FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda

Meeting 10:30 am – 12:00 pm
Admin Conference room #1901
December 3, 2025
Zoom Meeting ID: 880 2480 6352

Attendees: Doreen Finkelstein, Voltaire Villanueva, Elaine Kuo, Stacy Gleixner, Vanessa Santillan-Nieto, Kelaiah Harris, Dolores Davison, Ajani Byrd, Kurt Hueg, Teresa Ong, Alan Tran

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Updates	Elaine Kuo	• SLO/Follow-Up Report	10:30-10:40
SLO/Follow-Up Report Dolores reported that the Follow-Up Report is in strong shape and nearing completion. One remaining item under discussion is how supporting documents and evidence will be incorporated into the report, which will be addressed by the Office of Instruction. The report was also reviewed by Gohar Momjian, the newly appointed Vice Chancellor, who previously served on the commission and provided valuable feedback from an external perspective. The report is scheduled to go before the Board at its January 12th meeting. Assuming the Board approves the report on consent, it will then be submitted to the ACCJC by the March 1st deadline. The college anticipates a follow-up visit from the commission.			
Program Review Revision Wrap-Up	Elaine Kuo	Identify areas of improvement	10:40-11:00
The committee revisited the aspirational criteria developed in prior meetings and noted that no objections had been raised since the last discussion. These criteria will guide both revisions to the program review template and improvements to the overall process. The committee agreed to adopt a hybrid model that includes constituency-based focus groups with Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Deans, followed by a smaller working group with representation from educational and educational support programs. Feedback from the focus groups will inform the working group's recommended template revisions, which will return to IEC for review and approval through the participatory governance process. Members raised concerns about the current program review structure, particularly the writer, reader, and summative experiences. The summative component was described as limited in impact, currently consisting of brief presentations to MIPC, which does not fully reflect the depth of faculty and staff engagement. The committee emphasized the need to			

improve engagement and perceived value by strengthening feedback loops and ensuring that program review outcomes are shared in more meaningful and accessible ways across the college.

The committee also discussed the relationship between comprehensive and annual program reviews, questioning whether the existing model best supports reflection and long-term planning. While comprehensive reviews have traditionally informed annual reviews, members suggested a more scaffolded approach in which annual reviews build toward the comprehensive. This shift could reduce redundancy, strengthen alignment, and increase engagement. Although budget integration was acknowledged as an important consideration, IEC reaffirmed its decision to defer budget-related changes until the next cycle unless focus group feedback indicates a need to revisit that decision.

Blueprint 2030 Report Out Framework	Elaine Kuo	Report out framework/structure	11:00-12:00

The committee discussed establishing a structured, collaborative space to support engagement with Blueprint 2030 that is safe, inclusive, and allows for documentation and aggregation of information across goals. This space is intended to share progress, exchange feedback, coordinate efforts, and identify opportunities for college-level support, particularly where resources may overlap or be duplicated. Members emphasized that discussions should focus on iterative guidance and support rather than evaluation of individual work, and that structured prompts or templates could help keep conversations productive and focused.

The committee explored potential engagement and reporting processes, considering whether updates to IEC should come from goal stewards, objective stewards, or both, and whether reporting should occur by teams rather than individuals. Participation was discussed broadly, including ex-officio members such as IRP staff and activity team representatives. Members agreed that participation should reflect shared ownership of Blueprint 2030 across the college rather than appearing solely administrative, and that these processes should remain iterative and flexible over time.

A key focus of discussion was clarifying IEC's role in relation to MIPC. Members proposed that IEC focus on evaluating and documenting overall progress across objectives, identifying themes, gaps, and support needs, and making recommendations at the college level. In contrast, MIPC would lead communication and campus-wide information sharing, ensuring transparency and broader engagement. Clear reporting criteria, regular updates, and representation from faculty, classified professionals, students, and administrators were emphasized to maintain a collaborative and meaningful approach to Blueprint 2030.

Concerns were raised that current structures place leadership and accountability primarily with administrators, potentially limiting engagement from faculty, classified staff, and students. While administrative coordination is necessary, most implementation work is carried out by faculty and classified professionals, and their contributions are not clearly reflected in the steward or reporting structures. Members agreed that the blueprint should foster shared ownership, similar to accreditation processes, and that the role of stewards should be clarified as guides rather than sole decision-makers.

To strengthen engagement, the committee discussed formalizing the roles of faculty and classified professionals as co-chairs or tri-chairs on implementation teams. This approach could increase agency, accountability, and participation while balancing workload considerations. An action item was identified for objective stewards to recruit co-chairs explicitly, ensuring that non-administrators have visible leadership opportunities and that Blueprint 2030 reflects a truly shared institutional effort.

Student involvement was also addressed, recognizing that shorter-term student enrollment creates challenges for long-term planning but does not preclude meaningful participation. Members suggested students could engage through implementation teams, reporting structures, or communication channels such as ASFC, Senate, and MIPC. IEC could support clearer pathways for student involvement and document expected student outcomes related to Blueprint 2030, reinforcing transparency, inclusive leadership, and intentional engagement across all campus constituencies.

The committee emphasized establishing an ongoing, sustainable reporting and evaluation cycle, ideally on an annual basis. Evaluation would include reviewing metrics, efficiency, and alignment with district and state priorities. IEC would focus on synthesizing information, identifying shared challenges and duplications, supporting stewards, and forwarding recommendations, while fostering a culture of reflection and iterative improvement across teams. Members noted the importance of balancing short-term activity cycles with longer-term project goals, recognizing that while team membership may change annually, projects may span multiple years.

Finally, the committee agreed on distinguishing IEC and MIPC roles: IEC would lead evaluation, synthesis, and recommendations, while MIPC would facilitate broader engagement, transparency, and actionable follow-up at the college level. Templates or facilitated prompts may guide reporting, with flexibility to evolve over time. An action item was identified to email MIPC to clarify expectations for college engagement, transparency, and associated action items, ensuring that Blueprint 2030 remains meaningful, collaborative, and actionable across the institution.