



Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda

Meeting 10:30 am – 12:00 pm
Admin Conference room #1901
October 29, 2025
Zoom Meeting ID: 873 8827 9409

Attendees: Doreen Finkelstein, Voltaire Villanueva, Elaine Kuo, Stacy Gleixner, Vanessa Santillan-Nieto, Bret Watson, Lene Whitley-Putz, Kimberly Escamilla, Teresa Ong, Alan Tran, Kelaiah Harris

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Updates	Elaine Kuo	• MIPC ○ 26-26 Priorities ○ Governance eval • SLO • Blueprint 2030	10:30-10:50
MIPC Elaine provided updates on the MIPC presentation, reviewing IEC's priorities for AY25-26, which were approved. IEC's three primary focus areas are Program Review, the Blueprint 2030, and the Governance Evaluation. While the governance evaluation was approved, there was insufficient time for detailed discussion, particularly regarding recommendations from IEC. MIPC did not determine actions based on last year's survey results, and further clarification of MIPC's purpose and goals is needed before evaluating future survey outcomes. Elaine will return to MIPC on November 7 to continue the discussion. SLO An update was provided on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and the ACCJC Follow-Up report due on March 1. Last year, the accreditor issued a single finding regarding SLOs, which was expected, and significant work has been underway since January to address it. The draft report was shared with Academic Senate on Monday and will be finalized by mid-December for the January board agenda. Dolores Davison, the SLO coordinator, is updating links in the report to include resources and examples, enhancing the report's content. An editable link to the draft will be emailed to the committee for review and feedback using track changes or comments. Blueprint 2030 The Blueprint 2030 was officially accepted by the board and has now moved into the implementation stage. IEC will explore ways to intersect with the Blueprint through reporting,			

feedback, and guidance, to be discussed at a future meeting. During the October 20th onboarding, objective stewards (deans/AVPs) and goal stewards (VPs) reviewed their facilitator and leadership roles, including tracking progress, reporting successes and challenges, and coordinating across teams to avoid duplication. Initial implementation steps include selecting one to two measurable metrics per objective and defining activities. Efforts are also underway to engage the broader campus, including faculty and classified staff, to ensure wider participation and input.

The committee discussed strategies to increase faculty engagement in Blueprint 2030 initiatives, noting Academic Senate feedback that participation is higher when specific activities are clearly defined rather than vague, year-long commitments. Suggestions included short-term, one-day events to encourage broader involvement without overburdening those already engaged. It was suggested to map objective stewards to their respective objectives to provide clear points of contact. An action item was identified to add objective stewards to the Blueprint table and publish a public version while maintaining a working document for ongoing updates.

Program Review Revision	Elaine Kuo	Identify areas of improvement	10:50-12:00
-------------------------	------------	-------------------------------	-------------

The committee discussed program review as a key component of this year's scope of work, encompassing both the process and the comprehensive templates used by Educational Programs and Educational Support Programs. Program review operates on a five-year cycle, with annual reflection on data and information shared via templates reviewed by cross-departmental colleagues and the appropriate vice president. The committee is currently focused on reviewing the comprehensive templates, last updated in 2018–19, to ensure alignment with Blueprint 2030 and other institutional priorities.

IEC reviewed proposed program review deliverables, noting that revisions will be part of a regular cycle of continuous improvement. The discussion emphasized alignment between program review and other institutional initiatives, including the Aspen Unlocking Opportunity Project, Blueprint 2030, and the Student Equity Plan. Any revisions should reflect these initiatives and incorporate feedback from program review evaluation surveys. The committee discussed the potential need for a taskforce or stakeholder group to reconcile these frameworks and implement recommended changes. They also discussed the need for an approval process, including potential review through MIPC and other governance bodies.

The proposed timeline for updating the templates includes establishing the stakeholder group in December and January to ensure inclusion of all relevant perspectives. In February and March, the group will review the templates, apply IEC guidance, and return proposed revisions for committee feedback. By April, final preparations will be made for spring quarter implementation, with mid-May targeted for adoption.

The committee discussed the evolving purpose and goals of program review. While the process was originally designed to demonstrate academic quality for accreditation, the IEC noted the need to expand its focus to include equity, student success, and alignment with other institutional initiatives. Members suggested that future prompts could include equity-focused metrics, data on disproportionate impact, program value (for students outcomes related to transfer and potential wage earnings), and forward-looking planning elements.

Survey feedback from previous cycles indicated that some programs find it difficult to interpret data trends, leading to incomplete or surface-level responses. IRP coaches shared that while certain prompts may initially frustrate writers, coaching can help programs identify trends and develop interventions even when underlying causes are unclear. The IEC emphasized the importance of ensuring that prompts are meaningful, support reflective practice, and connect to institutional priorities.

The committee also discussed how engaging with program review data can lead to actionable insights. For example, one program, after reflecting on their 5-year program review course section data, identified an opportunity to offer late-start classes. Members agreed that thoughtful engagement with data can make program review more relevant and effective, particularly if the templates are made more intuitive. IEC reiterated that program review should be a meaningful, collaborative process rather than a compliance exercise. When the current program review template was designed in 2017-18, the template's goal was to focus on demonstrating academic quality, a key aspect of the accreditation standards. As the college is in this next accreditation cycle, the committee has greater flexibility to design a process that promotes reflection, innovation, and actionable outcomes. Challenges remain, particularly for classified staff who often complete reviews independently while managing other duties. The committee stressed the importance of fostering collaboration within departments to ensure shared ownership and more representative input.

To enhance engagement and impact, members suggested:

- Shifting the annual template toward reflection and monitoring, while using the comprehensive template for strategic, forward-looking planning.
- Integrating program review with related campus initiatives, such as SLO assessment, to reduce duplication and increase coherence.
- Considering campus-wide events (e.g., a “Program Review Day” or showcase) to dedicate time for reflection, celebrate accomplishments, and promote collaboration and visibility.

The committee agreed that strong program reviews provide actionable ideas within a program’s sphere of influence, elevate diverse voices, and lead to continuous improvement.



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Members emphasized the importance of aligning the process with broader institutional priorities while ensuring it remains relevant, equitable, and impactful. IEC will continue this discussion at the next meeting.

DRAFT