

Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
March 19, 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 Tijtjahi, Joseph Geissler, Rudy Frias, Mary Walker, Leigh Ann Unger, Scott Howell, Roberta Tragarz, Mary Mettler, Pat Hall, Daniel Rebolledo (student)

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 March 5, 2014		The minutes of March 5, 2014, were approved without dissent (moved by John Hernandez and seconded by Lana Wong).												
3. Discuss 2014/2015 Modified Planning Process	<p><i>Aaron Voelcker</i> previewed the <i>Resource Request Process Flowchart</i>.</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> Changes can be made next year since this <i>Flowchart</i> has already been approved for this year. Craig Nance will be joining us late but I did want to relay his suggested revisions to the <i>Flowchart</i>: Put Phase 1 on one page and Phase 2 on a second page</p> <p><i>Aaron Voelcker:</i> This document will be moved to the Planning Document page.</p>	The motion to approve, make public and use the <i>Resource Request Process Flowchart</i> for the SCC Self-Study was approved without dissent (moved by Joe Geissler and seconded by Craig Nance).												
4. Create 2014/2015 Modified PIE Resource Request Prioritization Rubric	<p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> We have two Vice Presidents here, Aracely when will you have your Academic Affairs prioritized list?</p> <p><i>Aracely Mora:</i> I am waiting for the Joint Chairs to provide me with the list. They will be meeting the beginning of April. I will not be making changes to their prioritized list.</p> <p><i>John Hernandez:</i> We are going to use the PIE Rubric.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Written on Board</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 33%;">Plan</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 33%;">Budget</td> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 33%;">DPPS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>no cost analyzer</td> <td>review costs</td> <td>who does em?</td> </tr> <tr> <td>remove amounts</td> <td>analysis</td> <td>who doesn't</td> </tr> <tr> <td>inserts</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Planning drives budget.</p> <p>Miss goals</p>	Plan	Budget	DPPS	no cost analyzer	review costs	who does em?	remove amounts	analysis	who doesn't	inserts		
Plan	Budget	DPPS												
no cost analyzer	review costs	who does em?												
remove amounts	analysis	who doesn't												
inserts														

	<p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> We are going to create PIE’s modified rubric and practice today. PIE members will review the list prior to the April 16, 2014, meeting, when the prioritization will begin. We can create our list by a couple of methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIE members can review the list prior to the meeting and do an individual tally, send it to the co-chairs, we will tally the individual lists, and bring one list to the meeting to be discussed • We can invite guests to the discussion. <p>Should the PIE committee consider cost or just planning?</p> <p><i>Aracely Mora:</i> Conceptual, integrated planning is exclusive of funding. The Budget Committee is charged with funding.</p> <p><i>Lana Wong:</i> For “at a glance,” the Budget Committee may return our prioritized list if there is no funding and ask PIE to re-prioritize.</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> Let’s be blind to the cost, prioritize, then, add cost.</p> <p><i>Aracely Mora:</i> The first round can be blind to the cost; the Budget Committee looks at the budget in total.</p> <p><i>Leigh Ann Unger:</i> Planning drives the budget.</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> Let’s modify the rubric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove cost columns • Remove Technology and Facilities Master Plans • Consolidate DPP/Program Review/Outcomes Assessment <p><i>John Hernandez:</i> Incorporate and include information that all entities would include in their prioritized list.</p> <p><i>Aracely Mora:</i> DPP --- Program Review --- Next DPP</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> Should we add replacement needs? Are governance committees forwarding any needs to the Vice Presidents?</p> <p><i>Lana Wong:</i> The Technology Committee never discussed what recommendations they would make to PIE.</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> To speed up the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online 	<p>Technology Emergency? “augmentations” Ensure the base</p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email • Use PIE Rubric for next year • Send to Aracely <p><i>Aracely Mora:</i> Would PIE and the Budget Committee consider a set-aside?</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> Next meeting we will look at the line budget items.</p> <p><i>Aracely Mora:</i> Before we have a conversation about set-asides, let's ensure the base. Technology is something we all need, we all support, but we don't want to have to pay for it.</p> <p><i>Aracely Mora to Lana Wong:</i> Did I understand your point? You have uncertainty about whether or not you can submit the Technology Committee priorities in the timeframe remaining?</p> <p><i>Lana Wong:</i> We are still trying to work out what was going to be required of us. Are we generating our own priorities based on the <i>Technology Plan</i> and implementing that plan? Are we including the technology needs of the Divisions?</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> The District may fund a 5 year technology replacement from the Stabilization Fund for 2014-2015, at \$1.22 million. The next year, the District would pay 80% and the College's 20%, and each year the amount the District pays would be diminished until after 5 years, the College would pay for their own replacement costs.</p> <p><i>Craig Nance:</i> If this expense is part of the District budget, it should stay at the District and stabilization funds should not be used.</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> I will take this information back to the District.</p> <p><i>Lana Wong:</i> Equipment replacement costs are coming from the DDPs and funding to replace is coming from the DDP. We are looking at equipment and staffing, as well.</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> Next year, the Technology Committee will not be looking at the DPP, a request form will be used.</p>	
<p>5. Practice Use of 2014/2015 Modified PIE Resource</p>	<p>Using the first item on the sample prioritized list: Humanities Full-time custodian:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety, has automatic priority 	

<p>Request Prioritization Rubric</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rank within that group • Yes, rank safety • All three custodian positions can't be ranked together, they are separate requests. <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> We will define legally mandated.</p> <p><i>Scott Howell:</i> We will have to try out the rubric to see if it works.</p> <p><i>John Hernandez:</i> We are struggling with the weighting, not the numbers.</p> <p><i>Corinna Evett:</i> Your homework for the next meeting is to use this sample prioritized list, assume these items are included in DPPs with a good rationale.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Written on Board</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Safety Automatic priority 1-10 Define legally mandated</p> <p>A motion to add a numerical number or weight to the rubric was passed without dissent (moved by Craig Nance moved and seconded by Mary Mettler).</p>
<p>6. Practice Use of 2015/2016 PIE Resource Request Prioritization Rubric</p>		
<p>7. PIE Process for Discussion of Prioritization Results</p>		
<p>8. Questions/Others</p>		
<p>Summary of the Meeting</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft rubric for 2013-2014 2. Practice and vote at the next meeting 3. Joint Chairs will compile their prioritized list at their April 2, 2014 meeting. 4. The Vice President's prioritized list is due by Wednesday, 4/16/14. 5. Prioritization will be done by the 1st meeting in May. 	
<p>Next meeting</p>	<p>Wednesday, April 2, 2014, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., E-206</p>	<p>A motion to adjourn was approved without dissent (moved by Aracely Mora and seconded by Roberta Tragarz).</p>