

**GROSSMONT COLLEGE**  
**Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (PIEC) Committee**  
**Friday, August 23, 2019**  
**9:00 a.m. – 10:20 a.m.**  
**ASGC Board Room**  
**MEETING SUMMARY**

**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	ASSOCIATE STUDENTS OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE	ADVISORY
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Catherine Webb	<input type="checkbox"/> Blanca Valdez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Reese
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jocelyn Pacheco-Fonseca Indira Saldana (proxy)	<input type="checkbox"/> Vacant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marsha Gable
	<input type="checkbox"/> Vacant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill McGreevy
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Victoria Rodriguez
		<input type="checkbox"/> Joyce Fries
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natalie Ray

ACADEMIC SENATE	CLASSIFIED SENATE	ADMINISTRATORS' ASSOCIATION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lara Braff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nadia Almaguer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan Ahrens
<input type="checkbox"/> Yohanny Corona-Batalona	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alexis Lytle	<input type="checkbox"/> Courtney Williams
<input type="checkbox"/> Tiffany Glen-Hall		<input type="checkbox"/> Heriberto Vasquez

EX-OFFICIO	RECORDER	GUEST(S)
<input type="checkbox"/> Lida Rafia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Krista Ames-Cook (proxy for Cindy E.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sam Ballard
<input type="checkbox"/> Bonnie Ripley		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cary Willard
<input type="checkbox"/> Christine Vicino		

ROUTINE BUSINESS	
1. Welcome and Introductions	Meeting called to order at 9:06 AM by Catherine Webb. Introductions around the table; Proxies: Indira Saldana (for Jocelyn) and Krista Ames-Cook (for Cindy E.); Guests: Sam Ballard, Cary Willard; Natalie pulled up the Agenda on the projection screen.
2. Public Comment	None
3. Additions/Deletions to Agenda	None
4. Approve 05/17/19 Meeting Notes	Approved as presented with thumbs up vote.
5. Annual Review of Norms	Catherine explained that these were established by the group during PIEC's first meeting with her last year. Document was reviewed and the following updates were requested to correct typos: (a) If there are times when we feel unsafe, find ways to recalibrate and move forward in a gentle way. (item #5) (b) Quick check (weather check-in at the beginning of the meeting). (item #2) Group consensus was to continue checking this list at the beginning of each new semester and adjust norms as needed.

DISCUSSION OF PRIOR AGENDA ITEMS / OLD BUSINESS

6. Local Vision for Success Goals – Equity component

**Handout – “Grossmont College Vision Goals”**

Update from Catherine on the final targets for the equity component of the Vision goals:

- CPIE office was charged (by PIEC) with “doing the math” in reference to the 10-year plan from the State Chancellor’s Office (Completion, Transfer, Units, and Workforce)
- 5-year goal-setting with targets for 50% mark (completed by Catherine)
- Instructions from state: For any goals (on page 1), also need to set target goals for the sub groups that are disproportionately impacted (equity); set specific goals for each of these metrics
- Data sets on pages 2-3 were selected based on the specific groups impacted and the goals are customized based on the data
- Clarification inquiry from Lara: Who is included in “overall goal” group? Per Catherine: the college as a whole
- Catherine provided percentages and numbers so it’s simpler to see the size of the subgroups
- In some of the subgroups, the data used for the goals (per the State Chancellor’s Office) has not been collected “cleanly”; it’s the data collected to date; as we collect more data, the information will improve
- From Bill, the data has been self-reported (e.g., through CCCApply) and so this needs to be kept in mind; we are using the data that is currently available to us
- Per Catherine, progress with regard to the Vision Goals needs to be reviewed and analyzed in a “triangulated” approach; not relying on just one report or dataset; want to be looking at many sources of data, then having the conversation about what does this mean for rate of success?
- Clarification inquiry from Indira: Is this data from 16-17 academic year? Per Catherine: Yes, as directed from the State Chancellor’s Office
- Inquiry from Cary about how to interpret the Equity data; what does the “overall goal for the college” mean? Per Catherine: the percentage (from page 1) is shared on this chart as a point of reference; per the State Chancellor’s Office, each equity target was required to be higher than the target set for the overall college
- Inquiry from Lara about the charge of this committee (discuss or operationalize?) and how some of these goals will be determined if it’s an area beyond our control (i.e. workforce goals); Catherine referred back to the PIEC charge/purpose and stated that this group sets the goals that are communicated to the SSE group that Lida’s working with to implement; follow up inquiry about the two groups (PIEC and SSC) and that the operational work that’s being implemented reflect the vision goals

7. Progress on Annual Unit Plan Calendar & Template

**Handout – “Working Principles for AUP Calendar & Templates”**

Report from the AUP Workgroup (Joan, Bill, Natalie, Catherine & Tiffany [absent]):

- Working principles were the touchpoints we wanted to keep in mind as the group was working on the AUP calendar and templates
- From Joan: We were trying to keep at the forefront what Annual Unit Planning (AUP) is and keeping the working principles front and center as we strive to streamline; it’s also a way to establish equity and make sure a process is in place
- From Natalie: How do we put meaning in this so there’s a place for everyone’s needs and everyone’s work/efforts? This was another working principle that we kept in mind (integrity, transparency, etc.)
- Inquiry from Cary: How do we address the “emergency processes” so that they don’t interfere with the long-term processes that are being implemented and without derailing these initiatives? How are we “messaging” our efforts effectively?
- Comment from Bill: As an example, Cary has developed an “emergency budget” type form that is being used only in the interim until the AUP process can be finalized and implemented; a lot of our discussion(s) end up at the Academic Affairs arena, and how this contributes to Student Services and Administrative Services
- From Joan: This process will help make program review more meaningful; currently, we have a 6-year process and the AUP aligns the program review process so that intermediate goals/metrics are used to continually improve
- From Catherine: The meaningfulness of program review is part of the AUP process; AUP is the bridge between program review and resource allocation

Review of draft AUP timeline:

- Timeline reflects timing of decisions and basing decisions on need(s) and not just money
- There is a regular annual “season” for recruiting and hiring faculty; AUP timeline is trying to position the college so we can be competitive for recruiting the best faculty; therefore, we want to have the postings and deadlines ready for winter break each year, so prospective faculty can complete applications during break and go from there
- Draft timeline is “ideal world” first and the snags that could delay this process
- Time given to review the draft timeline – any places causing confusion?
  - From Natalie: Where do these go when the AUPs are done? What if you go through the process and don’t have any specific resource requests?
  - From Catherine: If you’re on a 6-year cycle, each program’s review is 1/6 of your next review. If you’re on a 3-year cycle, your program’s review is 1/3 of your next review. You would only submit it (AUP) further if you have resource allocation requests.
  - From Lara:
    - (a) What are “units”? Per Catherine: “unit” refers to the department (with a departmental budget) and are typically linked to a budgetary line;
    - (b) Why is the request submitted so early (i.e. winter break) if the President isn’t making a decision until February (for example)? Wouldn’t that build resentment? Per Catherine: In the example for faculty staffing, the prioritized list would be approved by the president early (i.e. November); each group/department has its own prioritized list (facilities, hiring, PD, etc.) and yet these all need to be looked at together comprehensively and presented to College Council
- In suggested model, CPE analyzes AUPs for overarching college-wide themes; this qualitative analysis would be done by Catherine and Victoria; these findings would be brought to PIEC for discussion
- Inquiry about the blue long box (Nov. – Jan.) about “No Regularly Scheduled College Council Meetings”; Catherine explained the College Council schedule is the 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday and there are some holiday interruptions in winter, doesn’t necessarily mean there are no meetings, just happen at a different time during that month; request to remove this box from the draft timeline
- **Action Item:** Catherine will update the draft timeline and resend to group (completed 8/23)
- Catherine wants to run a simulation with the timing to review/analyze glitches; there are many open questions with this AUP timeline; the draft shared is just a “first draft” and in an ideal world view
- Clarification from Catherine about Classified Staffing Prioritization Committee – is this for new positions only, correct? Per Marsha G., Yes
- From Bill: The prioritization lists go directly from the committees to College Council; request to add an arrow on the draft timeline to reflect this; additional request to update/modify the diamonds in the legend
- **Action Item:** Catherine will update the draft timeline accordingly and will resend (done 8/23)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinking of our needs separate from the funds, in this order and in this balance, is important because we wait until the mid-point of the academic year and then need to be ready and nimble to act/proceed with the process</li> <li>• From Bill: “Hold Harmless Agreement” was extended; this guarantees the funding amounts to what was received in 2017-18 + COLA increase</li> <li>• Next steps:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Catherine will update the working draft and will send out; please share with your constituencies and gather/collect feedback; ideal situation and work backwards from there; Catherine is available to attend meetings to answer questions</li> <li>○ Templates for AUP are being developed; Draft from Academic Affairs will be revised to make it lighter; Three frames model (What, So What, Now What) and bridging this in from the program reviews; drafts may be shared between meetings for feedback to continue making progress on these</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

**NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

<p>8. Establishing working guidelines for new &amp; revised KPIs</p>	<p>Last semester we discussed the need to recommend a new set of KPIs that does not rely on the (now retired) Student Success Scorecard. What working principles should guide us as we establish a useful, timely, and meaningful set of KPIs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No time for this today; Request for members to be part of a subcommittee?</li> <li>• Volunteers for subcommittee: Nadia, Victoria, Catherine will work on the KPIs to draft for next meeting (Sept.)</li> </ul>
--	---

**COMMITTEE/CONSTITUENCY REPORTS**

<p>9. Reports from other college governance committees and constituency groups, as needed</p>	<p><b>Staffing Committee</b> (Mike) – No report  <b>Budget Committee</b> (Bill) – No meetings since spring, no report  <b>College Council</b> (Marsha) – Meeting on 8/22/2019 with presentations from PD, SSE, CSPC (Emergency &amp; Categorical positions). The CSPC list is moving forward. Suggestions shared to improve how the CSPC works. Possible interest to have PIEC presentation at College Council later in the semester</p>
---	--

**FOR CONSENSUS**

<p>10.</p>	
------------	--

**FOR FOLLOW-UP AT NEXT MEETING**

Who	Item	Timeline

**11. WORK AHEAD**

**NEXT MEETING: Friday, September 20, 2019 from 11:00 – 12:30 in the ASGC Board Room**

Meeting adjourned at 10:26 AM

***Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Committee  
Norms***

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

- Thumb up- all the way in; Thumb middle- can live with it; Thumb down-want to keep talking about additional solutions.
- Quick check (weather check-in at the beginning of the meeting). This would help us calibrate our body language with one another.
- Raise hand to let folks know you are going to speak. Be respectful of others who may have raised their hand before you.
- Everybody's voice is equal, important and valuable.
- If there are times when we feel unsafe, find ways to recalibrate and move forward in a gentle way.
- Use a parking lot.
- Give ourselves passing time at the end of meetings.
- If a proxy is requested make sure the proxy is briefed prior to the meeting.
- 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.
- Periodically check in on our norms and adjust them.