



CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE AGENDA

STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE
Brookens Administrative Center, Meeting Room Three
1776 E. Washington, Urbana
Thursday, April 17, 2008 – 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS: Betz, Knott, McGinty

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
I. <u>CALL TO ORDER</u>	
II. <u>ROLL CALL</u>	
III. <u>APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM</u>	
IV. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u> a. April 2, 2008	1-4
V. <u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	
VI. <u>DISCUSSION REGARDING CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD STRATEGIC PLAN</u>	
VII. <u>OTHER BUSINESS</u>	
VIII. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	

1 CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
2 COMMITTEE MINUTES
3

4
5 **STRATEGIC PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE**

6 **Wednesday, April 2, 2008**

7 **Meeting Room 3, Brookens Administrative Center**

8 **1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

9
10 4:30 p.m.

11
12 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Betz, Knott, McGinty

13
14 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

15
16 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Kat Bork (Administrative Secretary), Deb Busey (County Administrator of
17 Finance & HR Management), C. Pius Weibel (County Board Chair), Robert
18 Rich (University of Illinois Institute of Government and Public Affairs)

19
20 **CALL TO ORDER**

21
22 McGinty called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m.

23
24 **ROLL CALL**

25
26 The Recording Secretary called the roll. Betz, Knott, and McGinty were present at the time of roll call,
27 establishing the presence of a quorum.

28
29 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM**

30
31 **MOTION** by Knott to approve the agenda; seconded by Betz. **Motion carried.**

32
33 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

34
35 **MOTION** by Betz to approve the Strategic Planning Subcommittee minutes of September 18, 2007 and
36 September 24, 2007; seconded by Knott. **Motion carried.**

37
38 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

39
40 There was no public participation.

41
42 **DISCUSSION REGARDING CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD STRATEGIC PLAN**

43
44 McGinty provided background on the original ten-point plan that received input from all County
45 officials and was developed into the Champaign County Strategic Plan. The County Board wants to make sure
46 it does this process right. McGinty re-introduced Robert Rich, who would assist the subcommittee by educating
47 them on strategic planning and providing structure for the plan. He encouraged the subcommittee to be thinking
48 about defining the County's vision.

49
50 Rich stated that he understood that the subcommittee was looking for an implementation framework to
51 serve as a framework for moving forward that both the County Board and the public could refer to. Rich
52 encouraged the subcommittee to stop him if he stated anything incorrectly about the County's plans. In looking
53 at the strategic plan, Rich asked if the plan embraces the values you as a board want to move forward with,

54 because then it is really a philosophy. He expressed it is important to ask what is the level of development and
55 economic growth the County Board's wants to emphasize. Referring to the second sentence of the vision
56 statement, he asked what the metric is for determining a safe and healthy environment for the citizens. The plan
57 has underscored education, which Rich found interesting because the County does not have a particular
58 jurisdiction the way it does with healthcare or the criminal justice system. Rich suggested the subcommittee
59 revisit the mission statement. The vision is a statement of direction as well as values. He was not sure they
60 have captured the direction.

61
62 Betz stated he does think the County has the diversity it values. He said land use policies can increase
63 diversity by allowing lower income development. The County has made diversity a priority with its
64 construction projects and workforce. McGinty stated it would make sense to have a separate value statement.
65 Rich said that was just what he was going to suggest. Many strategic plans have a separate value statement and
66 it is important to make it consistent. He next pointed out that a strategic planning process represents a roadmap
67 of how we get from here to there. He encouraged the subcommittee to think of implementation in three different
68 time periods: 1 to 12 months, 13 to 24 months, and 24 to 36 months. He stated one cannot go beyond 36 months
69 in the reality of trying to be operational. The next step is to use goals as building blocks for the strategic plan.

70
71 Betz asked what Rich meant by operational. Rich said it means each goal be feasible (not a Christmas
72 wish list), each goal be expressed in terms of the steps needed to get it done (some steps to occur in the three
73 time periods, some beyond), and the goals must be measurable in order to see if they have actually been
74 achieved. McGinty said it is difficult to put measurements on some County departments. Rich stated a
75 measurement is not necessarily a five-point scale; it is whether one can verify that a goal has been achieved. A
76 measurement can have a yes or no answer or a range. McGinty mentioned the Juvenile Detention Center and
77 the measurement of success would be in that type of institution. Rich wants to resist the notion that some things
78 are not measurable. When something is hard to measure, we implement multiple measures because a single
79 measure will not capture success. One of the goals is to define the range of success. Betz noted the Mental
80 Health Board has developed a matrix for measuring recidivism in an interesting way. Weibel added that things
81 can be measured in two ways, the goal and how far one has improved. Rich talked about revising the goals once
82 you measure what is achieved and see why or why not the goals were reached. McGinty said the County Board
83 could do a progress update towards the three-year goals annually at budget time. Rich suggested the
84 subcommittee determine for each goal how it is feasible, measurable, and expressed in terms of how it will be
85 done. Then the goals are broken into sub-goals for each time period. This is the first step for each of the goals,
86 and then you have your implementation framework. McGinty said Board members have talked about using a
87 dashboard metrics to quickly review the progress. Rich suggested they revisit the goals every four months
88 during the first time period and afterwards every six months. The review would look at the steps to see how the
89 County was doing. It may mean some additional sub-goals are established. Rich emphasized this is not meant
90 to be a straightjacket, it is meant to be a helpful framework.

91
92 Betz was worried about a political report card that might lead to revising goals to make them look more
93 achievable for political purposes. Rich said to not express it as a report card, express it as progress towards
94 meeting the strategic goals. He explained what constitutes success is a conceptual discussion, not a
95 measurement. Rich said Betz's point was well taken, if we are not there yet, it does not mean we have failed.
96 McGinty said this was excellent beginning. Rich was willing to return to another meeting to start on the goals
97 and facilitate the discussion of goals with the subcommittee. Weibel said the subcommittee should start this
98 process themselves and then have Rich review their progress. Knott asked Rich's advice on people not being
99 comfortable with strategic planning, how do we get most people on board. Rich suggested having a frank
100 discussion about how you will use it. This is an ongoing discussion, not a five-year plan or straightjacket. It is
101 important to say this is meant to be a dynamic management tool. The purpose of the four-month review is not
102 an evaluation session, it is a progress report. He wanted the County Board to understand they are after a
103 formative discussion on goals. They have agreed on goals and are having a midterm assessment. Betz stated
104 that broad goals are fairly easy to get agreement on. Rich noted that is why you have sub-goals. Betz some

105 goals will not be unanimous. Rich stated that being unanimous is not the goal. There are multiple measures of
106 success, not one. Goals adopted on a vote of 12 to 11 basis are difficult to implement and at that point it would
107 be hard to succeed. Betz raised his point because some of the goals could be split in that fashion amongst Board
108 members. Rich introduced the concept of readiness to implement as whether there is capacity in the County to
109 move forward with implementing goals. One of the ways to look at capacity is the level of consensus and
110 opposition. With a 12 to 11 split, there is not a high level of readiness at that time. Weibel asked for Knott to
111 comment on Board members against this. Knott replied some Board members see this plan as just an expansion
112 of government and that we cannot agree on it. Some Board members do not have experience with this type of
113 planning. Rich noted some people might have had negative experience with a strategic plan had been done but
114 then shelved without being implemented.

115
116 Betz said he has been skeptical of the process. His concerns in part are things like what occurred with
117 BigSmallAll where a great deal of money was spent and the report is now just sitting out there rotting. Rich
118 responded that the process is more important than the product. He is firm believer that strategic planning is only
119 as good as the process you use to get there. An implementation process builds confidence when people can see
120 a positive result. Knott said the County has resources to implement the strategic plan where other entities do
121 not. The budget will limit how much the County can do. Rich said the budget is very important because
122 sometimes goals cost more than originally thought and the planning process allows the Board to determine if it
123 wants to spend more money on a goal or not. Knott emphasized engaging all Board members early on some
124 difficult issues that they will not want to deal with. Knott said the budget process has generated more discussion
125 and gotten more consensus in the last couple of years. McGinty stated he did not want this strategic plan to sit
126 on the shelf. The County Board is the implementers; it is up to them to do it. It should be an autopilot method
127 of doing business. Betz asked, in terms of the procedures, if it done through this type of subcommittee or with a
128 full study session of the County Board. Rich stated his experience is to have this subcommittee prepare a draft,
129 and then take the draft to a full committee for discussion.

130
131 McGinty suggested the subcommittee take what they have today and do more work, then review it with
132 Rich. Rich encouraged the committee to email or call him because he could help clear something up. Betz
133 asked if Rich was suggesting they rewrite the strategic plan. Rich suggested they start with a new section called
134 "Values," then revisit the vision statement. You want to talk about the core County values that you are trying to
135 promote and then see if you are capturing it in vision statement. Busey remarked the vision statement could end
136 up being very different. Rich said they should consider what they want the County to look like 20 years from
137 now, what is an achievable dream. Rich recommended not going back to the County Board until the
138 subcommittee has goals and sub-goals.

139
140 The subcommittee agreed to meet on April 30, 2008 at 4:30 p.m. with Rich and on April 17, 2008 at
141 4:30 p.m. with just the subcommittee. Betz said they could almost have a chart of values and statements. Busey
142 suggested starting with the values and forget they have vision statement. The subcommittee could list all the
143 values of the County Board and then see if those values are covered. The subcommittee agreed.

144 OTHER BUSINESS

145
146
147 McGinty stated that he and Knott have started to discuss logistics of reducing size of the County Board.
148 Knott did some research and passed out information about what other counties are doing regarding their County
149 Boards' size. McGinty stated any reduction plan could not happen until after the redistricting in 2012. McGinty
150 has heard from many constituents that the County Board is too big and cumbersome. Knott had articles about a
151 county that did some strategic planning. The County Board makes the decision on the size and number of
152 districts. They could put an advisory question on the ballot to get the voters' opinion. McGinty and Knott just
153 wanted to throw this idea out on table so it does not get lost. McGinty stated the Board's size, the number of
154 Administrators, and the Board Chair's role are all interconnected. Knott noted it is easier to ask the question
155 well in advance. McGinty distributed a chart that showed the math of reducing the County Board to 18 Board

156 members. All of the committees would be reduced to seven members, except for the Policy, Personnel, &
157 Appointments Committee which would remain at nine members. Every County Board would serve on two
158 committees, except for the Board Chair who would serve on the Policy Committee and two other committees.
159 The outline would remove the Justice & Social Services Committee because the business of that committee
160 would be covered by the Nursing Home Board of Directors. McGinty would like to see a reduction in the size
161 of the Board as an advisory question on this year's ballot to help guide the County Board. Knott said it is
162 similar to the previous single member district question, in that it is an indicator, not an enforceable question.
163

164 Betz stated he thought they were skipping the whole process of goals and that this idea is a solution
165 before the process has been done. Betz stated one of our values is racial diversity and Champaign County has
166 one of the only racially diverse County Boards. He felt the County Board would lose its diversity with a
167 reduction in its size. He thought they are coming to a solution before we have followed the process and it
168 disturbed him. McGinty said the focus is on strategic planning. This is a side conversation between him and
169 Knott that they wanted to bring to the table. Betz noted the subcommittee is nowhere near goals statements. He
170 thought this goes outside of this process. Knott said they threw it out there to keep it in the mix. The ballot
171 question would have to be decided by August, so this fits the timeframe. Weibel agreed with Betz because they
172 have not set any goals about reducing the Board. Busey suggested it was too early to discuss this proposal
173 because the subcommittee could start looking at goals. There are five months between now and August, by that
174 time she hoped the strategic plan will be documented. This could be an outcome of a little bit later in the
175 process. McGinty said he understood, but was concerned by time flying and progress is not made. Knott and
176 McGinty were thinking aloud and are willing with have it go through process. Knott said he would not
177 apologize for bringing an idea to the table because often members do not. Betz said it is too early to discuss and
178 this could derail the entire thing. Knott said every county has its issues and they should not be afraid to talk
179 about it. Betz said if they are going to talk about reducing the Board's size, then he wants to talk about every
180 possible option of reducing it.

181

182 **ADJOURNMENT**

183

184 Meeting adjourned at 5:42 p.m.

185

186 Respectfully submitted,

187

188 Kat Bork

189 Administrative Secretary

190

191

Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.