



FOOTHILL COLLEGE

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

Integrated Planning & Budget Process Task Force May 20, 2009 Notes 4:00PM President's Conference Room

Agenda

1. Reflection and discussion on feedback received so far
2. Roles and products of each committee or council
3. Don't leave "planning" out of integrated planning and budgeting.

Team Members Participating:

Maureen Chenoweth (CS), Shane Courtney (ASFC), Dolores Davison (AS), Konnilyn Feig, Daniel Peck, Lucy Rodriguez, and Katie Townsend-Merino.

Next Time (If we're able to do everything over email, then no meeting on May 27th).

1. Talk about criteria list for Fast Track to Innovation
2. Add in description for Research Group
3. Committee list for next time.
4. Finalize draft for next week so it can get to all the groups.
5. Won't meet on June 17th

Notes:

1. ASFC Feedback about Membership
 - a. A motion was passed asking that the CPC include 4 students.
 - b. Student Trustee: Representative is supposed to be as involved as much as possible around campus. It is imperative that student trustee be involved on CPC.
 - c. ASFC was not aware that students who were assigned to Roundtable were not going because the students were not held accountable. This will be solved by holding students accountable through a system where students report back. If students cannot commit for a year - then they cannot apply for the position.
 - d. What about 3 student voters and 1 ex-officio student? Shane doesn't think this is fair because he's supposed to represent 18,000 students.
 - e. As a year trial, the voting students would be the ASFC president, the student trustee, and two more ASFC students.
 - f. This whole process is new and on probation - not just the student members participation in the governance committee.
 - g. Our experience with Classified Staff is that people had Banner training on short notice. The College Planning Council supercedes Banner training.

- h. Another idea is having asynchronous meetings and keeping all the information online - however the taskforce felt that a standing meeting time needs to be scheduled.
- 2. Attendance problems
 - a. Not just students, but everyone has to come to all the meetings so that the groups they represent actually have representation. It's not fair for people to only show up when decisions are being made or after they are made, but not have participated in the discussion or done their homework on the decisions.
 - b. We collectively agree that attendance is an issue for every constituent. It needs to be communicated that important discussions will happen at the College Planning Council that constituent groups will not want to miss. A probationary year will be given to every group.
- 3. At the end of the day are the decisions sound?
- 4. ASFC Feedback about committee Structure
 - a. It sounded like it was a better structure than the last one.
- 5. Academic Senate Feedback about committee Structure
 - a. Every Foothill faculty member received the IPB proposals in an email from Katie Townsend-Merino.
 - b. Although the structure looks bureaucratic, it's partly unavoidable because the nature of including every constituent in decision-making is inherently bureaucratic.
 - c. There's fear among the faculty about changing how decisions are currently made - even though they will be more responsible for decision-making.
 - d. For the most part, faculty have liked the organizational structure. There's a lot of cautious optimism. There's a tendency to revert back to old behaviors and people are worried it'll devolve back into the old form.
 - e. There's a lack of understanding that Ed Resources no longer exists. It needs to really be communicated that if a committee or task is not on the chart, then it doesn't exist as part of the governance structure.
 - f. Resource allocation only really happen once a year.
- 6. Classified Senate Feedback about committee Structure
 - a. The Classified Senate was delighted with the direction of greater inclusion of staff and noted that they recognized and honored the primary reliance areas of the Academic Senate and appointed faculty in cases where there are clearly academic proposals, situations, and solutions needed, as well as value input from the faculty when it comes to clearly administrative or student service unit plans and proposals.
 - b. With greater inclusion, staff want to ensure that they are allowed to participate. The taskforce noted that in cases where appointed staff couldn't participate - it typically involved individual cases that needed to be resolved not by this taskforce. The understanding is that staff will participate in the shared governance processes.
 - c. The Classified Senate suggested that a specific set of guidelines be developed about the structure and processes for proposing uses of funds, as well as cutting funds.

- d. A transparent reverse process is essential and communication needs to come back down - especially regarding cuts.
 - e. The Classified Senate suggested that there needs to be a built-in evaluation process and the taskforce is working on it.
 - f. Broad participation is necessary and although the classified staff had representation on the development of the academic program plans - there has been no mention of the student or administrative program plan where staff input is most needed.
 - i. Because all the program plans need to be aligned, the team that developed the academic program plan will also develop the administrative program plan. However, no one knows the status of the student services program plans or when they will be developed or who is involved. When the student services plans do get developed they need to include classified senate representation.
7. Committees in General
- a. Going forward - we need to ask if all the committees that exist on campus are needed going forward. The reason for this is so that many of these can be integrated or streamlined. Also committee reports and plans will fall under this structure.
 - b. There's a lot of work here at different levels - but it's not the role of the Taskforce to do everything - other people and groups need to develop that.
8. Committee Roles and products
- a. One suggestion was to include any brand new program proposal under the purview of the College Planning Council in order to determine if that new program is sustainable or not. There was some discussion about the role of the Academic and Professional Matter Group in discussing the sustainability of new programs. Right now new program development seems to fall under its own independent process. Where does program development fit in here? New programs need to come to CPC so that new programs can be reviewed for financing as well as a mission check, etc.
 - b. The College Planning Council is the highest shared government group on campus.
 - c. Daniel's will write up a description of the Research Advisory Group.
 - d. It should be the role of the Vice President of Educational Resources & Instruction to participate in the Operational planning committee and to attend these meeting as an ex officio member. It was noted that being ex officio would be a shift from the current model and like everything present a challenge to not devolve into past practice.
 - e. Where does program development fit in here? New programs need to come to CPC so that new programs can be reviewed for financing, mission check, etc.
 - f. Travel Careers was taken to Ed Resources first and then to APM.
 - g. Dolores disagrees with taking out student learning.
 - h. Change number 8 to "makes recommendations regarding budget adjustments when required"
9. Memberships: The memberships were discussed and changes were made to the membership list. Roles and responsibilities were also discussed. Katie will be

adding these comments to the next rendition to be sent out with next Wednesday's agenda.