

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
May 21, 2014
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Daniel Rebolledo (student representative), Craig Rutan, Robert Tragarz, Steven Deeley, Scott Howell, Lana Wong, Rudy Frias, Leigh Ann Unger, John Hernandez, Aracely Mora, Janis Perry, Craig Nance, Mary Mettler

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	<p>Corinna Evett reported that the EMC recommended Intersession for 2015, and, the Academic Senate approved it, as well.</p> <p>Aracely Mora: Do we need to generate FTES?</p> <p>Craig Rutan: What are the teaching costs and can we afford it?</p> <p>Corinna Evett: The EMC based their decision on student information and supported Intersession pending funding availability. PIE can't make a decision because we don't have enough information.</p> <p>Aracely Mora: FTES growth comes from Intersession for SCC.</p> <p>Janis Perry: The Academic Senate and the Union need to consult prior to the institutional calendar being negotiated.</p>	
2. Announcements and/or Updates	<p>POE: Resource Augmentation Request; misaligned planning process of District and Colleges. The Adobe Cloud item was approved at POE.</p> <p>John Hernandez: POE was asked to make a fiscal recommendation.</p> <p>BUDGET COMMITTEE: The Committee categorized all 63 items on the prioritized list:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supplies (instruction – may be funded by Lottery or State funding) 2. Equipment 3. Miscellaneous 4. Salaries 	

~~5. Facilities~~

Steven Deeley: Three items were not broken down. There was a lack of description and no information about where the figures came from or back-up documentation.

Aaron Voelcker (referring to the projected chart): The items in white were not funded; the items in red need more documentation and the items in yellow were funded.

Aracely Mora: We can recommend an item if it fits into the category of instructional equipment or instructional supplies, based on the documentation provided.

Corinna Evett: We can re-order this list.

Lana Wong: The Technical Committee looked at three items dealing with replacement.

Mary Mettler: Can we make changes to the item?

Craig Rutan: Technical replacement comes from different pots of money from direct instruction and what isn't.

Aracely Mora: We need to separate the requests with logic and common sense. One large pot is not realistic. We are learning what does and doesn't work through the process. The Budget Committee sees the need to establish a college baseline budget.

Craig Nance: How much we fund is a College Council decision with the College President.

Mary Mettler: #8 was ranked the highest, which was removed from the list; hopefully, you can get a piece of this funded.

Corinna Evett: We can re-order the items. Do we have a motion to change the order of these items?

John Hernandez: I am uncomfortable re-ranking the items after we have gone through the process.

Corinna Evett: We don't have time to re-order these items and send them back to

On the Board
Classroom/Instruction

Equipment & Supplies
Separate Requests

May 7, 2014		(moved by Steven Deeley and seconded by Scott Howell).
4. Review and Discuss the Budget Committee's Analysis of the PIE 2014-2015 Resource Request Prioritization List		
5. Vote on a PIE 2014-2015 Resource Request Prioritization Recommendation List to be Forwarded to College Council		
6. Evaluate the 2014-2015 Modified/Transitional Planning Process, including feedback from Vice Presidents	Steve Deeley: Large items should be itemized. I would suggest adding to the form a request for supporting documentation to justify the cost of the item.	
7. Discuss Personnel (non-faculty) Process Input from Committee Members	<p>Corinna Evett: We should keep in mind for next year that there are items that are separated out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safety and legally mandated items • technology • professional development <p>Aaron Voelcker: We developed a process we haven't seen actualized. We had to revise the process for this year. How do we parse things out; how we weight items is up to this committee and not to be shared with the college community.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: We haven't completed the process and I am reluctant to make changes since we don't know how the process will work. Personnel comes from the general fund.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Budget line items include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safety • emergencies 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • legally mandated items • division • unit <p>Changes will affect the flow chart.</p>	
8. Revise and Approve PIE 2015-2016 Prioritization Rubric	Tabled	
9. Revise and Approve "SCC Resource Request Form"	Tabled	
10. Review, Possibly Revise and Possibly Approve "SCC Resource Request Process Flowchart"	Tabled	
11. Determine a Recommendation to College Council Regarding 2015 Winter Intersession		
12. Determine Other Recommendations for College Council: Possible Budget Line Items		
13. Questions/Other		
14. Next meeting:	<p>Craig Nance moved that the meeting be adjourned at 5:10 p.m.</p> <p>June 4th, Wednesday, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m.</p>	<p>The motion was passed unanimously (moved by Craig Nance and seconded by Roberta Tragarz).</p>