

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

Attendance: Mary Walker, Joyce Wagner, Rudy Frias, Craig Nance, Joe Geissler, Janis Perry, Alice Ho, Scott Howell, Leigh Ann Unger, Mary Mettler, Aracely Mora, Robert Tragarz, Rudy Tjiptahadi, Steven Deeley
)

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. Announcements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College Council: There was a discussion regarding using lottery funds to create budget line for departments. • Accreditation: The formal report is due in January 2015. The President was asked to verify information. 	
3. Reports from Governance Committees	None	
4. Approval of October 1, 2014 Minutes		<p>The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by Joe Geissler and seconded by Rudy Tjiptahadi), with a suggestion to modify the number of times people's names were repeat.</p> <p>The motion was passed unanimously (moved by Craig Nance and seconded by Joe Geissler), with one correction</p>
5. Recommended Revisions to <i>Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisions were shared • Grants will come to PIE before College Council <p>There was a motion made to recommend the <i>Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant</i> to College Council.</p> <p>At the Joint Chairs Joe was asked for a definition of technology to be sent to the Technology Committee and ranked by the Joint Chairs.</p>	<p>The motion was passed unanimously (moved by Craig Nance and seconded by Steven Deeley).</p>

	<p>Corinna Evett: Alice Ho will take this request to the Technical Committee.</p> <p>Aracely Mora: The Joint Chairs shared their process for determining what will be sent to Technology Committee. Where was the confusion?</p> <p>There was a motion made to approve the <i>Facility Request Form</i>.</p>	<p>The motion was passed unanimously (moved by Mary Mettler and seconded by Joe Geissler), with one correction</p>																				
<p>6. Weights for Resource Request Rubric</p>	<p>Concerns were expressed about the unit rankings not coming out the way the rankings were intended because some items scored higher on serving the SCC Mission or the SCC Goals.</p> <p>Question: How should we weight each of these metrics?</p> <p>Craig Nance: Aaron reversed the order of the multiplier values of Mission (9) and SCC Goals (6)</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="428 779 1417 974"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>On Board</u></th> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Maximum 5 points</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mission</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Legally mandated</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SCC goals</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Discussion: Should Mission be a yes/no and not weighted?</p> <p>There was a motion made to change Mission to a yes/no.</p> <p>Mary Mettler: Weight each criteria accordingly, on a scale of 1 to 5 instead of 1 to 10.</p> <p>A suggestion was made to change the weighting to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 – 5 • Tiered <p>A motion was made to weigh Program Review, Department Planning</p>		<u>On Board</u>		<u>Maximum 5 points</u>	3	2	1	5	Mission			4.75	Legally mandated			4.5	SCC goals			4.25	<p>The motion was passed with one dissent (moved by Mary Mettler and seconded by Craig Nance).</p> <p>The motion was passed unanimously (moved</p>
	<u>On Board</u>		<u>Maximum 5 points</u>																			
3	2	1	5																			
Mission			4.75																			
Legally mandated			4.5																			
SCC goals			4.25																			

	Portfolio & Outcome Assessment equally.	by Joyce Wagner and seconded by ???????), with one correction
7. Weights for Facility Need Rubric	-	
8. Questions/Other		
9. Adjourned Next Meeting	Craig Nance moved that the meeting be adjourned at 4:59 p.m. November 19, 2014, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., Room E-206	The motion was passed unanimously (moved by Craig Nance and seconded by Rudy Tijptahadi).