



Institutional Effectiveness Committee Agenda

Meeting 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
Admin Conference room #1901
March 25, 2025
Zoom Meeting ID: 862 1606 0987

Attendees: Bret Watson, Elaine Kuo, Kelaiah Harris, Voltaire Villanueva, Dolores Davison, Doreen Finkelstein, Lene Whitley Putz, Kurt Huel, Stacy Gleixner, Phuong Tran, Laurie Scolari, Ajani Byrd

Item	Presenter	Description	Time
Approval of Minutes		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• October 31, 2024• November 19, 2024• December 5, 2024• January 24, 2025• February 12, 2025	
Minutes approved.			
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	1:00-1:40
MIPC Discussion - Technology Committee IEC recommended that two items, the Tech Committee and the Governance Evaluation, be sent to MIPC for discussion. However, due to time constraints, only the Tech Committee discussion was completed. Key concerns included the lack of clarity in the presented flowchart, designated VP oversight, and committee membership. MIPC agreed to further discuss these items and report back to IEC.			
Governance Evaluation The governance evaluation discussion at MIPC was postponed to May. Given this timeline, two options were discussed. The first option is to proceed with the original plan of asking MIPC to define their role and what they want captured in an evaluation, which would delay the evaluation until 2026. The second option is to move forward with an evaluation using rec-			

ommendations from the IRP office, incorporating relevant questions from the 2021 governance evaluation into a shorter assessment to be administered in Spring 2025. Since there are no accreditation consequences for delaying the evaluation, the committee agreed to keep the governance evaluation discussion on MIPC's May agenda. However, they recommended conducting a formative evaluation in Spring 2025 and sharing the results in Fall 2025. IEC will continue discussions on evaluation content in future meetings.

ACCJC Peer Review Team Report – SLOs

Voltaire provided an update on the progress of SLOs. The Academic Senate SLO Workgroup has drafted an SLO framework documents and plans to convene an SLO Committee consisting of faculty representatives from each division. Additional faculty roles and the Office of Instruction will support the work of the committee as discussions continue. The Senate appointed an Interim SLO coordinator, Allison Meezan, with a 0.15 reassign time for the spring quarter.

The workgroup also reviewed current programs that regularly assess SLOs within their departments. While SLO discussions are taking place in some areas, they are not yet systematic. Departments like English and Math are being tapped to help develop a structured approach, potentially mirroring the RSI faculty support model. Plans are in place to form a faculty cohort group in the summer, and there has been discussion of incorporating SLO training into a spring flex day and faculty association negotiations regarding faculty service beyond instructional duties.

To align with 2024 ACCJC standards, Canvas will be used as the initial technology platform, with future consideration of tools like eLumen. The SLO framework is scheduled for Senate approval on April 7th. In the future, discussions will focus on integrating SLOs with existing initiatives such as RSI, ILOs, CAPs, and program review while ensuring the process remains meaningful and effective.

SVE and CCCCCO Equity Plan 3.0	Ajani Byrd	Update on planning documents	1:40-2:00
--------------------------------	------------	------------------------------	-----------

Strategic Vision For Equity

The purpose of the SVE is to go beyond the state's minimum equity requirements, addressing 13 key issues and 55 goals. The Office of Equity and Inclusion is collaborating with Stanford on an analysis of the SVE related activities. At this time, it remains uncertain whether another SVE document will be developed. The Office of Equity and Inclusion will lead the effort to tentatively reimagine and reflect on the SVE. Key priorities for Spring 2025 include confirming with Cabinet whether SVE should continue and, if so, in what format. If a decision is made to move forward with a SVE plan, summer will be dedicated to strategizing its direction and aligning it with the Educational Master Plan. By Fall 2025, an approach will be finalized and introduced to the college.



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

California Community College Chancellor's Office Equity Plan 3.0

Ajani and his office will lead the State Chancellor's Equity 3.0 Plan as Equity 2.0 concludes this year. Equity 3.0 will align with Vision 2030, with a strong focus on student educational plans. The Institutional Research & Planning office will serve as key collaborators, while the Educational Master Plan (EMP) will provide overall direction. A draft of the Educational Master Plan is expected by May and the IEC should be involved to ensure Equity 3.0 alignment to the EMP.

ACCJC Annual Update	Stacy Gleixner	ACCJC Annual Update presentation	2:00-2:30
---------------------	----------------	----------------------------------	-----------

Stacy presented the ACCJC annual report, which requires the college to submit data based on specific metrics set by ACCJC, along with locally defined goals. While certain metrics are mandated, there is flexibility in revising the college's local goal metrics. Since these goals were last approved by the Board in 2019 and last reviewed through governance in winter 2021, the committee suggested it may be time to revisit them.

The report includes data on enrollment and degree completion rates, prompting discussion about how these metrics align with the broader objectives of the EMP. There is potential value in establishing internal goals for specific degrees, student populations, or programs—not just to meet ACCJC requirements, but to inform institutional strategy and improvement.

A key concern raised was the ongoing decline in transfer rates and associate degree completions, likely linked to the enrollment drop during the pandemic. If this trend continues, it may require a focused institutional response. Given that the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) provides incentives for degree completions, strategic efforts to boost those numbers could have both academic and financial benefits.

The committee also suggested setting internal benchmarks to monitor progress and flag areas of concern. These benchmarks could support campus-wide, data-informed discussions and help guide equity-focused decision-making. Future discussions through the IEC could explore how such benchmarks align with the Educational Master Plan and institutional priorities.