

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting  
April 1, 2015  
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

**Attendance:** Roberta Tragarz, Rudy Frias, Mary Mettler, John Hernandez, Rudy Tijptahadi, Joe Geissler, Scott Howell, Alice Ho, Arleen Satele, Joyce Wagner, Jose Vargas

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	None	
3. Reports from Governance Committees	<p><u>Technology Committee/Alice Ho:</u></p> <p>Suggestion to add Technology Committee to the Resource Request form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of students served by equipment</li> <li>• The number of courses served</li> <li>• How many classrooms are affected if a request is not funded</li> <li>• Will the requestor accept partial funding?</li> </ul> <p>A separate form was suggested for technology, similar to facility need form.</p> <p><u>Budget Committee</u></p> <p>There were four requested funded for a total of \$110,000:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$19,000 for professional development</li> <li>• \$ 4,000 for EOPS books</li> <li>• \$87,000 for Supplemental Instruction for STEM</li> </ul> <p>A second round of funding is set for April 15, 2015; if items are not approved for 14-15, will they be considered for 15-16?</p>	

	<p><u>Joint Chairs/Aaron Voelcker:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aaron Voelcker attended the Joint Chairs to field questions and the Chairs asked for clarification regarding the PIE process.</li> <li>• There is a need for a feedback loop.</li> <li>• Does this list make sense in terms of order?</li> </ul>	
<p>4. Approval minutes of the March 18, 2015 PIE meeting</p>		<p>The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by <b>Mary Mettler</b> and seconded by <b>Scott Howell</b>).</p>
<p>5. Review RSCCD Grant Schedule</p>	<p>Grant Schedule for District-wide all funded grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presented to POE and brought forward as informational at PIE</li> </ul> <p>Stephen Reed proposed a National Endowment for the Humanities and the American Library Association grant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMPC was not contacted by email.</li> </ul> <p>The grant review process was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two readings?</li> <li>• There is a need for a brief turn around in order to meet grant deadline</li> <li>• Can a second reading be waived for grants without issues?</li> <li>• There is a duplication of roles relative to the focus on college goals. Questions raised in this forum would be addressed by the two readings in College Council.</li> <li>• Discussions about whether or not PIE is the body to have two readings and College Council one reading in order to provide for time limitations.</li> <li>• Questions about timeliness of grant review when PIE moves to meeting once a month in the fall.</li> <li>• The second reading can be done by an email vote if necessary.</li> <li>• Overall, it was decided that because of its responsibilities and role in planning, PIE is the body that should have two readings, and it is recommended that College Council have one reading.</li> <li>• PIEs review can provide constructive feedback on how to strengthen the grant application.</li> <li>• How informed are classified representatives and how are they reporting back?</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting information reported on a CSEA website for all classified staff to access and view.</li> </ul> <p>A motion was made to wave second reading.</p> <p>A motion was made to recommend grant to College Council.</p> <p>A motion was made in order to prevent a time problem for grants, that PIE recommend one reading to College Council.</p>	<p>The motion was made by <b>John Hernandez</b> and seconded by <b>Mary Mettler</b>. The motion was passed.</p> <p>The motion was made by <b>Joe Geissler</b> and seconded by <b>Rudy Tjiptahadi</b>. The motion was passed.</p> <p>The motion was made by <b>John Hernandez</b> and seconded by <b>Jose Vargas</b>. The motion was passed.</p>
<p>6. Discuss PIE Task Force Question Recommendations for the SCC PIE College Wide Planning Evaluation Survey</p>	<p>The PIE Task Force has created a SurveyMonkey survey for evaluation of the resource request form, resource request and allocation process, and the result of the most recent process.</p> <p>Rudy Tjiptahadi demonstrated the survey to the committee. Allows for feedback to be disaggregated by area and constituency.</p> <p>This survey is a big component of the systematic assessment of integrated planning and resource allocation.</p> <p>A motion was made to approve and accept the survey.</p> <p>The survey will be launched.</p>	<p>The motion was made by <b>John Hernandez</b> and seconded by <b>Mary Mettler</b>. The motion was passed without dissent.</p>
<p>7. Discussion Possible Request Groupings</p>	<p>Previous suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Instructional Equipment and Supplies</li> <li>B. Personnel</li> <li>C. Technology (instructional and non-instruction)</li> <li>D. Operating Expenses</li> </ul> <p>Discussion of possible ways to group requests for prioritization purposes:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate equipment and supplies. Lottery can pay for one and not the other.</li> <li>• Could you organize by object code?</li> </ul> <p>Written on the White Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use funding sources as the categories?</li> <li>• Prioritize according to available funds? If the Budget Committee shorts this out, may not need to do this.</li> <li>• If there are 7 categories; how do you decide what is the #1 priority for general funds?</li> <li>• Should we spend restricted funds first until there is nothing left?</li> <li>• Add the funding categories on the Resource Request form</li> <li>• Do the splitting into units early</li> <li>• Are we losing sight of the institutional effectiveness portion of our charge?</li> <li>• Hold early discussions in fall semester to determine college priorities</li> <li>• Determine priority of categories per planning documents: Education Master Plan/Technology Plan/Facilities Plan, etc.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Next meeting</b></p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.</p> <p>Wednesday, April 15, 2015, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., E-206</p>	