

Santiago Canyon College
Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee
MINUTES
June 4, 2014
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Steven Deeley, Corinna Evett, Rudy Frias, Joe Geissler, John Hernandez, Scott Howell, Steve Kawa, Craig Nance, Janis Perry, Craig Rutan, Rudy Tijptahadi, Roberta Tragarz, Leigh Ann Unger, Jose Vargas, Aaron Voelcker, Lana Wong

Absent: Rudy Carrion, Mary Mettler, Aracely Mora, Mary Walker

Guest: Tiffany Garbis

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	OUTCOME/FOLLOW UP
1. Welcome	Corinna Evett: Thanked everyone in attendance for showing up during Finals Week.	
2. Announcements and/or Updates	<p>Corinna Evett: Planning and Organizational Effectiveness (POE) Committee met June 25, 2014. Craig Rutan attended in Corinna's absence. A subgroup was created to align the planning sequences and timing of the College with the District</p> <p>The District Council reported a \$3.3 million budget augmentation. The District Council recommended \$500,000 be allocated from the anticipated growth funds for trustee and legal expenses. This money would be "off the top" and the rest of the growth funds to be distributed through the colleges' budget model. SCC should explore the \$400,000 for next year. The Chancellor already budgeted \$18,000 for international programs. The POE Committee can make recommendations but the Chancellor decides the final budget. The final budget is still undetermined but will be transparent.</p>	
3. Approve 21 May 2014 Minutes	<p>Minutes were not presented for approval.</p> <p>Rudy Tijptahadi: Voting and approval of PIE minutes should be done soon or online as citations in the Self Evaluation use the minutes as pieces of evidence.</p>	

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.

4. **Revise and Approve PIE**

2015-2016 Prioritization Rubric

*Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee
Resource Prioritization Recommendations
Submitted to College Council 10 June 2014*

The prioritized list of resource recommendations for funding in 2014-2015 was reviewed. The lists were delineated into three (3) separate lists:

- A. Instruction, Equipment and Supplies Restricted Funds
- B. Revisit Items - 8, 27 and 39
- C. Recommended Items - only include revisited items if not funded by Instruction, Equipment Restricted Funds

Discussion of the 2015-2016 Prioritization Rubric and the Resource Request Form overlapped.

Aaron Voelcker: Form was previously approved for the modified 2014-2015 funding cycle. Is this the same rubric we want to use for the current cycle of prioritizing 2015-2016?

Corinna Evett: Does everyone agree on the legend?

Aaron Voelcker: Do we want to remove the double asterisks "GF" column and foot note?

Craig Rutan: Does not matter. It is up to the Budget Committee, not the department chairs

Corinna Evett: Does everyone agree on three columns on amount?

Steve Kawa: Is the Amt. Ongoing column an annual figure or a total figure?

Corinna Evett: It is the figure entered on the Resource Request Form (question #5).

Steve Kawa: A copy machine has both a onetime amount (purchase) and an ongoing amount (maintenance).

Corinna Evett: Resource Request Total (question #4) and Check the Following that Apply to the Cost (question #5) were merged together and fields for dollar amount were added to the Resource Request Form.

Jose Vargas: Suggested changing the information at the top (paragraph #2) to include the fiscal range of "July 1st to June 30th".

Steve Kawa: Cautioned members to be aware that Purchase Orders (POs) cannot be submitted after June 30th.

John Hernandez: Agreed Jose's suggestion clarified fiscal year

Jose Vargas: Discussed that new money which comes in before July 1st can still be added to the current year's prioritization list and not the next.

John Hernandez: Discussed concerns with departments submitting reorganization and the Fiscal Department review at Step 3 of the process.

Aaron Voelcker: In order to integrate all planning, the columns on Mission, SCC Goals, Technology Master Plan Goals and Facilities Master Plan Priority must stay.

Corinna Evett: The "Mission" column is attributed as a "gimmie" and should be left as a check off column.

Craig Nance: If we assign a point value to the columns, it will provide an emphasis on overall importance.

Corinna Evett: Discussed that if the "Mission" column is not checked, then the planning of integrated planning is not being addressed. Requestors should identify the goal that they think the request most represents. PIE can consider prioritize how well they reach the goal.

Jose Vargas: Why separate Facilities Master Plan and Technology Master Plan Goals?

Corinna Evett: We are validating the connection among the integrated planning. The College will be achieving specific goals college wide.

Craig Nance: Why include columns without any weight?

Corinna Evett: The columns help the College recognize and achieve stated goals.

Aaron Voelcker: Opened the floor for discussion whether to include the Facilities Master Plan and Technology Master Plan Goals columns or not.

Craig Rutan: If we don't assign a number, then why does it need to be in the rubric? Committee members can look at the Resource Request Form if they have further questions.

Lana Wong: Suggested keeping the forms for the next accreditation cycle set of evidence. It is important to make note in the form to encourage the requestor to look more broadly at their request.

Corinna Evett: It validates work putting it into the rubric.

John Hernandez: Agreed to keep the columns.

Leigh Ann Unger: Suggested keeping the columns in for one year.

Craig Nance: Suggested using these columns as a factor in case of a tie breaker.

A straw vote was called to leave the goals and plans in place: 10 ayes, 5 nays.

Aaron Voelcker: Opened the floor for discussion whether to include the Department Planning Portfolio (DPP), Program Review, Outcomes Assessment

and Replacement Need columns or not.

Steven Deeley: Expressed concern with the subjectivity of weighting.

Aaron Voelcker: Suggested that a norming session be scheduled to include different request for facilities, technology and personnel. It is a judgment call and PIE committee members can be subjective so long as they are consistent in their weighting.

Corinna Evett: Discussed the function of PIE was to shuffle the prioritization list. She closed the discussion on weighting.

Scott Howell: Expressed concerns when unexpected safety issues, legal mandates and necessary items to hold class cannot be planned.

Corinna Evett: We didn't have those issues last time because it was the modified cycle and non-planned and safety issues were of the "here and now". The focus is on future planning and will have to consider these issues this time.

Aaron Voelcker: PIE members are to prioritize request as planned for. Has it been planned and if so, prioritize the requests accordingly.

Craig Nance: Agreed and discussed troubles with columns. Discuss can take place later. Suggested adding a column to rate how well does the request fit in the global plan.

John Hernandez: Wanted clarification and training on weighting points over Yes/No columns. Stressed that the Department Planning Portfolio (DPP), Program Review, Outcomes Assessment and Replacement Need columns were the core of integrated planning. If we don't assign any value to it, no one will converse or discuss at the department level.

Craig Rutan: Explained the challenges with fitting all the requests in the columns. Departments must differentiate the needs from the wants. Every dollar spent on outcomes assessment is meant to address identified deficiencies.

Janis Perry: Outcomes assessment holds the most importance. The Educational Master Plan is driven by the mission. Assessment of how well we align with the plan is rooted in the mission. Requestors need to look at it globally: What do I need? Is it in my plan?

Corinna Evett: If the request isn't aligned with the mission or goals for the college, it does not move forward. PIE will create a list of various items to discuss in the fall but PIE needs to distribute the information to the campus tomorrow.

Aaron Voelcker: Will change formatting (blue color) of the four columns later to avoid confusion about sections being more important.

Craig Nance: Concerned how the current request from Astronomy and Physics

	<p>for blackout curtains and Geology for intensity light fit in with the current rubric.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: Responded that the departments would be able to show just cause. The original building plans included the curtains but the building wasn't constructed to specifications. Items which are directly related to instruction can easily prove request through data and planning.</p> <p>Lana Wong: Discussed the similarities of question #14 (... provide evidence that this resource request is in your unit's DPP) and question #8 (When was the first time that you submitted this resource request) on the Resource Request Form. Asked what a "unit" was?</p> <p>Corinna Evett: A unit can be a division or department and is available to everyone.</p> <p>Jose Vargas: Suggested question #12 to read "List <u>any of</u> the Technology Master Plan goals that this resource request supports"</p>	<p>Craig Rutan motioned to approve the <i>2015-2016 Prioritization Rubric</i> as modified. Leigh Ann Unger seconded.</p> <p>Motion was approved without dissent.</p>
<p>5. Revise and Approve SCC <i>Resource Request Form</i></p>	<p>Discussion of the Resource Request Form and the 2015-2016 Prioritization Rubric overlapped.</p> <p>Craig Nance: Requested item #1 on "Resource Request (RR) Title" be included on the Rubric form to maintain consistency.</p> <p>Craig Nance: Questioned how if the department ranking should be noted on the rubric.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Discussed that the department and division ranking are superseded by the Vice President ranking.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Explained that resource request forms may be submitted at various times during the year and that ranking is done only once a year.</p>	<p>Craig Rutan motioned to approve the <i>Resource Request Form</i> as modified. John Hernandez seconded.</p> <p>Motion was approved without dissent.</p>
<p>6. Revise, Possibly Revise and Possibly Approve SCC <i>Resource Request Process Flowchart 2014-2015 At a Glance</i></p>	<p>Corinna Evett: Opened the floor for discussion if enough time has been built in for PIE to send to the Budget Committee before final recommendations.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: The 2013/2014 At a Glance used to be earlier (August/September).</p> <p>Leigh Ann Unger: Questioned if the Department Planning Portfolios (DPPs) were required to be reviewed during FLEX weeks.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: DPPs are encouraged to be reviewed during FLEX, but not required.</p> <p>Rudy Tjiptahadi: DPPs can be submitted anytime. It is recommended that they</p>	

	<p>review it twice a year during FLEX week.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Opened the floor for discussion of when resource request forms are due.</p> <p>Steve Kawa: Discussed that the finalized figures for the budget are not established until the end of September.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Suggest forms be due at the end of Spring.</p> <p>Steve Kawa: Agreed</p> <p>Joe Geissler: Reminded the committee that the last At a Glance was a modified schedule for 2013-2014.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: Discussed the new joint chairs committee meetings will be the last Wednesday of the month during September, October and November. They do not meet in December.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Asked about the preferred deadlines for non-academic affairs.</p> <p>John Hernandez: No preference on deadlines but encouraged the sooner the better.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Suggested that since this is the first time it will go through the full collegial governance structure that it would be best to frontload fall with deadlines.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: November and December are quiet months and suggest that the campus works on the request over the summer. It provides more play and squeeze to adjust deadlines. The PIE committee will only meet once during February.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Suggested leaving the process alone and start with the schedule as planned. If revisions are necessary, changes can be made later.</p> <p>John Hernandez: Asked when the requests go to the Budget Committee.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Can go anytime but for the purposes of planning it should go in March.</p> <p>John Hernandez: Suggested moving the process back to April so it can go to College Council in time.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Agreed to the changes and will make revisions and send it to the college community.</p>	
<p>7. Revise, Possibly Revise and Possibly Approve SCC <i>Facility Request Form and Process</i></p>	<p>Corinna Evett: Presented the form and process. Biology will be the first department to pilot the form.</p> <p>No further discussion.</p>	<p>Craig Nance motioned to approve the <i>Facility Request Form and Process</i> as presented. Janis Perry seconded. Motion was approved without dissent.</p>

<p>8. Determine a Recommendation to College Council <i>2015 Winter Intersession</i></p>	<p>Corinna Evett: Opened the floor to discussion about scheduling the 2015 Winter Intersession. The Academic Senate created a formal resolution in support of 2015 Winter Intersession so long as it does not negatively or adversely impact the fall and spring schedules.</p> <p>Craig Nance: Asked if college council will evaluate offering intersession in the fall once the final counts of fall FTES are in.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: Discussed that PIE should make recommendations as to what the committee agrees to at this point. The decision to schedule intersession will not occur until August.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: Polled the members to their opinion.</p> <p>Craig Nance: Intersession 2014 occurred because the Chancellor made the request in Fall.</p> <p>John Hernandez: The sooner the planning, the better.</p> <p>Janis Perry: Counseling has already planned for 2015 Intersession.</p> <p>Leigh Ann Unger: If intersession is canceled, does it change the academic calendar.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: It can but requires full discussion.</p> <p>Janis Perry: The calendar can no longer change because of union issues. The college needs to figure out a process to negotiate a calendar.</p> <p>Corinna Evett: It is an understanding the Faculty Associate Rancho Santiago Community College District (FARSCCD) can negotiate and can be difficult. The calendar is available for discussion before negotiation.</p>	<p>Janis Perry motioned to make a recommendations in support of offering <i>2015 Winter Intersession</i> as presented. Joe Geissler seconded.</p> <p>Motion was approved. Craig Nance abstained from voting.</p>
<p>9. Determine Other Recommendations to College Council <i>Possible Line Items</i></p>	<p>Corinna Evett: Discussion on Budget Line items will occur in fall.</p>	
<p>10. Questions/Others</p>	<p>No items were discussed.</p>	