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	Budget Committee/Steven Deeley: • There is a structural deficient • If there is any categorical funding that can offset the deficient the Budget Committee will make the recommendation. • Next meeting is May 26. Facilities Committee/Craig Nance: • No money to remodel the D Building. • Signs have been placed on the Gym, Library, and Humanities. • Parking issues were discussed. POE/Aaron Voelcker: Evaluating the District planning and resource allocation process: • District does Department Portfolios every 2 years • Corinna introduced PIE's survey • POE will modify that survey to evaluate the District's processes and potentially other District Governance's committees.	

		• This integrates SCC into the District's planning processes which is a positive for Accreditation.	
4.	Approval of April 15, 2015 minutes	Tabled	
	Approval of April 1, 2015 minutes		Craig Nance moved to add the April 1, 2015 minutes to the agenda; Joe Geissler seconded the motion; the motion was unanimously approved. Craig Nance moved to approve the minutes of 4/1/15; Steven Deeley seconded the motion, the minutes were unanimously approved.
5.	Discuss Survey Results	The results of the survey were discussed: • 75% positive response would have been the best outcome. • These responses will form a baseline for the future. • If more requests had been approved; the positive response rates might have been higher. • How many of the committee members wrote responses? Open ended comments discussion: • Will Taskstream make this process easier? • PIE is the gatekeeper • Some of the comments offers simple ideas that can be incorporated, i.e. #7, checklist for the goals. • #5 and #10 refer to adding narrative to the form that would explain why the requested item is important Impressions of the level of agreement with the planning and resource allocation process: • Coordinate the year at a glance with the flow chart • The comments don't reflect some of the ratings. • If your outcome is good; it is going to color your opinion, as has been mentioned previously. • Our needs are not funded; they are then part of the priority process; what should be prioritized is not needs, but wants.	

	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. 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? • Two concerns from comments: A. Busy work – look at those parts and fix B. Repetition of requested information When the comment responses were filtered for those that completed or attempted to complete the form: • Responses were more negative than those who had not attempted or completed a form. 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: A. Trends B. If no planning is going on, how will we know how to spend the money we have? Mary: Can you filter open-ended comments to those who have completed a form? After those commented were filtered: Mary: After viewing those results, do we need to educate users? 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? Craig Nance: Will we add sections where they can explain why the item is important? Aaron: Let's figure out the process before we discuss changes to the form.	
6. Discuss and Make Any Resource	Tabled	Aracely moved to table agenda items #6, 7, and 8; Craig Nance seconded the motion; it was unanimously passed...

Request Form Revisions		
7. Discuss the Make Any Facility Need Form Revisions	Tabled	
8. Discuss Any Rubric Revisions	Tabled	
9. Questions/Other	What are the changes you are willing to make to the process from feedback you have received? • Deadlines reminders—set up automatic reminder emails. Use subject line, not body of email. • Send reminders to heads of the four areas and let them filter it down.	
Next meeting	The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m. For next meeting, please review planning documents, including request forms, year at a glance, etc. Wednesday, May 20, 2015, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m., E-206	Craig Nance moved to adjourn the meeting; it was seconded by Steven Deeley; the motion was unanimously passed.