



**Agenda
Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE)
Committee Meeting
Wednesday, 4 May 2016
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Room E-206**

1. Welcome
2. Announcements
3. Brief Reports from Governance Committees
4. Approve 2 March 2016 Minutes
5. Review of the “RSCCD Resource Development Grant Development Schedule” Updated 21 April 2016
6. Discuss the Budget Committee’s analysis of the 2015-2016 PIE Committee Prioritization Rankings for 2016-2017 Funding
7. Re-evaluate 2015-2016 PIE Committee Prioritization Rankings for 2016-2017 Funding List Order
 - a. Vote on a 2015-2016 PIE Committee Prioritization Rankings for 2016-2017 Funding recommendation for College Council
8. Discuss Facility Needs Ranking
 - a. Vote on a PIE Committee Facility Needs Prioritization Ranking Recommendation for College Council
9. **Review, Evaluate, and Analyze the Results of the PIE Committee’s 2015-2016 College-wide Planning and Resource Allocation Process Survey**
10. Evaluate Resource Request Forms and Facility Needs Request Forms and Revise as Necessary
11. Discuss the 2016-2017 Year at a Glance Document and Another Planning Document
 - a. These documents will be sent out for an email vote following this meeting
12. Questions/Other

**Congratulations on a successful spring,
and we wish you a spectacular summer!**

**Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
May 4, 2016
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs**

Attendance: Lucy Carr-Rollitt, Steven Deeley, Elizabeth Elchlepp, Corinna Evett, Joe Geissler, John Hernandez, Rosalba Hernandez, Alice Ho, Eric Hovanitz, Scott Howell, Kari Irwin, Von Lawson, Mary Mettler, Aracely Mora, Maureen Roe, Arleen Satele, Rudy Tijptahadi, Roberta Tragarz, Aaron Voelcker, Joyce Wagner, Amber Wagstaff, Mary Walker

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>EMPC:</u> Aaron – Discussed proposed goals submitted by governance committees, etc. and provided feedback; grouped goals into themes and reviewing them by theme; themes are: 1. Communication, Access and Visibility; 2. Pathways; 3. Professional Development; 4. Integration for Success; 5. Fiscal, Physical and Technological Resources</p> <p><u>Technology Committee/Alice Ho:</u> Kari-Brainstorming activities and have to re-do Tech Plan next year</p> <p><u>Honors Committee:</u> Elizabeth - Keeping in mind students’ schedules so that it works for them; reduced the unit numbers from 18 to 15 or 16; this will allow a better completion rate.</p> <p><u>Facilities Committee:</u> Arlene- Food Bank idea approved; will be located by Snack Shack next to field and hope to start next spring; purpose is to serve students in need</p>	
4. Approval of Mar 2, 2016 minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First-Steven D • Second-John H • Approved 	

<p>5. RSCCD Resource Development Grant Development Schedule</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed the status of grants per the grant schedule for this year 	
<p>6. Discuss Budget Committee's analysis of 2015-2016 PIE Committee Prioritization Rankings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aaron reviewed the rubric and sources of funding; • Lottery- Motion to cover all requests that qualify for lottery funds- one time; (Yes for STAR Resources) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First-Maureen R ○ Second-Steve D ○ Approved • IELM- Arlene shared there is about \$87,000; can roll over one year; (new allocation could be approximately \$100,000); discussed how to select the requests that should be funded; checked requests to see if any were approved by lottery; Motion to rank requests by priority in sequential order (all the 1's first, 2's second, 3's third) – totals \$100,000. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First-Mary W ○ Second-Rudy T ○ Approved • General Funds- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Motion to prioritize groupings if general funds become available (would do 1's, 2's, 3's etc. in all categories) starting with: (disclaimer: available one-time general funds can skip ongoing requests) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1. Personnel (ongoing) ▪ 2. Instructional equipment ▪ 3. Instructional technology ▪ 4. Non instructional technology ▪ 5. Non instructional equipment ▪ 6. <i>Facilities (approved in #10 on Agenda)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First –Arlene S • Second –Rosalba H • Approved ○ Motion to fund smaller requests before personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ First – Steve D ▪ Second – Von L ▪ Approved 	

<p>7. Re-evaluate 2015-2016 PIE Committee Prioritization Rankings for 16-17 Funding List order</p>	<p>a. Vote on 2015-2016 PIE Committee Prioritization Rankings for 16-17 Funding recommendations for College Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Personnel – move Athletic Trainer 19 hours to #4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First-Roberta T 2. Second-Steve D 3. Approved 	
<p>8. Discuss Facility Needs Ranking</p>	<p>a. Vote on PIE Committee Facility Needs Prioritization Ranking Recommendation for College Council: Aaron discussed outcomes of revised rankings by Facilities Committee; Motion to re-order by Facility Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o First-Joyce W. o Second-Von L o Approved 	
<p>9. Review, Evaluate, and Analyze the Results of the PIE Committee's 15-16 College-wide Planning and Resource Allocation Process Survey</p>	<p>a. The survey yielded mixed results. Looking at the responses from only those that completed a Resource Request Form, positive and negative sentiments were split nearly 50%-50%. Discussion ensued about the complexity of the process. The committee agreed to make little changes based on these results. One comment/suggestion was ultimately considered: consider integrating the Facilities Request Form with the Resource Request Form rather than 2 distinct forms.</p>	
<p>10. Evaluate Resource Request Forms and Facility Needs Request Forms and Revise as Necessary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed process and adding additional sixth list for Facilities; discussed where it should fall on prioritized list in #6 on Agenda, discussed which items have been already funded. Motion to place in sixth position <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o First – Mary W o Second-Rosalba H o Approved • Motion to move #11 to #4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o First-Maureen R o Second-Elizabeth E o Approved 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to move #13 to #9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First –Lucy C ○ Second-Steve D ○ Approved • Motion to approve complete reordered list <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First –Von L ○ Second-Steve D ○ Approved • The committee agreed to maintain the current process, with the exception of the new practice of including facilities requests on the Resource Request Form and eliminating a separate process for facilities. Facilities requests will now go directly to the Facilities (Safety) Committee, similar to technology requests going to the Technology Committee. • Discussed if there should be changes to Resource Request Forms; add Checkbox “Facility Committee” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First- Arlene ○ Second – Elizabeth ○ Approved 	
<p>11. Discuss the 16-17 Year at a Glance Document and Another Planning Document</p>	<p>a. These documents will be sent out for an email vote following this meeting</p>	
<p>12. Question/Other</p>		

Adjourned 5:05pm