



## Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda

**Meeting 1:00 pm – 2:00 pm  
Admin Conference room #1901**

**January 22, 2026**

Zoom Meeting ID: 829 3257 7627

**Attendees:** Doreen Finkelstein, Voltaire Villanueva, Elaine Kuo, Stacy Gleixner, Vanessa Santillan-Nieto, Kelaiah Harris, Dolores Davison, Kurt Hueg, Alan Tran, Kimberly Escamilla, Lene Whitley-Putz, Bret Watson

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Approval of Minutes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• November 18, 2025</li><li>• December 3, 2025</li></ul>	
Minutes approved.			
Updates	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Follow-Up Report/ SLO</li><li>• MIPC Governance Eval</li><li>• Program Review</li><li>• Blueprint Implementation</li></ul>	1:00-1:30
<b>Follow-Up Report/ SLO</b> The Board of Trustees approved the ACCJC follow-up report, and the document is currently being routed for signatures. Once signatures are completed, the report will be submitted to the college's ACCJC liaison ahead of the March 1st deadline. The signature process should be completed soon. Preparations for the accreditation site visit are ongoing, with the visit confirmed for Monday, March 23rd, during finals week. Additionally, progress has been made regarding Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). A requested system field to incorporate SLOs directly into course outlines is nearly ready, which will help transition SLO documentation from its current spreadsheet-based format to a more sustainable system in CourseLeaf.			
The SLO Committee continues to make steady progress and is focusing on several priorities for the remainder of the academic year. Mary Vanatta is leading efforts to ensure missing SLOs are entered, with a goal of completing this work by the end of the quarter. The committee also plans to host SLO open office hours during the third week of February, offering both Zoom and in-person support sessions. Additionally, the committee emphasized			



the importance of improving communication with part-time faculty by working closely with pod leads and department chairs to ensure timely dissemination of SLO updates and expectations.

### **MIPC Governance Eval**

At the recent MIPC meeting on January 16th, members discussed next steps following the spring 2025 Governance Evaluation results, which included IEC's recommendation to focus on participation, communication, and decision-making. Much of the discussion centered on improving communication about MIPC's work, but no formal decisions were made regarding specific strategies. Given that further direction is still needed, the discussion will remain in a temporary "parking lot." In the meantime, IEC will continue administering the existing assessment instrument without changes until MIPC provides further guidance.

### **Program Review**

The committee discussed updates to the program review revision process following a conversation held in December. Outreach is underway to key campus stakeholders to recruit volunteers for two half-day work sessions focused on reviewing and revising program review process and templates. The sessions will be facilitated by Elaine Kuo and Kelaiah Harris, with feedback returned to IEC for final recommendations before moving through the participatory governance process. The revision effort will include two tracks: one focused on the instructional template involving faculty, instructional deans, and department chairs, and a second focused on educational support program templates involving classified staff, student services faculty, supervisors, and deans.

Committee members emphasized the importance of evaluating both the program review templates and the overall review process. Some members recommended prioritizing process improvements before making significant template revisions, given the limited time available. Members also discussed the importance of aligning program review revisions with institutional priorities, including Blueprint goals, student equity initiatives, and evolving ACCJC accreditation standards.

### **Blueprint Implementation**

Members were reminded of the upcoming Blueprint 2030 kickoff event scheduled for the following week, which will introduce implementation teams responsible for carrying out each objective. The event will provide an opportunity for campus members to learn about the teams' work, connect with implementation efforts, and explore ways to become involved. Implementation teams are currently at varying stages of progress, with some building upon existing initiatives and others still in early planning phases. Each team has identified activities planned for the 2025–2026 academic year, and additional details are available through a Canvas site linked on the Foothill 2030 website.



The committee also continued its discussion regarding student engagement in Blueprint 2030. Alan Tran shared that updates from IEC meetings are regularly reported to the Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC), and students are encouraged to attend meetings if they have interest in specific topics. The committee expressed support for maintaining student representation within IEC while strengthening communication with ASFC through regular updates and documentation. Members also emphasized the need to provide support and resources to student representatives to effectively share information with the broader student body.

Blueprint 2030 Report Out Framework	Elaine Kuo	Report out framework/structure	1:30-2:30
-------------------------------------	------------	--------------------------------	-----------

The committee recognized the need to clearly define the roles of IEC, MIPC, and Goal Stewards in the Blueprint 2030 implementation process, noting that IEC's focus is on assessing and tracking progress rather than directing operational work. There was a suggestion for MIPC to support Blueprint evaluation through transparency, information awareness, and college engagement, aligning with governance evaluation categories of participation, communication, and decision-making. The committee agreed that this recommendation would be presented at the next MIPC meeting. Additionally, the committee reviewed Goal Steward responsibilities, which include supporting Objective Stewards, building campus engagement, addressing resource and implementation barriers, communicating progress to the campus, and tracking data needs in collaboration with Institutional Research.

The discussion then shifted to how IEC could support Blueprint 2030 through evaluation and alignment functions rather than operational oversight. Members explored potential responsibilities, including documenting the implementation process, providing iterative guidance based on Goal Steward updates, and reporting summary updates to MIPC. The committee introduced a scorecard model as a tool to measure quantitative outcomes and a rubric tool to measure qualitative assessments of meaningful change. Members emphasized the importance of defined evaluation criteria that would allow IEC to consistently assess progress across different objectives at the college level. The committee reviewed previously identified criteria, as well as incorporating additional elements such as equity-centered reflection and integration with other planning initiatives.

The committee discussed how these criteria would guide feedback, ensuring evaluations are consistent, transparent, and not arbitrary. Scenarios were considered in which metrics may be limited in scope, highlighting IEC's role in providing feedback and encouraging deeper analysis while allowing Goal and Objective Stewards to determine implementation approaches. Members agreed that while IEC would have final authority over the evaluation framework, incorporating Steward input would ensure the criteria and rubric are practical and meaningful without being overly prescriptive. Goal Stewards could report to MIPC, but



# FOOTHILL COLLEGE

for evaluation purposes, they would also provide updates to IEC using the committee-developed scorecard and evaluation rubric. This process is intended to capture meaningful change rather than merely activity completion. The committee agreed to draft the evaluation rubric and scorecard, share it with Goal Stewards for feedback, and refine it iteratively, recognizing that initial approaches may be piloted while maintaining a supportive rather than punitive approach.

Finally, the committee emphasized the importance of balancing accountability with encouragement, noting that many activities are already underway. IEC's feedback is intended to be constructive, helping teams reflect on alignment with transformational goals and equity priorities. The discussion reinforced that the evaluation framework is designed to guide reflection, support alignment with broader college goals, and surface systemic issues to MIPC when necessary.

DRAFT