

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
September 2, 2015**

Aaron Voelcker and Corinna Evett, Co-Chairs

Attendees: Joyce Wagner, Joe Geissler, Alice Ho, Elizabeth Elchlepp, Mary Walker, Lucy Carr-Rollitt, Rosalba Hernandez (replacement for Rudy Frias), Stephen Deeley, Rudy Tjiptahadi, John Hernandez, Roberta Tragarz, Arleen Satele, Rosalba Hernandez

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	Introductions were made and new members were welcomed.	
2. Announcements	Time change for PIE, from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m., to the NEW TIME 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. There may be an online/email meeting early in Spring 16.	
3. Reports from Governance Committees	Budget – Steven Deeley First meeting yesterday <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibilities of Budget Committee were updated • SCC will have a balanced budget this year • Future discussion on how we can build a small reserve/contingency fund District Council discussed State’s onetime non-discretionary funds – Corinna suggested having it go through the budget allocation committees. \$50,000 was given to each college for marketing.	
4. Approve 3 June 2015 Minutes		A motion to approve the minutes was passed without dissent (Moved by Geissler; seconded by Walker).
5. Review Committee SCC Mission Statement, Committee Mission, Responsibilities, and Annual	Reviewed Mission Committee will be reviewing the college planning documents this Fall, including the Technology Master Plan, the Facilities Master Plan, and the Educational Master Plan.	Corinna reminded the Committee to share that the revised resource and facilities request forms are available online with their individual committee members. These new forms were revised, as is noted

	<p>Revisions requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aracely asked to have “or designee” added to Vice Presidents • Change Assistant Dean to Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Library & Learning Support Services • Add Student Success and Equity Committee • Change to Honors Program Committee <p>PIE co-chairs will speak with EMPC co-chairs to avoid duplication as the Education Master Plan is revised.</p> <p>Aracely: It is very timely to be working on the Education Master Plan, following the process of the last two years with PIE. The role the joint chairs play in the prioritization process, coming out of the instructional division, are seeing the connections between the DDPs, Academic Program Review and the Technology Plan. I think this will translate into more intention work on the goals of the Education Master Plan and an understanding of how the review process should work. Faculty will understand that their input will be driving the institution. We can work on improving our communication as a College.</p>	<p>on the forms, as of 6/3/15.</p> <p>Aracely moved to accept suggested edits and allow co-chairs to make minor edits and Joe Geissler seconded.</p>
<p>6. Discuss PIE Prioritization Process</p> <p>A. Includes prioritization Rubric Revisions</p>	<p>Agreed on eight groupings for rankings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Equipment: Instruction and Non-instruction 2. Supplies: Instruction and Non-instruction 3. Personnel 4. Technology: Instruction and Non-instruction) 5. Contract Services <p>Aracely: Regarding the length of the list that is reviewed, I am questioning if we should rank everything on the list regardless of the ability of the entire list being funded. A suggestion would be to ask that those sending prioritized lists to PIE send their top five, just for personnel.</p> <p>Corinna: Aracely, we discussed that, and we decided that PIE will not limit the number of items submitted, but we can open that discussion again in the future. Others can impose a cut off: We may need to think about where the cut off will take place – with committees, with joint chairs, before the Vice</p>	<p>This will be a topic for a future agenda.</p>

	Presidents review the list or should we have the Vice Presidents make the cut before submitting the prioritized list to PIE?	
<p>7. Discuss and make any PIE Prioritization Rubric Revisions</p> <p>A.</p> <p>B. Includes possible separate rubrics for each grouping</p>	<p>Should there be a rubric for each or these areas or one rubric for all areas?</p> <p>Instructional equipment Non-instructional equipment Instructional supplies Non-instructional supplies Personnel Non-instructional technology Personnel Instructional Technology Non-instructional technology Contract Services</p> <p>Discussion followed on ranking and rubrics and whether the weighting should remain as is. Corinna asked if anyone wanted to change the ranking weight. There was no response.</p>	<p>Arlene will provide the Committee with the technical budget definitions.</p> <p>Aaron will use the groupings to go back to the list of prioritized requests to re-rank under the groupings.</p>
8. Questions/Others		
Next meeting	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.</p> <p>Next time:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limit the number of request, i.e., top five? 2. look at the unique ranking 3. Consider how you define the eight groupings/categories in your area and will that enable the various entities to provide the VPs with eight ranked lists so they can rank like items with like items. <p>Next meeting: Wednesday, October 7, 2015, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m., E-206</p>	