



Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda

Meeting 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
Admin Conference room #1943
May 13, 2025
Zoom Meeting ID: 830 8396 0557

Attendees: Doreen Finkelstein, Ajani Byrd, Voltaire Villanueva, Elaine Kuo, Stacy Gleixner, Dolores Davison, Kurt Hueg, Phuong Tran, Laurie Scolari

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Updates	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• MIPC Discussion<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Technology Committee○ Governance Eval• ACCJC Peer Review Team Report<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ SLOs○ ILOs	
MIPC Discussion - Technology Committee <p>MIPC has assigned VP oversight of the Tech Committee to Laurie Scolari. The committee's work is expected to begin in the fall, aligning with both the district's 2025–2028 Tech Plan timeline and the EMP. The committee will also revise the Decision-Making Chart to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the various participating groups and will identify additional members as needed to ensure balanced and appropriate representation.</p>			
MIPC Discussion - Governance Evaluation <p>MIPC endorsed the IEC's recommendation to conduct a governance evaluation survey, which was distributed to college employees and ASFC MIPC representatives. The survey will remain open for two weeks. Preliminary findings will be shared with the IEC and MIPC on June 6th.</p>			
ACCJC Peer Review Team Report - SLOs <p>Dolores Davison was identified as the 2025–26 SLO Coordinator and is organizing in-person SLO training sessions in response to faculty preferences. These sessions are scheduled for September 8–9 and 10–11 and will follow a structure similar to last summer's RSI model, spanning two to three weeks. The training will be integrated with the Futures Summit and the Leadership Retreat, both taking place in September. In addition, Dolores will meet with departments and divisions to provide guidance and support throughout the SLO process.</p>			

ACCJC Peer Review Team Report – ILOs

The ILO survey remains open until May 18. Revised ILOs are expected to be presented at the next Academic Senate meeting and to MIPC in June. The committee also recognized the need for a future discussion on integrating CAP outcomes with ILOs.

Additionally, the committee discussed the role of Administrative Unit Outcomes, noting that while they are not currently in practice, there should be documentation and evidence of strategic planning efforts within administrative areas to ensure compliance with accreditation standards.

Program Sustainability Proposal	Voltaire Villanueva	Program viability proposal presentation	1:30-2:00
---------------------------------	---------------------	---	-----------

Voltaire presented the Program Sustainability Review (PSR) proposal to the committee, outlining its purpose as a structured, transparent process designed specifically for academic programs that may require additional support or potential discontinuance. The proposal seeks to clearly distinguish the PSR process from program review and ensures that it is governed by the Academic Senate, with input and participation from the IEC and MIPC. The committee engaged in a robust discussion, raising several key considerations to refine the proposal:

- The need to incorporate safeguards to prevent the PSR process from being misused (e.g., due to interpersonal conflicts or bias).
- The importance of communicating and establishing data thresholds and expectations, clear documentation, and a tracking mechanism—particularly to identify recurring PSR triggers for the same program over time.
- The need for flexibility in trigger criteria, recognizing that each program has unique characteristics.
- The role of the IEC as one of oversight and evaluation of the PSR process itself, rather than one involved in the operational decisions about individual programs.
- Recommendations to initiate a PSR must be grounded in data-informed justification.
- Faculty/staff representation from the program under review should be limited to maintain team neutrality and balance.

The committee agreed that IEC's feedback would be incorporated into the next iteration of the PSR proposal. The revised draft will then be presented to the Academic Senate for further discussion and consideration.



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

SVE 2.0 Follow-Up	Ajani Byrd	Alignment of SVE 2.0 in the Planning Calendar 7-year cycle	2:00-2:30
<p>The committee discussed challenges of the Strategic Vision for Equity (SVE) and the Student Equity Plan (SEP)—differing timelines of each plan—and questioned whether SVE 2.0 should remain a standalone document or be integrated into broader institutional planning efforts, such as the Blueprint for Success 2030 (formerly EMP).</p> <p>A major part of the conversation addressed how to elevate the visibility and impact of the SEP 3.0. Members expressed concern about the risk of equity being included only superficially, without meaningful accountability or measurable outcomes, especially for diverse student populations. While some proposed positioning SEP 3.0 as the institution’s central equity framework—potentially eliminating the need for a separate SVE—others emphasized that SVE uniquely addresses areas like culturally responsive pedagogy, which are not robustly covered by SEP 3.0. To preserve these instructional equity components, suggestions included creating a local addendum to SEP 3.0 or embedding these elements into Academic Senate work or district-wide initiatives. The committee also agreed that the IEC should serve as a key reviewing body to ensure equity goals are explicitly integrated and aligned across college planning documents.</p> <p>Given that the future of SVE 2.0 depends on pending guidance from executive leadership, the committee reached consensus to remove it from the planning calendar draft while leaving open the possibility of revisiting it at a later time.</p>			