

Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
October 5, 2016
Michael DeCarbo and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Aaron Voelcker, Michael DeCarbo, Lacy Hedenberg, Alice Ho, Ruth Babeshoff, Marilyn Flores, Arleen Satele, Rosalba Hernandez, Maureen Roe; Elizabeth Elchlepp, Roberta Tragarz, Steven Deeley, Eric Hovanitz

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>Budget Committee: sent out award letters to those awarded resources from last year's resource request and prioritization process</p> <p>Facilities Committee: Voted to include Safety with Facilities. The committee will become the Facilities, Safety and Emergency Committee</p> <p>SS&E: Presentation on Common Assessment Initiative. Redesigning reports delivered to the committee to include best practice highlights. Meeting agendas will be adjusted to streamline content with the goal addressing all agenda items in a single meeting</p> <p>Enrollment Management: Chairs have been requested to identify when courses are planned to be offered for each degree over the next two-year period so that counselors are able to assist students better in developing Ed. Plans. Forms to be completed by October 31st</p> <p>Technology: Recommended transition from Blackboard to Canvas</p> <p>Web Committee: Training for accessibility for ADA compliance is ongoing</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Honors: Met to go over responsibilities of committee, identified student rep, made changes to schedule, updated proposed offerings, reduction from 18 to 15-unit requirement for students.</p> <p>EMPC: Working to get goals approved. Approved by Senate on Tuesday, 10/4/2016. Up for 2nd reading at College Council next Tuesday 10/11/2016.</p> <p>Academic Senate: Approved EMP Goals and changes to EAR membership; forwarded ranked faculty positions to college president</p>	
<p>4. Approval of September 7, 2016 minutes</p>	<p>Marilyn should be included in attendee list Fix first sentence in Year at a Glance section</p>	<p>Motion to approve minutes made by Steven Deeley, Seconded by Elizabeth Elchlepp.</p> <p>Approved, pending corrections, without descent.</p>
<p>5. Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant: Humanities Initiatives at Community Colleges</p>	<p>Forensics Program will spearhead the grant. Central topic and defined audience requirement. Topic: Women in Power; Audience: First generation women</p> <p>Brings Humanities together</p> <p>Forensics team would work with many departments in order to provide events around the aforementioned topic. Use of video technology would be incorporated.</p> <p>Ruth – Stipend or release time question: is it stipend or release time? Jared – to be determined based on position and determined by administration. Most likely a stipend.</p> <p>Maureen - How competitive is this grant? Jared - Focus on community colleges. Due to grant award size there may not be much competition. May be other grant opportunity coming forward.</p>	<p>Ruth Babeshoff moved, Arleen Satele seconded, to suspend the rule and wave first reading.</p> <p>Approved without descent</p> <p>Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant approved without descent.</p>
<p>6. PIE Prioritization Rubric Revisions</p>	<p>Changes proposed: English department said the categories of DPP, Program Review, Outcome assessment should just be a check not a scale (0 or 1) Some argued that the rationale as to why it should be reduced is because the answers provided as to why it supported the DPP was tangential. Some argued that a simple box checking would not provide sufficient evidence.</p>	<p>Aaron will exam a method to present PIE data to reflect a change to 0-2 in each category</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Others pointed out that the 0-5 was too subjective. It was pointed out that less options may lead to more ties.</p> <p>It was proposed to change to a 0 – not meet, 1 – meets, 2 - exceeds</p> <p>Most of the conversation revolved around the unit ranking and as to whether it should have as much weight as it has in past rankings. In order to honor unit ranking it has been heavily weighted, critics argue that it undermines the work done by PIE. Currently Unit ranking allows for 27.5 step between rankings, the group posed ways to change this step amount.</p> <p>Proposed additional categories included: cross curricular/service, supports pathways number of students served number of degree programs served</p>	<p>Members are to analyze these additions and possibly synthesize to create a new category.</p>
<p>7. Recommendation from Educational Master Planning Committee: Assessing Progress Toward Achieving Stated Institutional Goals</p>	<p>How would PIE be able to assess whether the EMP goals are met are not? This is not as simple as in-progress, completed, or no longer in-progress. The proposal is to have EMP identify which party would be responsible to carry out specific activities and then that assessment would be included in that responsible party's DPP. The goals could also be made public and all college constituent groups could also weigh in with their contributions. PIE would then evaluate the content of the reports and compile the data. The driving consideration is to not create additional layers of reports, hence tying it to the DPP.</p>	<p>Committee asked to consider this solution and alternatives for discussion at the next meeting.</p>
<p>8. Grant Funded Resources: Planning for Technology and Technology Support Beyond Date of Completion</p>	<p>When a grant comes through, there are unseen technological costs. IT is burdened with technology purchased through grants due to the additional unplanned services. Solutions offered:</p>	<p>Members are to review the form and identify a possible way to address this concern.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW-UP
	Consider a process to include Facilities Committee and Technology Committee to evaluate the long-term effects of technology/facilities acquired through grant funds.	
9. Questions/Other		
Next meeting	Wednesday, November 2, 2016, 3:00 – 4:30 p.m., E-206	