

GROSSMONT COLLEGE
Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee (PIEC)
Friday, April 17, 2026
11:00 a.m. – 12:30p.m.
Minutes
College Conference Room 10-106
[ZOOM LINK](#)

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)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tate Hurvitz	<input type="checkbox"/> Jayson Alvarado	<input type="checkbox"/> Victoria Christine Rodriguez
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Malia Molina	<input type="checkbox"/> Nicholas Pata	<input type="checkbox"/> Susana Munoz
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karolia Macias
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Hern

ACADEMIC SENATE (voting)	CLASSIFIED SENATE (Voting)	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION (Voting)
<input type="checkbox"/> Rukiya Akua	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dawn Heuft	<input type="checkbox"/> Courtney Willis
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Denise Schulmeyer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brandi Tonne	<input type="checkbox"/> Niko Crumpton
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michele Martens	<input type="checkbox"/> TBD

ADVISORY (non-voting)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Joan Ahrens, VP Academic Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/> TBD, District Research Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Maria Denise Aceves, Curriculum
<input type="checkbox"/> TBD, VP Student Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Joyce Fries, Academic Program Review	
<input type="checkbox"/> Meya Alomar, VP Administrative Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Kelly Menck, Academic Program Review	
<input type="checkbox"/> Marcelo Nieto, Research and Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rafael Ayala, Research and Planning	

CPIE	GUESTS	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PJ Ball (Recorder)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome and Introductions	
2. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	Addition of Student Services Program Review
3. Approve meeting notes: a. 03/20/2026	Quorum was not met, 03/20 minutes will be approved along with 04/17 minutes at the 05/15 PIEC meeting.
NEW BUSINESS	
4. Governance Survey	The committee reviewed proposed governance survey questions related to committee demographics, governance structure, committee effectiveness, member understanding, and professional development needs. The group agreed that Tate would review the

	<p>survey questions and provide recommendations for potential improvements.</p> <p>Discussion focused on committee effectiveness, member participation, and governance training. Members noted that while training opportunities exist for committee chairs, regular committee members often receive limited preparation regarding their roles and expectations. The committee discussed the potential need for additional training and onboarding support for governance participants.</p> <p>The group also discussed challenges related to professional development timing, particularly for newly appointed co-chairs and classified professionals who may face limitations on volunteer or training time due to work policies. Additional survey questions related to governance website accessibility, training effectiveness, and proxy participation were also considered for inclusion.</p>
5. AUP Survey	<p>The committee reviewed the Annual Unit Planning (AUP) survey distributed to deans and chairs, which evaluates various aspects of the AUP process, including alignment with the college mission, clarity of instructions, and availability of training and support. Discussion highlighted inconsistent training opportunities related to AUP completion and identified areas for improving guidance and resources for participants.</p> <p>The group also discussed potential improvements to the AUP process and survey, including the addition of both academic and student services templates and the possible inclusion of budget request components. Plans for the upcoming spring planning forum were reviewed, including a structured process for identifying and prioritizing strategic goals related to completion culture and community partnerships through table discussions and voting activities.</p> <p>Additionally, the committee discussed extending the AUP submission deadline to early October to better align with the revised planning timeline, while confirming that SLO documentation deadlines would remain unchanged.</p>
6. Student Services Program Review	<p>The committee reviewed the development of a new Student Services Program Review questionnaire designed to be concise, aligned with the existing AUP process, and inclusive of optional Vision-Aligned Reporting (VAR) data sections. The questionnaire was developed through multiple meetings with Student Services leadership and departments and has been shared with the Academic Senate and Classified Senate presidents for final feedback.</p> <p>Discussion also included the structure of the Student Services Program Review process, which will differ from the Academic Affairs model by utilizing a coordinator to provide training and oversight rather than a formal committee structure.</p> <p>The committee voted unanimously to recommend the Student Services Program Review process to College Council pending final feedback from both Senates. Tate will prepare the recommendation form and share it with Malia for review prior to submission.</p>

UPDATE		
7. Spring Planning Forum	Spring Planning Forum will be held on Friday, April 24 th 9am-12pm In Griffin Gate.	
COMMITTEE/CONSTITUENCY REPORTS		
8. Reports on PIEC-related topics from constituency groups and other committees (as needed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associated Students: • Classified Senate: • Faculty Senate: • Admin Association: 	N/A	
FOR FOLLOW-UP AT NEXT MEETING		
Who	What	When
PIEC members		

Important:

Next Meeting Date: Friday, May 15, 2026

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.