



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

Office of Instruction and Institutional Research
(650) 949-7240 | <http://www.foothill.edu/staff/irs/>

Integrated Planning & Budget Process Task Force May 13, 2009 Notes 4:00PM President's Conference Room

Agenda

1. Reflection and discussion on feedback received so far
2. Job description of Tri-chairs and committee members
3. Potential discussion of criteria for Fast Track

Next Time (4:00 PM, May 20th, President's Conference Room)

1. Make the process chart less busy looking
2. Develop the description and products of each group on Google docs.
3. Send Katie your gmail account (once you create it) so that you can add to the descriptions and products of each group.

Team Members Participating:

Maureen Chenoweth (CS), Dolores Davison (AS), Peter Murray, Daniel Peck, Lucy Rodriguez, and Katie Townsend-Merino

Notes:

1. Admin council gave feedback to Katie, Daniel, and Peter.
 - a. Make the process chart less busy - it overwhelms the eye.
 - b. A concern was expressed about division requests going to all the different strategic initiatives - which people feel are equivalent to pots of money. Do the initiatives have dollars tied to them or are they just recommendation and prioritization bodies?
 - c. A concern was expressed about lack of divisional representation on each strategic initiative.
 - i. The committee discussed the value of having representatives who have submitted requests attend whichever strategic initiative group - in order to not lose their request in the translation of it.
 - ii. One to mitigate is the proposed written and posted communication about why or why not something prioritized a certain way.
 - iii. It was also recommended that a good model be developed so that after a couple of years - academic, administrative, and service unit program reviews be clearly written - so that a representative no longer becomes necessary.
 - d. A question about what goes to Fast Track for Innovation was asked - someone requested a rubric for what qualifies something to get fast tracked.

- i. Rubrics are backward looking assessments - and it's harder to be innovative with a rubric. Instead, the innovation needs to come from the bottom up and at any point in the process a recommendation can be sent to fast track when it appears to be very innovative - this doesn't necessarily mean it's automatically funded.
 - e. A concern was expressed that this process and structure simply won't work - but no explanation as to why.
 - i. The committee discussed traditional modes of planning processes and structures and recognized that this new proposed model values the Senates more - and perhaps the idea of a transparent, well communicated structure is scary or perhaps there is an assumption that people will find loopholes or the ear of a decision-maker without actually going through the process.
 - f. A concern was expressed that this process was "too bureaucratic."
 - i. Bureaucracy is a buzzword with negative connotations, yet in a public organization, the decisions need to include constituents, as well as be accountable to constituents. Although it may be attractive and tempting to make decisions without constituency input - the result is part of the dysfunction we're experiencing as a college today.
 - g. A concern was expressed about there not being enough students.
 - i. The student groups were solicited about this concern, and it will be revisited.
- 2. Roundtable gave feedback to Katie and Daniel.
 - a. A concern was expressed that College Planning Council would be overwhelmed by the amount of work going to them
 - i. The strategic initiative groups need to do their job well - so that the College Planning Council does not duplicate their work.
- 3. Next time we'll be discussing the roles and products of the College Planning Council and the Strategic Initiatives.
 - a. What goes in and out of each group?
 - b. The taskforce will work on google docs this week to come up with descriptions - Katie is heading up the process.