GROSSMONT COLLEGE
Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC)
Friday, October 18, 2024
11:00 a.m. – 12:30p.m.
Notes

Purpose The goal of the Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee is to ensure a culture of continuous quality improvement and data-informed decision-making. Best practices for institutional effectiveness include improving equity and student learning and achievement by analyzing data and using results to inform practice. It uses environmental scan data as well as institutional outcomes to drive
institutional responses. The committee reviews program assessment results against the college's mission, values, and strategic goals. The committee is also responsible for assuring the continuous integration of planning across the campus, regularly evaluating the college's progress to ensure institutional effectiveness.

CO-CHAIRS (voting)	ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF GROSSMONT (voting)	EX-OFFICIO (voting)
☒ Joan Garcia Ahrens	☒ Kalia Nakamura	☒Victoria Christine Rodriguez
☒Juliana Bertin	☒ Julio Hernandez	☒ Susana Munoz
	☐ TBD	☐ Felicia Kalker
		☒ Karen Hern

ACADEMIC SENATE (voting)	CLASSIFIED SENATE (Voting)	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION (Voting)
☒Denise Schulmeyer	☒ Michele Martens	☐Courtney Willis
☒Eva Nicasio	☒ Brandi Tonne	☒Niko Crumpton
☒Summer Webb		☐Wayne Branker

ADVISORYY (non-voting)		
☐Agustín Albarrán, Academic Affairs	☐TBD District Research Planning	☐ Maria Denise Aceves, Curriculum
☐ TBD, Student Services	☒Joyce Fries, Academic Program Review	
☐Sheree Stopper, Administrative Services	☒Kelly Menck, Academic Program Review	
☐Marcelo Nieto, Research and Planning	☐Natalie Ray, Student Services Program Review	

CPIE	GUEST	
☒Christopher Yerkes	☐	☐
☐Carmen Hernandez	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome and Introductions	J. Bertin welcomed the committee to the meeting and the committee members introduced themselves
2. Public Comment	None.
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	None.
4. Approve meeting notes: a. 09/20/24	J. Bertin said meeting notes will be sent out for review and then approval at the November meeting.
NEW BUSINESS & CONSENSUS	
5. Discuss Standard I Feedback Form - Standard I	Denise S. shared that she has visited the governance committees in order to explain the ACCJC standards review process. Committee members felt confused and overwhelmed by the task. An email was sent to committee co-chairs simplifying the task and process for the committee members.

D. Schulmeyer led a review and feedback discussion of ACCJC Standard 1.

Feedback included:
1.1
- Leading the AUP forum

1.2
Q1 – Regularly examine KPIs and set targets for improvement at Annual Planning Forum

1.3
Q1 - Conducting regular program review. Analyzing disaggregated data, Annual Unit Plans, set long and short term goals, outcomes assessment, institution-wide data at Annual Planning Forum hosted by PIEC at which KPIs are reviewed and priorities set.
- At the previous forum face to face and online section course success rates were compared and equity gaps noted. As a result, a question was added to AUP template regarding the equity gap/action plan. Data will be reviewed in a year.

Q2a – Set institutional priorities to improve online success rates; change AUP template, holding everyone accountable to set goals of addressing the equity gap in online courses

Q2b – Monitoring KPIs for course success, retention, grad rates, and students completing math/English in their first year (momentum point)

Q2c- Looking at KPIs at the beginning of the academic year and again in preparation for the annual planning forum That will be used to set goals for next year

Q3- Where the college needs to improve: online course success rates

Q4a - Continue to monitor online sections

Q4b – Alignment of AUP, equity

1.5
Q1 – PR dashboard, degrees/certificate dashboard, Annual Planning Forum, accreditation processes (entire colleges contributes to writing ISER), PR reports at AS, governing board meetings/workshops, various committees and forums for where specific priorities are highlighted and discussed (e.g. President's Forum), summer reports to Governing Board on how the college is meeting strategic and equity goals (e.g. public invited to governing board meetings)

NEW BUSINESS
6. Annual Unit Planning Handbook	J. Ahrens gave clarity to the committee on the AUP process. She shared a memo that explains the timeline for the AUPs and a diagram of the AUP process. A draft will be available at the November 1st meeting. The AUP process needs to be evaluated. Anyone who wants to contribute to the

	evaluation needs to read AUP manual before evaluating.
UPDATE	
7. None	

COMMITTEE/CONSTITUENCY REPORTS	
8. Reports on PIEC-related topics from constituency groups and other committees (as needed) • Associated Students: • Classified Senate: • Faculty Senate: • Admin Association:	ASGC: K. Nakamura and J. Hernandez shared that club rush is next Wednesday (10/23). Additionally, the ASGC is selling a benefits sticker. They are trying to grow this sticker by adding participants such as restaurants in order to increase revenue. Also, attempting to grow ASGC by increasing participation in clubs and promoting events. CS: M. Martens – Recently held pop-ups. This is the first time data was gathered from students who participated. The data is not completely compiled yet. Student participants will be entered into drawing for prizes. Also, Classified Staff are nominating for a new executive board. AS: None. AA: N. Crumpton - Professional development requirements for admin and classified are being discussed. Data still being gathered on responses.

FOR FOLLOW-UP AT NEXT MEETING		
Who	**What**	**When**
PIEC members	1. **Read Standard 2** 2. **Complete Governance Feedback form** 3. **Return feedback form to Juliana.bertin@gcccd and Joan.ahrens@gcccd.edu**	**Friday, November 1st**
PIEC members	**Read Annual Unit Planning Handbook**	**December PIEC Mtg. Friday, December 20**

Important: Annual Collegewide Planning Forum, Friday, April 25, 2025
Next Meeting Date: November 15, 2024

PLANNING & INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (PIEC)
MEETING NORMS

October 20, 2023

In participatory government, a high level of collegiality, respect, and civility is expected. Those expectations include the following:

In Person Setting

- Everybody's voice is equal, important and valuable.
- Operate under the assumption that everyone is speaking with a positive intent.
- Be solution focused when you don't understand where someone is coming from.
- If there are times when we feel unsafe. Find ways to recalibrate and move forward in a gentle way.
- Raise hand to let folks know you are going to speak. Be respectful of others who may have raised their hand before you.
- When measuring consensus members will use the Thumb up- all the way in; Thumb middle- can live with it; Thumb down- want to keep talking about additional solutions.
- Use a parking lot.
- If a proxy is requested make sure the proxy is briefed prior to the meeting.

Virtual Setting

- Conversations in the chat should be discussed.
- At the beginning of the meeting, members may drop an emoji from the Zoom library as a quick check-in at the beginning of the meeting. This would help us calibrate our body language with one another.
- Consensus will be measured in the chat. The co-chair will type the item to be vote on in the chat. Voting members will type in the chat; Yes-agree; No-disagree; Abstain-decline to vote.