



## Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda

**Meeting 12:30 pm – 2:00 pm**  
**Library Conference room #3533**  
**November 18, 2025**  
Zoom Meeting ID: 821 8663 0824

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

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Approval of Minutes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• October 9, 2025</li><li>• October 29, 2025</li></ul>	
Minutes approved.			
Updates	Elaine Kuo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• MIPC<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Governance eval</li></ul></li><li>• SLO/Follow-Up Report</li></ul>	12:30-12:45
<p><b>MIPC</b></p> <p>Elaine reported on attending the MIPC meeting, where members discussed next steps related to the governance evaluation. The committee noted that the purpose statement currently posted on the website was developed prior to Blueprint 2030 and emphasized the need to ensure alignment with the document. As part of this work, Elaine will return to MIPC in the winter quarter to facilitate a follow-up conversation on areas requiring alignment. During that meeting, MIPC is encouraged to identify a small set of metrics once the committee's goals are clearly defined.</p> <p><b>SLO/Follow-Up Report</b></p> <p>The Academic Senate reported that it has accepted the ACCJC Follow-Up Report, and the document will go to MIPC for review on Friday. The draft report has undergone only minor language edits and now includes a description of the faculty-supporting-faculty workshops, which have been widely utilized and positively received. Senate members expressed appreciation for the collaborative approach taken by the administration which has been well received by faculty. In addition, faculty engagement with the SLO canvas cites are strong with active participation occurring across pod channels supported by faculty mentors. The remaining major task for the Follow-Up Report before Board approval on January 12<sup>th</sup> is</p>			



# FOOTHILL COLLEGE

assembling and attaching all required documents, including determining how to package training course materials in a format similar to the ISER.

SVE and CCCCCO Equity  
Plan 3.0 Update

Ajani Byrd

Update on planning  
documents

12:45-1:20

Ajani presented the Equity 3.0 Plan, noting its intentional alignment with the College's Blueprint for Success and statewide Vision 2030. Leads from across the college contributed to drafting the plan to ensure strategies were realistic, collaborative, and informed by those closest to the work. MIPC will review the plan on Friday, and it will be submitted to the State Chancellor's Office on November 30, with Board review scheduled for December 8. Members reiterated that Equity 3.0 is not a standalone document but an action plan that operationalizes the Blueprint 2030 to address racial disparities, representing the third iteration of the state-mandated Student Equity Plan tied to roughly \$4.9 million in funding.

The committee reviewed the five core focus areas and their alignment with Blueprint goals, highlighting enrollment initiatives such as Kickstart Enrollment Days and the collegewide intensive focus on supporting Black and Latinx students through early educational planning and improved outreach using a CRM (Customer Relationship Management) software system. Academic Senate feedback was discussed, particularly concerns about the plan's heavy emphasis on student services and the need for instructional component representation. Members noted that the state-required plan reflects ongoing work rather than new initiatives, prompting interest in developing a more localized equity plan to address remaining gaps. The group emphasized the importance of continued iteration, including stronger accountability measures and SMART goals, while recognizing the lasting influence of earlier equity efforts such as 13-55. Additional discussion highlighted opportunities to use CRPP (Culturally Responsive Practices & Pedagogy professional development program) and ASCEND survey data, as well as forthcoming Vision for Online reporting, to better understand how multiple forms of student and faculty support intersect to improve equity outcomes.

Program Review Revision

Elaine Kuo

Identify areas of  
improvement

1:20-2:00

The committee continued discussions on revising the program review template. Members emphasized that both academic and student services programs are evaluated through five-year comprehensive reviews and annual check-ins to assess student outcomes and identify improvement opportunities, with faculty and staff providing input on metrics such as student success rates and resource allocation. The committee outlined a timeline, prioritizing winter quarter for refining review prompts, gathering feedback, and building consensus, with early spring reserved for implementation, while maintaining an iterative, flexible process to support student success and equity goals.



# FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Revisions to the comprehensive program review template were discussed, focusing on five key concepts: meaningful, engaging, reflective, actionable, and aligned, with alignment ensuring integration with the College's Blueprint for Success, Objective 3.1, the Student Equity 3.0 Plan, and the Aspen Institute's "Unlocking Opportunity" initiative. Members noted that budget and resource requests are included in the template but not fully integrated, and placeholders will be iterated in future cycles.

The committee discussed insights gained from current program review practices, noting that the comprehensive review template may be repetitive and that reflection, accountability, and actionable progress are more visible in annual reports. Members highlighted variability in how faculty complete reviews and the need for revisions to both the template and process to ensure meaningful and relevant evaluations. Concerns were raised regarding access to data and infrastructure, particularly for non-traditional programs, which limits the ability to set goals and measure outcomes effectively. The group emphasized the importance of dean engagement in guiding faculty through program reviews to ensure a comprehensive understanding of departmental performance rather than relying solely on individual course perspectives. The discussion also addressed closing feedback loops, including evaluating how allocated resources support program goals and documenting their impact. Finally, members agreed that integrating reflection, data analysis, and accountability into both the template and process would improve the usefulness of program reviews and support continuous program improvement. Lastly, it was noted that smaller departments or programs with many part-time faculty often struggle to coordinate data collection and meaningful reflection. Members emphasized the value of collaborative discussion, particularly in smaller programs, where faculty can share insights and interpret data together rather than working in isolation. The conversation highlighted the need for structured "shepherding," where deans or other leaders guide faculty through the process to ensure accuracy, context, and actionable outcomes.

The committee discussed structural models for program review and the hybrid model was proposed, combining IEC oversight with a separate working group focused on template and prompt development, incorporating feedback from faculty, staff, and deans. The group agreed that the chosen structure should balance process oversight with meaningful engagement and ensure communication between groups.