Present: Walker, Hernandez, Frias, Wagner, Geissler, Tragarz, Howell, Mettler, Nance, Deeley, Voelcker, Evett, Tjiptahadi, and Mora

1. Approve 4 March 2015 Minutes

    a. Howell moved; Frias seconded, and the minutes were approved by the committee with one abstention.

2. Discuss Budget Committee PIE Prioritize Resource Allocation List Recommendations

    a. Budget Committee Update: Since there are no available general funds, there is no way to fund new positions.

    b. First time in five years that we have received Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) monies in the total of $263,887

        i. The committee recommends that SCC use $163,000 this year and roll over the balance for next year as there is no guarantee that we will receive the funds next year.

        ii. Item #9 could use up most of the IELM funds

        iii. Questions about including #10 within the IELM allocated funds were raised

        iv. It was recommended that the Technology Master Plan be reviewed in order to see the planned order of replacements so that the funds could be most efficiently spent.

    c. Eleven items for direct classroom materials can be funded with lottery monies totaling $34, 704.85

3. Compile PIE Prioritize Resource Allocation List to Forward to College Council and SCC Community

    a. Discussion of any suggested changes to the order of the list.

        i. Continued discussion of using funds for #9 & #10

        ii. Discussion about whether or not request #32 should move up on the list because the Athletic Director position is going to be eliminated.

1. The Vice President of Academic Affairs moved #20 from the bottom of the Joint Chairs list to #7 on the list submitted to PIE.
2. There was discussion about the position of the Dean of Mathematics and Sciences and the additional responsibilities because of the absence of an Athletic Director.
3. It was also mentioned that the dean in this area may discontinue fulfilling the Athletic Director responsibilities.
4. In response, it was mentioned that the position related to #32 is not a game management position and that the Dean of Mathematics and Sciences is held to fulfilling the responsibilities delineated in the job description for the position.

b. Nance made a motion to move #32 to #21, which was seconded by Unger. The motion failed.

c. Nance moved to approve the "PIE Committee Resource Prioritization Recommendations to College Council" (Please see attached) with the "Final 2015-2016 PIE Prioritization List" (Please see attached); Deeley seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

4. Discuss Meeting Frequency: Suggestion: Beginning Fall 2016, change to once a month: 3rd Wednesday of the month from 3:00-4:30. EMC may change to once a month: 1st Wednesday of the month from 3:00-4:30.

a. After looking at the Year at a Glance document, it seems that the committee can complete its work in a timely manner by meeting only once a month.

b. Should it be deemed necessary, especially in the spring, the committee could meet via email.

c. Mettler moved to change PIE meeting day and time to once a month on the 3rd Wednesday of the month from 3:00-4:30. Tjiptahadi seconded, and approved with one abstention.

5. Discuss 4 March 2015 Homework

a. Reviewed last meeting suggestions for possible rubric changes

  i. Suggested that we do not include unit rankings, for requests could be ranked lower than they ought to be when taking a college-wide view.

  ii. Any alternative should not penalize areas with fewer requests.

  iii. Question about calibrating the list: Should all #1s be equal?

  iv. Include an additional column on rubric: Overall good of the college

  v. Suggested that we discuss each request in committee and prioritize as a group in order to reach a consensus, for some do not understand requests.

    1. Do we want units to explain their requests?

    2. Ought we to evaluate requests as a group?

    3. Would it be difficult to get through all of the request?

    4. Is it logistically possible?

    5. Do units understand the forms?

    6. Should we include a narrative that allows the requestor to explain how the request relates to the good of the entire college?

  vi. Should we include something that allows the requestor to express the sense of urgency related to the request? What will be the impact should the request not be funded?

  vii. Could we separate requests per possible funding sources, such as personel, facilities, and instructional equipment and supplies?

    1. Then deliberations should first occur for those items to be funded from general funds.

    2. That works well with categoricals, but what about when we have more general funds?

    3. Should we rank categorical fund items first then general fund items?

    4. Makes sense to exhaust categorical funds first so as to free up unrestricted general funds.

    5. There was a consensus that it makes sense to rank in categories—classifications.

6. Questions/Others

  a. Timeline to inform college community of any form changes:

       i. Before end of the semester we need to have our documents revised and ready for distribution

      ii. Therefore, we need to create, distribute, and review our survey before our last meeting of the semester on May 20th.

b. PIE Survey Task Force will have survey question and format recommendations for us at our next meeting.

c. For the next meeting, think about how we might group requests for greater ease when ranking requests as well as for greater logic.

      i. Classifications written on the board include the following:

         1. Instructional Equipment and Supplies

         2. Personnel

         3. Technology (Instructional and Non-Instructional)

         4. Operating Expenses (fees, misc.)

d. College Council tasked President Weispfenning and Academic Senate President Evett to come up with a recommendation related to categorical funds. PIE will get a report once the recommendation is shared and discussed in College Council.

Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Resource Prioritization Recommendations
Submitted to College Council
24 March 2015

1. The Committee has one SCC 2015-2016 Resource Request Prioritization List to recommend to the College Council: "Final 2015-16 PIE Prioritization List."

2. In addition, the PIE Committee recommends that College Council use the Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) monies that the Budget Committee identified in the sum of $163,000 to fund priority numbers 9 & 10 following the *SCC Technology Master Plan*.

3. Included with the "Final 2015-16 PIE Prioritization List," please find a copy of the Budget Committee analysis of the PIE Prioritization List that identifies the items that can be funded by: Instructional Equipment and Library Materials (IELM) funds and Lottery funds

4. There are three items that the Budget Committee is looking into in order to determine whether or not lottery funds can be used to fund them.

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, to act, to communicate and to think critically. We are committed to maintaining standards of excellence and providing accessible, transferable, and engaging education to a diverse community. (Approved 9/10/2013)