett added non-credit in appropriate boxes in the Flow Chart.	
	Lana Wong: When the Technology Committee gets a technology request it would have been vetted by the Division. Would it go through the Unit or will the administrator move it forward to governance committee?	
	Aracely Mora: I would suggest that a written narrative be added to the back of the flow chart to help others outside the PIE.	
	Craig Nance: I would suggest making columns in the flow chart for easier reading.	**Corinna Evett** will send the flow chart to **Craig Nance** and he will format.
	Craig Rutan: I would suggest the document be color-coded, as well.	**Craig Rutan** will work with **Craig Nance** to color code the flow chart.
	PHASE 2: Discussion commenced.	
	Corinna Evett: May I have someone make a motion to approve the official Flow Chart?	**Leigh Ann Unger** moved and **Craig Rutan** seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.
	Jose Vargas: May I use these documents as documentation for Accreditation?	
	Corinna Evett: Yes.	
	Craig Rutan: My understanding is that the Joint Chairs list goes to the Vice Presidents and then comes to PIE but the flow chart shows that the priority list from the Joint Chairs goes directly to the PIE.	
	Corinna Evett: I will revise to add the Vice Presidents after the Joint Chairs.	
	Steve Kawa: The Vice Presidents may be able to fund the request internally before it goes to PIE.	
	John Hernandez: We could fund with grant money or categorical funds, funding that constituents may not know exists.	

		Corinna Evett: May I have someone make a motion to approve the changes to Phases 1 and 1?	**Leigh Ann Unger** moved and **Craig Nance** seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved
5.	Request Form	Jose Vargas: Can you provide a link in the form to SCC goals? And, if the answer to each question is yes, include a request for an explanation. Craig Nance: We should make the process simple. John Hernandez: What we are looking for is data, attach evidence. Aaron Voelcker: *Taskstream* reports will be available to use as evidence. John Hernandez: Will every budget item require a budget request form? A motion was called to approve the Request Form.	**Craig Rutan** moved and **Jose Vargas** seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.
	Summary of the Meeting	Corinna Evett: • Communicate PIE information more effectively • PIE has a process; share it! • The PIE Rubric for next year was approved; share it! • Setting the rubric for this year.	
	Next meeting	Wednesday, March 19, 2014, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., E-206	