2011-2012 Foothill College Integrated Planning and Budget Process Survey

The third year of our new Integrated Planning and Budgeting Structure is coming to a close, and with that we want to use this opportunity to gather feedback from all of those involved.

This survey will be used as our assessment of the process to move forward with a continuous improvement of the structure. Please provide us with your suggestions and feedback to make the structure more informed, efficient and transparent in the new academic year.

This survey closes on June 17th at 5:00 pm.



Process Overview

Background of the Integrated Planning and Budgeting Structure

Last year, in Spring of 2011, the annual shared governance survey demonstrated a need to update the program review process, re-define the Program Review Committee charge and role to fit the new governance structure and develop college-wide processes and procedures regarding program discontinuance. In Fall of 2011, the new Annual Program Review template was distributed to identified instructional, student services and administrative unit programs.

The goal of this template was to integrate data and trends, including comprehensive Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment reflections into planning at all levels of the college, starting at the program level. These documents also serve as a communication tool between faculty, staff and administrators. Please use this survey to give feedback on your experience with the Integrated Planning and Budgeting Structure at Foothill College.

For more information on the history of the Integrated Planning and Budget Structure, visit: http://www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/IPBP/

For a copy of the latest Governance Handbook, click here: http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/Approved_GHB_100511.pdf

And to get more involved and stay informed, visit the President's Governance site, here: http://www.foothill.edu/president/governance.php

The Planning Process

l ar	I am a/an:						
0	Student						
0	Classified Staff Member						
0	Part-Time Faculty						
0	Full-Time Faculty						
0	Administrator						
Pri	mary Campus:						
0	Foothill						
0	Middlefield						
Sel	ect all planning committees you were a member of in 2011-2012						
	PaRC						
	Core Mission Workgroup (Basic Skills/Transfer/Workforce)						
	Operations Planning Committee (OPC)						
	ASFC						
	Academic Senate						
	Classified Senate						
	(none of the above)						

Process Overview

Sel	ect all activities in which you were directly involved					
	Writing SLOs (Course, Program, Service Area or Administrative Unit Level)					
	Assessing SLOs (Course, Program, Service Area, Administrative Unit, or Institutional Level)					
	Reflecting on SLOs (Course, Program, Service Area, Administrative Unit, or Institutional Level)					
	Writing Program Review for your area					
	Discussion of Program Review for your area					
	Discussion and/or prioritization of resource requests					
	what degree have you seen SLOs (Course, Program, Service Area, Administrative Unit, nstitutional Level) integrated into the college planning process:					
0	Not integrated at all					
0	Slightly integrated					
0	Moderately integrated					
0	Highly integrated					
То	what degree have you seen Program Review integrated into the college planning					
pro	ocess:					
0	Not integrated at all					
0	Slightly integrated					
0	Moderately integrated					
0	Highly integrated					
Do	you agree that the Core Mission Workgroups and their objectives support SLOs					
(Co	ourse, Program, Service Area, Administrative Unit, or Institutional Level)?					
0	Disagree					
0	Slightly disagree					
0	Slightly agree					
0	Agree					
0	I was not a member of a Core Mission Workgroup					

	what degree have you seen the core missions of Basic Skills, Transfer and Workforce egrated into the college planning process:
0	Not integrated at all
0	Slightly integrated
0	Moderately integrated
0	Highly integrated
	what degree have you seen the Educational and Strategic Master Plan as informing the lege planning process:
0	Not informing the process at all
0	Slightly informing the process
0	Somewhat informing the process
0	Highly informing the process

Resource Allocation and Specific Processes

	And
(Cc	garding resource and staffing requests, to what degree do you feel learning SLOs ourse, Program, Service Area, Administrative Unit, or Institutional Level) were integrated to the allocation process:
0	Not integrated at all
0	Slightly integrated
0	Moderately integrated
0	Highly integrated
	garding resource and staffing requests, to what degree do you feel program review
we	re integrated into the allocation process:
0	Not integrated at all
0	Slightly integrated
0	Moderately integrated
0	Highly integrated
Int go	s year, Vice Presidents and ESMP Appendices plans (e.g. Science Learning Institute, ernational Programs, and Marketing & Communications) were invited to present their als and needs to PaRC. To what degree do you feel this informed PaRC about the nning and resource needs of these groups?
0	Not informative at all
0	Slightly informative
0	Moderately informative
0	Highly informative
0	I did not serve on PaRC

If you actively participated in a resource or staffing prioritization process (at a department,				
division, or committee level), indicate to what extent you felt adequately prepared in				
mal	king a recommendation.			
0	Not prepared at all			
0	Slightly prepared			
0	Moderately prepared			
0	Highly prepared			
0	(did not participate)			
feel	nking of your answer above, indicate which of the following would have helped you to I more prepared, please check all that apply:			
	Further/clearer instructions			
	Additional time			
	Additional information or data			
	Ability to ask questions of request makers			
Othe	r (please specify)			

Thinking about the following aspects of planning, please indicate to what extent you agree with each of the following statements

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
The Integrated Planning and Budget structure was clear to me	О	С	О	O	О	О
Program Review instructions were clear	O	0	0	0	O	O
Program Review components were thorough	0	0	0	0	O	O
Adequate time was given to complete Program Review	O	0	0	O	O	O
Data provided was sufficient to complete Program Review	0	0	0	0	6	0
Program Reviews were used in decision making	O	0	0	0	O	O
All members of your area were encouraged to be involved in planning	0	0	0	0	0	0
Discussion and decisions were data driven and supported by sound evidence	O	0	O	O	0	O
Overall I'm satisfied with the Integrated Planning and Budget structure	0	0	O	0	0	0
Other (places enesify)						

Other (please specify)



PaRC Processes

This question only for members of PaRC (skip this question if not a member).

Consider your experience on this planning committee. For each statement below please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Agendas and Minutes were distributed in a timely manner	О	O	С	O	О
Discussions usually followed the agenda	O	O	O	O	0
PaRC completed the agendas efficiently	0	0	O	0	0
PaRC had appropriate information to make informed planning decisions	О	O	O	С	C
Discussions were data driven and supported by evidence	O	O	0	O	O
All campus constituents were represented at PaRC	O	O	O	O	O
All members of PaRC were encouraged to participate in discussions	O	O	O	O	0
There was a sense of respect between members	O	O	O	O	O
Meetings were positive and constructive	0	O	O	0	0
PaRC was a worthwhile use of my time	O	O	O	O	O
Other (please specify)					
		A			

FH Integrated Planning Survey Spring 2012				
Additional Comments				
Please give us any additional comments or information that can help to improve the Integrated Planning and Budget Structure.				

Thank You

Thank You!

Thank you for your time. These are all the questions we have for you today. Simply click "Done" and then you may close your internet browser.

