Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting  
April 5, 2017  
Michael DeCarbo, Co-Chair

Attendance:  Steven Deeley; Eric Hovanitz, Joe Geissler, Alice Ho, Lacey Hedenberg, Joyce Wagner, Maureen Roe, Ruth Babeshoff, Christopher McKay – 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>TASKS/FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Reports from Governance Committees | College Council:  
  - Facilities Manager position was approved and Administrative Services is in the process of hiring. |                 |
| 4. Approval of March 1, 2017, minutes | Postponed to next meeting |                 |
  - Funding Category Prioritization | Discussing the process  
  - Budget Committee used point value to determine how to prioritize allocating the funds  
  - Does PIE want to follow Budget Committee recommendations?  
  - Start with Instruction, Equipment and Library Materials funds  
  - Should PIE begin with funding the #1 request in each category?  
  - Items should be prioritized based on the item not the category  
  - Larger desks were identified as #1 by Budget Committee  
  - Chemistry printer has the same points as larger desk; approved the printer would prevent students from walking through chemistry storage room to print, a safety issue. |                 |
 Choose requests that provide safety and those that provided most need for students.

Lottery funds

- Approved as itemized by the Budget Committee
- Arlene suggested including Transportation as a future category

If additional funds become available, the following requests should be granted:

- Spirometers
- Nova-Utelogy Station
- Any additional smaller cost items


- The survey was reviewed by the Co-Chairs
- Suggestion: Did the Committee want to revise the Page 3, 5. Comment Box to read: *If you disagree with any of the above statements what changes to the Resource Request form or submission process would you recommend?*

### 7. Report from March 2017 Joint Chairs’ Meeting

- Open-ended conversation: Chairs are concerned with the PIE prioritization process and how the process can be improved.
  - Chairs feel they are wasting their time.
  - They feel that PIE is re-ranking the rankings done by Joint Chairs
  - They are frustrated with not knowing all of the different pots of money
- Three solutions offered:
  1. They would like their rankings to reflect the eight (8) categories
  2. Provide a rubric – Cindy Swift offered to develop a rubric
  3. Provide information on what items have been funded the past three years and how much funding was available
- Biggest frustration is with personnel requests.

### 8. Reporting Pathway for All Governance Committees and Other College Entities (Foundation, etc.)

- How does the Foundation submit a resource request?
  - There is no mapping of how all other College entities make resource requests.
  - Other than the Foundation, are there any other entities that do not report to a committee? Hawk’s Food Nest?
  - Does the President’s Cabinet have its own ranking?
- Recommendation made that the Foundation goes through the President’s Cabinet and that President’s Cabinet has its own ranking.

9. Preliminary Adjustments to 2017-2018 Resource Request Form

- Fall 2017, campus groups will be submitting their requests using this form. Can we make it more user friendly?
  - Specify a word count for narratives – no more than 200 words and add a separate question
  - Should this request not be granted how will it impact your program OR What will the consequences be if this item is not funded?

- Question #4
  - 4A: Please provide a brief (no more than 100 words) narrative explaining why you are making this request.
  - 4B: The immediate and/or long term impact this request will have on your program (no more than 100 words)
  - 4C: What will the consequences be if this item is not funded (no more than 100 words)?

- Question #5
  - Total one time and ongoing costs; include a box: Minimum amount that could be partially funded

- Question #6
  - Add President’s Cabinet

- Question #7
  - Clarify replacement; how do you define replacement? With a timeframe?
  - Remove replacement – the definition is problematic and difficult to define

- Question #8
  - First time submitted? Remove as this could be addressed in the narrative
• Question #9
  ➢ If we don’t need this explanation for accreditation purposes, can we revise to: Does this request support the SCC Mission?

• Question #10
  ➢ List SCC Goals with a box to check

Note: Suggestion to re-examine the ranking scale.

• Question #12
  ➢ If this is a technology request, answer the following:
    A. how many estimated students will be served?
    B. number of course sections serve
    C. number of classroom impacted

  If this is not a technology request, go to item #13

• Question #14
  ➢ The yearly DPP provides evidence; add, if this is a committee request: please submit minutes or agenda that supports the request

• Question #16
  ➢ If you complete outcome assessments, include evidence from submitted outcomes; should there be a word limit?

Some requestor used cut and paste directly from the document.

10. Educational Master Plan Reporting Template for Responsible Parties
    Postponed to next meeting

11. Questions/Other
    • The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

Next meeting
    • Wednesday, May 3, 2017, 3:00 to 4:30, E-206