

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting  
May 6, 2015**

**Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chair**

**Attendance:** Joyce Wagner, Mary Walker, Pat, Rudy Frias, Rudy Tjiptahadi, Mary Mettler, Roberta Tragarz, Scott Howell, Steven Deeley, Craig Nance, Arleen Satele; Aracely Mora, Alice Ho

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		
3. Reports from Governance Committees	<p><b>Budget Committee/Steven Deeley:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a structural deficient</li> <li>• If there is any categorical funding that can offset the deficient the Budget Committee will make the recommendation.</li> <li>• Next meeting is May 26.</li> </ul> <p>Facilities Committee/Craig Nance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No money to remodel the D Building.</li> <li>• Signs have been placed on the Gym, Library, and Humanities.</li> <li>• Parking issues were discussed.</li> </ul> <p>POE/Aaron Voelcker: Evaluating the District planning and resource allocation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District does Department Portfolios every 2 years</li> <li>• Corinna introduced PIE's survey</li> <li>• POE will modify that survey to evaluate the District's processes and potentially other District Governance's committees.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This integrates SCC into the District's planning processes which is a positive for Accreditation.</li> </ul>	
<p>4. Approval of April 15, 2015 minutes</p> <p>Approval of April 1, 2015 minutes</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	<p>Craig Nance moved to add the April 1, 2015 minutes to the agenda; Joe Geissler seconded the motion; the motion was unanimously approved.</p> <p>Craig Nance moved to approve the minutes of 4/1/15; Steven Deeley seconded the motion, the minutes were unanimously approved.</p>
<p>5. Discuss Survey Results</p>	<p>The results of the survey were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>75% positive response would have been the best outcome.</li> <li>These responses will form a baseline for the future.</li> <li>If more requests had been approved; the positive response rates might have been higher.</li> <li>How many of the committee members wrote responses?</li> </ul> <p>Open ended comments discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will Taskstream make this process easier?</li> <li>PIE is the gatekeeper</li> <li>Some of the comments offers simple ideas that can be incorporated, i.e. #7, checklist for the goals.</li> <li>#5 and #10 refer to adding narrative to the form that would explain why the requested item is important</li> </ul> <p>Impressions of the level of agreement with the planning and resource allocation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate the year at a glance with the flow chart</li> <li>The comments don't reflect some of the ratings.</li> <li>If your outcome is good; it is going to color your opinion, as has been mentioned previously.</li> <li>Our needs are not funded; they are then part of the priority process; what should be prioritized is not needs, but wants.</li> </ul>	

	<p>Aaron Voelcker: If we can agree that it is plausible that because there wasn't that great of an outcome to the resource allocation process, we are seeing a larger number of negative responses to the survey.</p> <p>How will we evaluate our process and get information that will allow us to improve our process in a way that it is really improving and not fine tuning to get what they want?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two concerns from comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Busy work – look at those parts and fix</li> <li>B. Repetition of requested information</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>When the comment responses were filtered for those that completed or attempted to complete the form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses were more negative than those who had not attempted or completed a form.</li> </ul> <p>Aaron: Paraphrasing what Arlene shared: stick with what we are doing with simplification, stream-lining; don't make major changes to ensure that there is data to review when comparing year to year for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Trends</li> <li>B. If no planning is going on, how will we know how to spend the money we have?</li> </ul> <p>Mary:</p> <p>Can you filter open-ended comments to those who have completed a form?</p> <p>After those commented were filtered:</p> <p>Mary: After viewing those results, do we need to educate users?</p> <p>Aaron: Any changes to the process or to the form anyone would like to advocate, that we haven't discussed, that possibly came from other channels of feedback?</p> <p>Craig Nance: Will we add sections where they can explain why the item is important?</p> <p>Aaron: Let's figure out the process before we discuss changes to the form.</p>	
<p>6. Discuss and Make Any Resource</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	<p>Aracely moved to table agenda items #6, 7, and 8; Craig Nance seconded the motion; it was unanimously passed...</p>

Request Form Revisions		
7. Discuss the Make Any Facility Need Form Revisions	Tabled	
8. Discuss Any Rubric Revisions	Tabled	
9. Questions/Other	<p>What are the changes you are willing to make to the process from feedback you have received?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deadlines reminders—set up automatic reminder emails. Use subject line, not body of email.</li> <li>• Send reminders to heads of the four areas and let them filter it down.</li> </ul>	
<b>Next meeting</b>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.</p> <p>For next meeting, please review planning documents, including request forms, year at a glance, etc.</p> <p>Wednesday, May 20, 2015, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., E-206</p>	<p>Craig Nance moved to adjourn the meeting; it was seconded by Steven Deeley; the motion was unanimously passed.</p>