

Minutes of the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) Committee Meeting
September 17, 2014
E-305
Corinna Evett and Aaron Voelcker, Co-Chairs

Attendance: Steven Deeley, Corinna Evett, Scott Howell, Mary Mettler, Craig Nance, Craig Rutan, Rudy Tijptahadi, Roberta Tragarz, Leigh Ann Unger, Matt Velasquez (ASG Representative), Aaron Voelcker, Joyce Wagner

Absent: Rudy Frias, Joe Geissler, John Hernandez, Steve Kawa, Aracely Mora, Janis Perry

Guest: Tiffany Garbis

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	TASKS/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome	Corinna Evett introduced Matt Velasquez, the newest member of the committee, as the student representative.	The meeting was called to order by Corinna Evett at 3:34 pm.
2. Announcements and/or Updates	No announcements or updates were presented.	
3. Reports from Governance Committees	<p>Corinna opened the floor for reports from Governance Committee.</p> <p>Budget Committee Chair – Steven Deeley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget and fiscal updates were provided by Steve Kawa. • The proposed adopted budget for the 2014/2015 year is \$34 million. • Last year expenditures were \$35 million. • The Budget Committee wanted the resource requestes to be itemized into five (5) categories: instructional supplies, non-instructional supplies, instructional equipment, non-instructional equipment and salaries. <p>Questions were asked regarding the availability of funds for both categorical and general as identified on the prioritized list. Discussion ensued about ongoing funding and rollovers. The recommendation made by PIE to College Council for categorical funding may be submitted on the July form but won't be funded until September. Steve Kawa will be the one to address how the funding will be handled, and, if Administrative Services or the division/departments will be responsible for creating the purchase requisition. Line items and lottery funds were discussed.</p>	

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. *(approved 9/10/2013)*

	<p>Educational Master Planning (EMP) Committee – Roberta Tragarz</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EMP will be changing the meeting format for the year because of workload. 44 Program Reviews are pending review. • A proposal to adjust the format will be presented to the College Council as an informational item. • The proposed format is a panel discussion where the committees is broken into groups and become specialized in certain departments or areas. <p>No discussion took place.</p>	
<p>4. Approve 3 September 2014 Minutes</p>	<p>Corinna Evett presented the minutes on the projector for reading.</p>	<p>Corrections were made to item #5, Facility Request Process and item #8, Task Force Creation</p> <p>Craig Rutan motioned to approve the minutes as corrected; Steven Deeley seconded the motion. The vote was passed without dissent.</p>
<p>5. Facility Request Process</p>	<p><u>Review SCC Facility Request Form</u></p> <p>Corinna Evett presented the SCC Facility Request Form on the projector and asked the members for feedback.</p> <p><u>SCC Facility Request Process Flowchart</u></p> <p>Corinna Evett presented the SCC Facility Request Process Flowchart on the projector and asked the members for feedback.</p> <p>Phase I of the flowchart was agreed upon as presented. Phase II had corrections. All references to Facilities Committee were removed because the committee already reviewed the facility requests that then consolidated and prioritized the requests going to the Vice President of Administrative Services. Discussion took place as to if all the Vice Presidents should be informed of the requests. It was agreed upon that since all the Vice Presidents serve on the PIE committee they would receive notification at some point. No process has been determined to notify originators of the final determination. Aaron Voelcker suggested using the PIE Committee Website to post a PDF of the final prioritized list as forwarded to College Council. It was determined that PIE is the recommending committee and that College Council is the approval committee therefore College Council would be charged with notifying originators via campus-wide email. Another suggestion for notification included the President’s Weekly Newsletter.</p>	<p>The form was agreed upon as presented.</p> <p>Phase II – box 3, 4, 5 and 6 – remove “& Facilities”</p> <p>Phase II – box 7 – PIE Committee Submits a Final Prioritized Facility Request Recommendation List to College Council <u>and Sends Email Notification to College Community</u></p>

	<p>Discussion ensued regarding facility timelines. Because the requests for facilities are expected to be minimal, the communication of prioritized list will be “played by ear”. It was encouraged that the PIE committee be as transparent as possible because facility requests are not documented in the “At-A-Glance” document like the budget process. The co-chairs of the Facility Committee were charged with notifying the originators of their recommendation before it goes to College Council.</p> <p><u>Review PIE Facility Request Rubric</u></p> <p>Aaron Voelcker presented the PIE Facility Request Rubric on the projector and asked the members for feedback.</p> <p>The Facility Master Plan is an integral part of the rubric. Aaron Voelcker volunteered to create a list of mock items from the 2011 Facility Master Plan to test the rubric. Discussion took place regarding the financial implications if regulatory/safety and grant issues if not immediately addressed. Legally mandated requirements are very definite and mandatory to be completed within a specified time. Safety issues may be broken down into various levels.</p>	<p>Steven Deeley motioned to approve the SCC Facility Request Process Flowchart as corrected; Craig Nance seconded the motion. The vote was passed without dissent.</p> <p>Mary Mettler, member of PIE rubric term definition task force, to provide definition of legally mandated and safety at next PIE meeting.</p> <p>Review of the form not complete and postponed to next meeting.</p>
<p>6. Discuss Possible Budget Line Item Recommendations to College Council</p> <p>Notes from the whiteboard</p>	<p>Corinna Evett opened the floor to discuss difficulties originators of resource request forms experienced.</p> <p>Divisions and Units { Office related requests (general funds) Classroom related requests (lottery funds)</p> <p>Safety (general fund)</p> <p>Legally Mandated</p> <p><u>When \$ comes, we should budget line items for:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All departments for instructional supplies (lottery funds rollover) 2. All division/units 3. Safety 4. Legally mandated 5. Faculty hires preparing to meet the faculty obligation number (FON) 6. Grant money for institutionalization per grant requirement <p>Members discussed line item processes and approvals. For lottery funds, originators prepare the purchase requisition and the dean/administrator approves. Steven Deeley commented that the adopted budget for 2014/2015 had very few</p>	<p>Craig Rutan motioned to direct PIE co-chairs to</p>

	<p>line items outside of salaries. It was suggested to make a formal recommendation to College Council to bring a sense of understanding and spirit to the college while actively advocating for line items in anticipation of when funds are available. The Budget Committee determines where monies come from but College Council should figure out how much.</p>	<p>make a recommendation to College Council that the Budget Committee research the implementation of suggested budget line items; Rudy Tjiptahadi seconded the motion. The vote was passed without dissent.</p>
<p>7. Discuss a Process for Resource Request Initiator Appeals to PIE</p>	<p>Corinna Evett opened the floor to discuss appeals from initiators. It was asked if members wanted to provide time in the meeting for guests (initiators) to come to PIE meetings or invite initiators for clarification, if needed.</p> <p>Members provided feedback, discussed various reasons and agreed to no appeal process. Reasons provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unfair/disadvantageous for some departments/units to provide supplemental information and not others • If points of clarification are needed, the PIE co-chairs can seek answers. • There is a wide representation on PIE so all constituencies are represented. • All Vice Presidents serve on PIE and so they should be able to speak to the items on the list and address questions. • Some people are better arguers than other and can sway decisions. 	<p>The committee agreed to not have a PIE appeals process for resource request initiator.</p>
<p>8. Discuss Grant Process</p>	<p>Corinna Evett presented the Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant on the projector and asked the members for feedback. The document can be found on the college homepage: About SCC > Collegial Governance or Faculty & Staff > Collegial Governance.</p> <p>The form has been available for a few years and may need updating. The members discussed matching requirements and other legal/ethical issues including new hires, institutionalization and bumping rights. Controversies regarding over commitment and not being able to match in-kind were discussed. The committee agreed that the document was comprehensive and necessary for college planning.</p>	<p>The committee recommends updating the following on the Request for Authorization to Apply for a Grant Form:</p> <p>#3 WHAT ARE THE PROJECTED FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS, IF ANY AND HOW WILL THEY BE MET?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add note “Submit Facilities Request Form once approved” <p>#6 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COLLEGE/DISTRICT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise language to include “mission and goals/objectives of the college” on the 1st bullet point

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise “program’s EMP/DPP/Program Review” on the 3rd bullet point to reflect current changes in EMP structure <p>#7 LONG TERM IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COLLEGE/DISTRICT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add note “New Hire personnel have bumping rights” <p>#10 RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Planning and Institutional Effectiveness check boxes. <p>Corinna Evett to follow up with Academic Senate and College Council.</p>
9. Questions/Other	No questions or other comments were presented.	
10. Adjourned		Craig Rutan moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:01 p.m.; Rudy Tjiptahadi seconded the motion. The vote was passed without dissent.
<p>Next Meeting October 1, 2014 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. Room E-206</p>		