

Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
May 7, 2014
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Corinna Evett, Steve Kawa, Lana Wong, Craig Rutan, Aracely Mora, Rudy Frias, Steven Deeley, Aaron Voelcker, John Hernandez, Craig Nance, Rudy Tijptahadi, Jose Vargas, Mary Walker, Joe Geissler, Leigh Ann Unger, Daniel Rebolledo (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 and/or Updates a. Phase I and Phase II Process Reminder b. Joint Chairs Presentation c. RSCCD Bid on Property in Anaheim/Yorba Linda	a. There is no oversight of Phase I by PIE. b. Aaron Voelcker reported to the Joint Chairs the planned actions of the PIE Committee at their next meeting and the steps that will be taken to finalize the prioritized lists. Aaron shared how difficult it had been to plan and implement simultaneously, which was appreciated by the Chairs. c. The District is planning to bid \$10-13 million on a property in Anaheim/Yorba Linda area. Steve Kawa reported that the bid had actually been submitted. John Hernandez: This is an observation – Are the goals consistent with the bid? What is the District’s process for planning? What was the level and degree of consultation with the Colleges?	
3. Approve Minutes of April 16, 2014		The minutes were approved without dissent (moved by Aracely Morar and seconded by Joe Geissler).

<p>4. Review & Discuss PIE 2014-2015 Resource Request Prioritization Results</p>	<p>John Hernandez: The Resource Request form will capture data in one place. It is difficult to determine a connection to the DDP/Program Review.</p> <p>Craig Nance: Create forms in the same order as on the sheet.</p> <p>Jose Vargas: The prioritized list submitted must be verified as on the DPP.</p> <p>Aracely Mora: We need a clearer definition of safety and legal, they are too co-mingled.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: We had access to all the documents, all items in the DDP/Program Review. We verified the legal mandate and safety, with the exception of about four, including CTE.</p> <p>John Hernandez: We need to come up with a common definition for safety/legally mandated.</p> <p>Craig Rutan: I would prefer items not being grouped, such as the janitor positions.</p> <p>Craig Nance: I would recommend that we evaluate personnel separated out. Faculty hires are required, administrators and classified are not.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Thirty-one of the 63 items, almost half, are personnel requests.</p>	<p>Committee members were asked to send their information to Aaron & Corinna prior to the next meeting.</p>
<p>5. Vote on a PIE 2014-2015 Resource Request Ranked List to be Forwarded to the Budget Committee for Analysis</p>	<p>Rudy Tijptahad: I would suggest placing a -0- in a column, not leaving it blank.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Before the next go-around, I will populate with appropriate -0-.</p> <p>Aracely Mora: Down the line, the process will be about priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritizing safety is problematic • Legally mandated – no choice. <p>Corinna Evett: We can request a safety budget line item, a legally mandated line item.</p> <p>Aaron Voelcker: Looking at the list from an institutional perspective - liability costs the institution, it is cheaper to fix the problem.</p>	

John Hernandez: I made assumptions in my scoring but I was consistent. In the future, I would re-consider weights, giving greater weight to the unit standing.

Aracely Mora: I agree with John. There was greater consistency at the Division/Department level. I have to trust that the Chemistry high priority is a safety issue. Safety shouldn't be negotiable.

Craig Rutan: Some of the requests, such as item #1, may already have happened. Safety issues should be evaluated by the Safety Committee.

Corinna Evett:

- Define terms
- Safety concerns

Jose Vargas: Don Maas could define safety issues.

Corinna Evett: We are evaluating items that should already be in the budget.

A motion was made to approve the current (as is) prioritized list for submission to the Budget Committee.

PRO

CON

Craig Nance: Not a lot of money; some items will get funded through restricted funds.

Rudy T.:

Safety – top items
Heavily weighted due to safety; no verification

Leigh Ann: We don't have additional information on which to base our discussion.

	<p>Jose Vargas: Second guessing the other Vice Presidents.</p> <p>Steve Deeley: Represents a lot of work from a lot of folks. Crowd-sourced, everyone's opinion</p> <p>Corinna: This will not be the last time we can discuss.</p> <p>Jose Vargas: This motion validates the time and effort expended by all.</p>	<p>The motion to approve the current prioritized list for submission to the Budget Committee was unanimously passed (Craig Nance moved and Aracely Mora seconded).</p> <p>Homework: Investigate how other colleges prioritize non-faculty hires.</p>
6. Evaluate the 2014-2015 Modified/Transitional Planning Process	Tabled to next meeting.	
7. Questions/Other	<p>The EMC reviewed the 2014 Intersession data, what it did and didn't do. The Committee recommended Intersession for Spring 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As long as it doesn't impact the Fall 14 class schedule • Health Center fees were not collected due to SAC • DSPS, another cost of Intersession 	
8. Next meeting:	May 21, 2014, 3:30 p.m., E-206.	