Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
April 16, 2014
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Roberta Tragarz, Lana Wong, Craig Rutan, Aracely Mora, Rudy Frias, Steven Deeley, Aaron Voelcker, Mary Mettler, John Hernandez, Craig Nance, Rudy Tijptahadi, Mary Walker, Joe Geissler, Daniel Rebolledo (student representative)

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 19, 2014 PIE meeting		The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by **Craig Nance** and seconded by **Joe Geissler**) with one correction.
3. Approve SCC Resource Request Form		
4. Discuss Results of Practice with and results of the 2014/2015 Modified PIE Resource Request Prioritization Rubric		
5. Revise 2014/2015 Prioritization Rubric as Necessary	*Aaron Voelcker*: Thank you to the members who sent me your completed trial rubrics. Please keep the rubric in the appropriate order; when everything is in the same order the cells can be properly averaged. Please don't adjust the list when you enter information. Aaron explained the structure of the Excel spreadsheet Rubric, including how the items were prioritized. *Aaron Voelcker*: My biggest concern is ties. We will deal with ties as they	The campus-wide **deadline for submitting requests is May 5, 2014, by noon.**

	occur.

Craig Rutan: Let's wait until the Budget Committee information is received to discuss ties.

Corinne Evett: How many items from each list do you want to include?

Aracely Mora: I received two lists from the joint chairs for a total of 31 items:
- One (1) list based on the prioritized list submitted from the Joint Chairs
- One (1) list based on items they don't want to be overlooked

Lana Wong feels that there are inequities in the process for technology; Aracely Mora feels that there are inequities in the process for instruction.

Mary Mettler: Time is a factor.

Aracely Mora:
- If we limit the number of items, it will change the process, expectations should match the process.
- If requests made are not considered, it will affect morale.
- The work done should be justified.

Steven Deeley: The quality of time spent making decisions will be affected with 40 decisions vs. 127 decisions.

John Hernandez: I want to honor the work done but common sense dictates that money availability should be considered.   Does it make sense to evaluate 127 requests if the funding is limited?

Mary Walker: I would suggest using tiers, look at every unit's top 10 requests; then, look at the second 10 requests.

Aaron Voelcker: The Department Chairs were aware that there wasn't any funding and yet they still did the work.

John Hernandez: As did Student Services. | Corinna Evett called for a vote.   Should we look at every item for this go-around? |

	Aaron Voelcker: We owe it to the College to review the entire list.	Yes votes 9 No votes 5
	Lana Wong: Aracely had a point, in order to set realistic expectations, priorities need to be established.	
	Corinna Evett: Do we want to have a discussion?	
	Joe Geissler: Yes, there should be discussion relative to the questions we have.	
	Corinna Evett: We will finalize the list we will be forwarding to the Budget Committee at the next meeting.	
	Rudy Tjiptahadi: There is a wide disparity and inconsistency in point values between this year's rubric and next year's rubric. I would recommend a point system that is more consistent. *Replacement Need* has 50% more value than *APR/DPP/SLO* combined, which is partly remedied by the reduction of the *Replacement* weighting from 1.5 to 1.	
	Craig Rutan: We don't have that information for this year's process; we will have it for next year.	
	Craig Nance: I like Rudy's suggestion for Program Review/DPP/Outcome Assessment range to change from 0 – 10 to 0 – 5.	**Corinna Evett** called for a motion. The motion to change replacement need to one (1) was unanimously passed (**Craig Nance** moved; and **Steve Deeley** seconded).
6. Finalize the 2014/2015 Modified Prioritization Process	*John Hernandez*: Why are those committees listed in Phase I, #6? *Joe Geissler*: #5 combination: What are we expecting to see? *Lana Woods:* Staffing/Operational is on the rubric but not on the request form. *Corinna Evett*: Where do you want to add that, between #5 and #6, after request in rubric #2 or a new type of request? *Mary Walker*: What is legally? #8, first time submitted not on the rubric. Not everything on the rubric is on the Resource Request form. Lori	

	Fasbinder asked if you would consider providing the Mission Statement and SCC Goals on the form. *Corinna Evett*: This form should be automated eventually in *Taskstream*. *Mary Walker*: Can we combine #10 and #11? *Lana Wong*: #8 doesn't include shared governance. Can we change prioritization request to a resource request? *Rudy Tjiptahadi*: You need to close the parenthesis.	A motion to approve the 2014/2015 Modified Prioritization Process was approved without dissent (moved by **Craig Rutan** and seconded by **Steven Deeley**). **Aracely Mora** suggested dating each revision until we come to the point where we aren't making additional revisions.
7. Discuss SCC Facilities Request Form & Process Flowchart	*Corinna Evett*: The facilities process mirrors the resource process, and is open for a discussion of the documents. Should we add facilities and budget? The item would only go to the Budget Committee if there were a cost. Do we set a spring date and a fall date to submit for prioritization? Do the Vice Presidents want to be advised? *Aracely Mora:* Yes *John Hernandez*: We should add square footage; an estimate of the needed square footage. I would suggest adding new or refurbished furniture and equipment, with an estimated cost. *Mary Walker*: I would add to desired location for #6, *will you accept another location*? *Aracely Mora*: What about a situation like OEC needing a replacement location?	

	Corinna Evett: I would add legally mandated. *Craig Rutan*: I would suggest asking for the requestor to include other information to support their request. Come to the next meeting after thinking about the process in order to discuss revisions to the Flow Chart and suggestions regarding how might facilities requests be funded? *John Hernandez*: A possible source of funding might be lottery or re-development funds. For example, the Muslim and Christian students have asked for a prayer room. Will they fill out this form?	
8. Discuss Possible District Acquisition of Property in Anaheim/Yorba Linda	Tabled	
9. Questions/Other	Report from Enrollment Management Committee (EMC): *Corinna Evett*: Regarding adding Intersession 15, the Enrollment Management Committee is: • Reviewing intersession data from Fall 13 to Intersession 14 • Reviewing the withdraw rate • Whether there is improved success in Intersession • FTES cheaper in Intersession *Craig Rutan*: the EMC is still looking at repeaters from Fall 13 to Intersession 14; Intersession was mostly introductory courses. We need the figures from Spring 14. *Craig Nance*: the 4 week math summer courses have better student success. *Craig Rutan*: Can the EMC make a recommendation on the basis of the current information? *Corinna Evett*: We should be able to make a decision on whether or not we will offer Intersession 2015 by the end of Spring. The Budget Committee has to weigh in. Should we ask the Budget Committee for the cost of intersession?	
Next meeting	The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m. Wednesday, May 7, 2014, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., E-206	