



GROSSMONT COLLEGE
College Council
Thursday, April 23, 2026
3-5 p.m.
GRIFFIN GATE

MEETING SUMMARY

Purpose: The College Council is the apex governance body which provides guidance and recommendations to the College President regarding institutional policies, planning, and processes in support of the college mission. It engages all college constituency groups (students, faculty, classified professionals and supervisors/administrators) and the governance system as a whole through the maintenance of clear governance practices and policies, coordination of committee work across functions, and a commitment to continuous improvement and consensus building. The constituent-based representatives of the council serve the college by maintaining a broad, college-wide, and student-centered view of the needs of the institution – both in the weighing of the input from its committees and in bringing forward items for consideration and discussion. In all matters within its purview, it will maintain a focus on the goal of equitable outcomes for all students as a key value informing decision-making.

CONVENER (NON-VOTING)	ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE (ASGC)	ADVISORY (NON-VOTING)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Pam Luster, Interim President</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lu Tri Vi Huynh	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Colleen Moreno, CSEA</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Proxy: Julie Bennett, CSEA</i>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joel Sanchez	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Julio Soto, AFT</i>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nathaniel Harris	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>TBD, Administrators Association Rep</i>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eric Anzures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Courtney Willis, Int. VPSS</i>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Joan Ahrens, Int. VPAA</i>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Meya Alomar, VPAS</i>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Tate Hurvitz, Int. Sr. Dean, CPIE</i>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Ernesto Rivera, Director of College and Community Relations</i>

ACADEMIC SENATE	CLASSIFIED SENATE	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sharon Sampson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Hellier	<input type="checkbox"/> TBD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Unis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Lam	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Varghese
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeff Waller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brandi Tonne	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Saks
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> June Yang	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michele Martens	<input type="checkbox"/> Javier Ayala

RECORDER	GUEST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Bernadette Black</i>	Victoria Rodriguez
<i>*Italicized = Non-voting</i>	

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome	<p>Pam welcomed everyone to the meeting. She noted there are several recommendations coming today from the prioritization committees and thanked everyone for getting their lists in.</p> <p>Pam indicated a couple weeks ago the college was asked to send an earmark to Congresswoman Sara Jacob's office on something to serve our students. Since Congresswoman Jacobs is committed to the student parent, we submitted an earmark for a student parent center and it was approved to be funded (\$1.5M). This would involve bringing in a pre-fabricated design. She noted we will work with the programs on campus. This would mean CalWORKS will no longer be in a trailer. Additionally, she noted when we go out for a bond, we want to look at a new child development center.</p> <p>Pam reminded everyone that tomorrow is the annual planning forum. Also, next Monday is the state of the college forum which will be streamed.</p>
2. Establish Quorum (50%+1 of voting members)	Quorum was established.
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	There were no additions or deletions to the agenda.
4. Approve Meeting Notes (3/26/26)	<p>Motion to approve: Vi Huynh Second: Jeff Waller</p> <p>The 3/26/26 meeting notes were unanimously approved.</p>
5. Public Comment (3 min max per comment)	Vi debriefed on the Governing Board meeting, specifically noting the disrespect our Curriculum committee received. It was emphasized that the curriculum followed the process and that we should stand firm. Pam added that we did put our best foot forward and thanked Vi for his comments.
<p>FOR CONSENSUS *</p> <p><i>* On College Council, consensus is reached when at least three-fourths (75%) of voting members present are in agreement, and if there are no more than two members from any one constituency who disagree, then consensus to move recommendation forward to President is reached.</i></p>	
<p>1. Recommendation from PIEC: Updated Student Services Program Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Template • Student Services Survey Questions • Student Services Program Review Process Outline • Student Services Program Review Calendar 	<p>Tate reported that as part of our preparation for our accreditation visit and creating our ISER, they identified student services program review as an area for improvement. A small group worked on drafting a student services program review process that aligned with the existing AUP. It also was an opportunity to take advantage of the new VAR requirements and making the program review process short. This draft process was shared with the student services leadership team for feedback. It was then shared at the full student services division meeting for review as well as all employees in student services. After, it was sent to both classified and academic senate presidents. PIEC is bringing the recommendation here for adoption.</p> <p>Motion: Vi Hunyh Second: Jeff Waller This recommendation was unanimously approved.</p> <p>Pam noted she asked Tate to go back to CPIE to create an administrative program review process.</p>

<p>2. Recommendation from Technology Committee: Technology Prioritized List</p>	<p>On behalf of Niko, Tate shared the prioritization process from the Technology Committee with the Council. The committee received requests from CPIE, members reviewed the requests and were encouraged to write clarifying questions for the requestors. They were given the option to come in for a presentation or do a video presentation. Next year, the committee wants to make the presentation mandatory. They received 17 technology requests and came up with their prioritized list. Tate noted that the committee did not consider pricing in the ranking. There was discussion about the AI server request addressing FERPA, and it was noted that currently the AI work is in the cloud server which makes us dependent upon the integrity of the vendor for privacy. If the college had a private server, then we would not be dependent on a third party. It was also noted this request came from the IT department in the LTR and is focused on instructional purposes for students. Student Nathaniel Harris asked if there was a list of cost estimates, and Tate noted there is but it's not part of the recommendation as it's rough estimates. After further discussion, June noted that she would like to hear more about the AI server before making a decision. Pam added that College Council can send a note to the committee for clarification. Further, Richard stated number 12 is a great RSI tool that allows translation, file sharing, messaging with students, and is more expansive, and was curious why it was low on the list. It was noted that this request was for ASL, not for distance education.</p> <p>Motion: Jeff motioned to move the list forward except for number 10 – AI server – pending clarification. Second: Sharon Sampson Opposed: Students Vi Hunyh and Nathaniel Harris</p> <p>Tate will take this clarifying question back to the Technology Committee.</p>
<p>3. Recommendation from Faculty Staffing: Faculty Prioritized List (updated list)</p>	<p>Joan shared the updated faculty staffing prioritized list (corrected since originally sent) and reviewed it with the group. The committee considered three components when scoring – data analysis, department changes since last hire, and department and program needs and institutional alignment. Last year, the committee moved away from presentations and gave the applicants four questions to respond to, which the committee felt was valuable.</p> <p>Motion: June Yang Second: Jeff Waller</p> <p>The prioritization list was unanimously approved.</p> <p>Pam thanked the committee for their work and noted they are still assessing the budget and how many positions can be filled. Joan acknowledged Brodney as serving as the co-chair as he will be stepping down next year.</p>

<p>4. Recommendation from Classified Staffing: Classified Staffing Prioritized list</p>	<p>Courtney shared the prioritized list and reviewed with the Council. She noted the committee received the requests from the AUP and invited those to come and present to the committee. They were given 4 minutes to present followed by 4 minutes of Q&A. It provided an opportunity for the committee to learn the true need. The committee completed their ratings and met and finalized the list. The notes included whether the positions were categorical, new, replacement/backfill, an increase from PT to FT, and required position by law. The presenters were sent the rubric ahead of time. The committee did not ask for cost, but it was noted that positions indicated if they had funding available.</p> <p>Sharon stated there’s still a lot of work to be done for veterans and asked that the certifying official be considered to fill. Courtney added that the supervisor was hired last fall and he has been helping with certifying students.</p> <p>Andrew asked about the student services specialist for the Village as he thought one was recently filled. It was clarified that the position that was filled was for an administrative assistant to the dean.</p> <p>Motion: Vi Huynh Second: Sharon Sampson</p> <p>The list was unanimously approved. Pam thanked the committee and noted that they are in process of reviewing budgets.</p>
---	---

INFORMATION

<p>1. Strategic Hires: • N/A</p>	<p>There were no new strategic hires to review.</p>
<p>2. Slice of PIE</p>	<p>Tate noted there is an accreditation requirement on demonstrating regular data review, so each month, College Council will be reviewing data. They started with completion data last month, and there was a question on what percentage of our students are seeking a degree or certificate, and he noted 83% of our students identify degree or transfer as their goal. Jeff added that it would be nice to know what percentage of students didn’t state they had long term goals, as well as the sample size for the data on persistence. Tate added that most students who do not have a degree or completion are taking one or two classes. Further, the way we define low income is flagged by someone receiving aid; 45% are documented to receiving aid. He explained this is the California Promise grant which does not require full time status like our local Promise does. Julie added that students with six units can qualify through ARC. Students receiving the Promise grant have greater persistence.</p> <p>It was reminded that bringing data here is not to try justifying decisions being made, but rather, to review data and look at the impacts on decisions being made. There was discussion about optimizing aid on campus for students and what would be helpful is to have a case management system that can assist those with the most need. Pam wants to take the summer to talk about how we can interact with each other on student’s needs and best resources.</p>

DISCUSSION

<p>1.</p>	
-----------	--

CONSTITUENCY AND COMMITTEE REPORTS (2 minutes maximum)	
<p>1. Constituency Updates: ASGC, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Administrators Association</p>	<p>ASGC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ASGC attended the SSCCC General Assembly and successfully passed 2 resolutions regarding funding for AB1705 tutoring support services and emergency financial aid in the Basic Needs components. ● Hosted Game Night on 4/22 with lots of fun. ● Will be tabling at Conservation Club Sustainability Fair on 4/27. <p>Academic Senate: The Academic Senate is currently engaged in advancing a resolution in support of the Pan African Virtual College (PAVC), reinforcing the college’s commitment to equity, global engagement, and culturally responsive education. In parallel, a retreat focused on Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) is being planned to review strategies that strengthen student engagement and improve outcomes in online learning environments. Additionally, the two departments that submitted Baccalaureate Degree Program (BDP) proposals will present at the next Senate meeting, providing an opportunity for campus-wide dialogue and review.</p> <p>In recognition of Black Student Success Week, the AS President participated in Legislative Day, advocating for policies that strengthen California’s response to federal rollbacks affecting Minority-Serving Institutions. These efforts include support for key legislation that aims to remove barriers, expand access to higher education, and secure sustained funding for programs proven to improve student retention and completion. There was advocacy for specific Bills such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AB 1871 (Fong), ● AB 2114 (Bryan), ● SB 1006 (Padilla), ● SB 125 (Reyes), ● ACA 7 (Jackson) <p>Classified Senate: Andrew reported the Senate heard presentations from Tate on the AI policies and student climate survey. They are back to full classified representation on governance committees. They are also accepting nominations for senators and encouraged people to submit nominations. They also moved forward four nominations for the Chancellor/Classified award to the district.</p> <p>Administrators Association: Nancy reported they have a new attorney for the association and will be participating in the reopener.</p>
<p>2. Budget Committee (BC)</p>	<p>Meya reported they discussed revisions to the rubric and provided recommendations for revisions on how to process or request augmentations. She also went through budget development.</p>
<p>3. Facilities Committee (FC)</p>	<p>Meya stated that they (FMO) walked around campus to review areas where weeds need to be pulled. Nancy added that an OTA course submitted an assessment and identified three ADA issues, and all three issues have been addressed.</p>
<p>4. Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC)</p>	<p>Tate noted they have been preparing for the planning forum. Next week, they hope to deploy the annual governance survey and AUP survey and then share the results at their next meeting.</p>

5. Professional Development Committee (PDC)	Victoria reported they spent time going over their areas of focus and the IEPI grant. The next step is to develop questions and identify who we might want to include when the team visits the campus.
6. Classified Staffing Prioritization Committee (CSPC)	
7. Faculty Staffing Prioritization Committee (FSPC)	
8. Student Success & Equity Committee (SSEC)	No report.
9. Technology Committee (TC)	Tate reported they are meeting Monday and will be reviewing the prioritization process and making revisions.
10. Accreditation Steering Committee	Pam stated that the team arrives in September. The ACCJC team submitted two core inquiries – RSI and nonfaculty evaluations. For RSI, they gave us guidance and will come back at the end of the semester for another review. She added that Sharon is hosting an RSI retreat next week. We must make an investment in online education. Pam did acknowledge that the web accessibility position is moving forward. Also, the state gave colleges one year extension on the accessibility requirement, but Pam emphasized that we are still moving forward with “Accessibility starts here”.

FOLLOW-UP

Who	Item	Timeline

Participatory Governance:

[College Council Website](#)

[Governance Handbook](#)

[College Council Recommendation Form](#)

NEXT MEETING: May 28, 2026 @ 3:00PM, Griffin Gate

Committees are to establish norms

In order to create valued outcomes, a commitment to participation, dialogue, and the pursuit of value in the form of useful output by all is necessary. It is acknowledged that there are power dynamics in a room. Work must be done to create the equitable and inclusive environment sought for effective and active participation. To do so, council/committee members will establish behavioral norms that include the following meeting rules of engagement, make use of meeting tools, and respect the roles of each member.

Engagement Norms

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

1. Free flow of conversation and raising hands when needed.
2. Thumbs up/Thumbs down/Thumbs sideways to convey individual council members vote toward action items.
3. Parking lot for ideas and possible future action items.
4. Summarize talking points with similar language for constituency representatives to take back to their respected constituency and taking the last 5 minutes of the meeting to do this.
5. Estimated times for each agenda item is up to the Convener of the council.
6. No rank in the room, but those that wish can use salutations.
7. Please keep dialogue respectful.
8. Reminder – body language.
9. Once a semester we have a social gathering.
10. Starting and Ending the meeting on time.
11. Respect each other.
12. Repeating what was voted on after the vote.
13. Education/background from other committees to make appropriate decisions.
14. Use of technology/cell phones is only in an emergency, and to be mindful and professional of the meeting.
15. Norms will be revisited once a semester for now.

Virtual Norms (Established April 2020):

1. Consensus / voting: (a) state item for vote in the chat, (b) record votes in chat grouped by constituencies.
2. Use the raise hand feature in the participant window when you wish to speak.
3. Mute microphone when not speaking.
4. Record the meetings for note taker to use as needed.
5. Consider ways for guests to observe (i.e. use “Registration” feature for meetings. Keep the chat area reserved for voting and advisory members.