

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
December 3, 2014
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Joyce Wagner, Mary Walker, Rudy Frias, Leigh Ann Unger, Rudy Tijptahadi, Mary Mettler, Steven Deeley, Alice Ho, Joe Geissler, Aracely Mora, Scott Howell, Craig Nance, Matthew Valazquez (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. Announcements	From POE: VPs send stuff that could have district implications in mid January—Then District send any RRs to colleges last week of January	
3. Reports from Governance Committees	Facilities Committee/Craig Nance: reported that the Facilities Committee re-ordered the form for greater ease in ranking. Technology Committee/Alice Ho: reported that the Technology Committee did complete the rankings but had to review 50 pages of information within three days. Suggestion: Add a new date to the <i>Year-at-a-Glance</i> to extend the review time for items directly submitted to a Committee.	
4. Approval of 17 September 2014 Minutes	A correct was requested eliminating Lana Wong as an attendee in the minutes of the November 5, 2014 PIE minutes, and replacing her name with Alice Ho	The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by Scott Howell and seconded by Leigh Ann Unger), with two corrections.
5. Planning Process Evaluation Tool/Activity	Two suggestions were made for evaluating the process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys • Forums Discussion about the timing of the evaluation process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the best time be soon after the process is completed when the information is fresh in the minds of those who are being surveyed? • Or, would it be best to do the survey after the recommendations have 	A motion was made to accept the form and was approved without dissent (moved by Craig Rutan and seconded by Joe Geissler).

	<p>been made?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">WRITTEN ON BOARD</p> <p>One survey after the process had been completed:</p> <p>Part A – Resource Request Form Part B – Timeline sufficiency Part C – Outcomes/overall satisfaction</p> <p>Informally receiving feedback throughout the process—have institutional dialog that is documented in minutes and an agenda; <i>systematic evidence</i> is the sticking point.</p> <p><u>Timing</u></p> <p><i>Year at a Glance</i> – send the survey the end of Spring semester</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suspect that most recommendations will be micro rather than macro <p>Part A – Resource Request Form & Process (timeline) Part B – Outcomes/Overall Satisfaction Part C – Recommendations</p> <p>Joyce Wagner suggested that the Technology, Joint Chairs, and Facilities Committee members and the Vice Presidents be asked for a brief re-cap of their evaluation of their individual process.</p>	<p>The decision was made to do one (1) survey, not two (2) surveys.</p> <p>Committee members were asked to draft questions for Part A, B, and C, for the first meeting, Spring 2015. Aaron Voelcker will send a reminder to committee members with a deadline for submitting questions.</p>
6. Questions/Others	.	
7. Adjourned Next Meeting	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.</p> <p>February 18, 2015, 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., Room E-206</p>	<p>The motion was passed unanimously (moved by Craig Nance and seconded by Mary Walker).</p>