



Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda

Meeting 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
Admin Conference room #1901
February 12, 2025
Zoom Meeting ID: 814 1054 1963

Attendees: Stephanie Crosby, Bret Watson, Elaine Kuo, Kelaiah Harris, Voltaire Villanueva, Dolores Davison, Doreen Finkelstein, Lene Whitley Putz, Garry Lee

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Technology Plan	Stephanie Crosby	Update on the planning document	1:00-1:25
<p>Stephanie Crosby provided an overview of the current Technology Plan, highlighting its ongoing development and the challenges encountered. While the previous Tech Plan team made significant progress, there remains a need for greater clarity regarding the roles and responsibilities of the various technology committees and how they collaborate to ensure these groups function cohesively.</p> <p>Additionally, the new Tech Plan should be aligned with the college's Educational Master Plan (EMP). The EMP will play a key role in guiding the Foothill Tech Committee. Once the EMP is finalized and adopted by the board, the Tech Committee can align their priorities with the EMP objectives.</p> <p>It was noted that many technology-related decisions have been made without adequate consultation with stakeholders. Moving forward, there is a need to refine the consultation process, possibly through program review and the resource allocation process, to ensure more transparency in decision-making.</p> <p>IEC recommends that MIPC continue its discussion on the Technology Committee's membership to ensure appropriate campus-wide representation. IEC members also agree that administrative oversight, particularly at the VP level, is necessary to ensure technology decisions are well-guided, streamlined, and aligned with the college's goals. The current Tech Tools Decision-Making chart should be updated to incorporate the Classified Senate into the decision-making process and further clarify the functions and roles of the various committees and workgroups. Once revised, the document should be returned to MIPC for formal approval and adoption.</p>			



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Planning Calendar	Elaine Kuo	Discuss planning calendar	1:25-2:00
<p>Elaine Kuo presented the Draft 2024-31 planning calendar. A key topic of discussion was the alignment of Foothill's planning calendar with the district. Committee members agreed that continued alignment with the district's timelines was essential. The committee also discussed the technology plan, which follows a three-year cycle. The next technology plan is due in spring 2026, but there were concerns about whether this timeline fits the college's needs. Given the district's upcoming technology plan refresh, members expressed uncertainty about how this should influence the college's approach.</p> <p>The committee also considered adjusting the EMP cycle, possibly shifting it to year five of the seven-year planning cycle to better align with accreditation preparation. This would allow for a more intentional refresh of the plan. The committee will explore different options for adjusting the EMP timeline and will present them for discussion at a future meeting. Action items include retrieving the most updated planning calendar from the district, creating a single document to clearly outline the various planning timelines for the college, district, and De Anza, and reviewing potential options for adjusting EMP timeline.</p>			
Governance Evaluation	Elaine Kuo	Discuss governance evaluation outcomes	2:00-2:30
<p>The IEC is responsible for evaluating the governance structure, a critical component of continuous improvement and accreditation. In the past, the college conducted annual surveys to assess various governance bodies, including the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, ASFC, and the primary shared governance body, now known as MIPC. These surveys were designed to gather feedback on the effectiveness of the governance structures, focusing on participation, understanding, and interaction within these bodies. However, this process has not been continued in recent years.</p> <p>There is broad consensus that a comprehensive evaluation should involve all governance units, as each plays an essential role in the college's decision-making processes. The committee also recognized the need to clarify MIPC's charge and goals, as its current purpose and purview make it unclear how to effectively assess its performance. To address this, the committee recommends that MIPC be given the opportunity to define its charge, goals, and intended outcomes clearly. If MIPC does not provide this clarity by the spring, the committee will move forward with creating an external evaluation framework based on existing documentation and its stated goals.</p> <p>The committee also discussed the frequency of governance evaluations, with differing opinions on whether these should take place annually or biennially. Ultimately, the committee agreed that regular evaluations are essential for continuous improvement, favoring a biennial</p>			



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

review cycle, similar to the election cycle for governance leadership. Elaine will present the governance evaluation recommendation to MIPC and report back to the IEC.