

**Budget and Planning Committee Meeting
Minutes
August 20, 2012**

Attendees: Carlton Jama Adams, Seth Baumrin, Ned Benton, Jane Bowers, Kinya Chandler, Jannette Domingo, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, Patricia Ketterer, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Thomas Kucharski, Nilsa Lam, James Llana, Anne Lopes, Robert Pignatello, Richard Saulnier, Francis Sheehan, Peter Shenkin, Larry Sullivan, Kenneth Holmes, Nana Akuba Chinebuah, Mehak Kapoor, Jeffrey Aikens

Associate Provost Llana called the meeting to order at 11:08 a.m.

1. Approval of Minutes from July 25, 2012.

Minutes were approved without amendment.

2. Review of the Financial Plan for FY2013.

VP Pignatello led the discussion about the financial plan. The financial plan will not be due on August 21, as previously reported. The College asked for an extension, which was granted by CUNY; however, a plan will be submitted to CUNY next week. He apologized for the delay in getting information to the Committee. We were planning on incorporating the increased revenue from tuition next year, but the University did not want us to factor that into the financial plan, something we discovered at the last minute; without being able to count on that extra revenue, we had a \$700,000 variance, due to higher than anticipated adjunct costs and lower than expected summer revenue, and so we had to re-work the budget numbers, hence the delay.

He continued with a discussion of the document "FY 2013 – 2015 Financial Plan Update." Currently, the investment proposal which was discussed at the last meeting is still intact, but to bring the out-year budgets into balance, we have had to slow the pace of non-instructional hiring, and we will have to track the accruals from vacant positions very carefully. We will maximize our return from the Compact funding by substituting some OTPS for salaries, to avoid using the Compact allocation for fringes. The result is a larger surplus for FY2013. The faculty hiring plan will not be affected, and under this plan we are at a steady-state budget for 2015, not relying on CUTRA to cover projected shortfalls.

Enrollment Report

VP Pignatello invited VP Saulnier to share the enrollment numbers. Both freshman and transfer targets will be met for fall enrollment. The college is 26 students ahead of the target for freshman enrollment. For transfers, we are currently 50 students behind the target, but VP Saulnier is sure that the target will be met because transfer students

usually register later or are still completing paperwork. Grad students are lagging just a bit. These numbers are the results after the cancellation cycle ended. The college only canceled 550 students, which is less than the normal 750 – 800. He is cautiously optimistic that we will make our target; we are looking for an increase of 204 FTEs over last year. He also explained that the decrease in summer revenue could be attributed to the dissolution of year-round Pell.

In response to a question, Saulnier reported the following numbers:

Transfer students: target is 1454 with 1404 registered.

Freshman: target is 1856 with 1882 registered.

Of those 1882, about 220 of them are SEEK students. Half of the remaining freshman are regular admits, while the other half are conditionally admitted, so there are about 840 conditional admits.

K. Kaplowitz. also inquired about the number of students who failed the Math proficiency exam. Saulnier replied that the main reason for conditional admits was the math proficiency exam, not writing and reading.

K. Chandler inquired about freshmen who opted to begin in the summer session rather than fall. Do they get counted as part of fall enrollment? VP Saulnier answered by saying that there isn't a large number of freshmen who begin in the summer.

Provost Bowers reminded the group that VP Saulnier will give a more in depth presentation on fall enrollment at the next BPC meeting.

SPS/FPS Recommendations and Distance Learning

N. Benton then moved the discussion to the 7 recommendations from the SPS/FPS subcommittees. Originally, the SPS/FPS had a goal of hiring 7 – 10 new faculty members. The new investment proposal only budgeted for five new faculty members. He would like to know why the new plan is two short. VP Pignatello explained that because the President and Provost are pushing the Distance Learning program, the budget could not accommodate additional expenditures.

N. Benton argued that the numbers should have stayed in the budget until a governance policy on distance education is set. Provost Bowers said that she is in favor of keeping the Distance Learning positions in the financial plan. Positions in that department will be needed sooner rather than later. One position has already been deferred, but the other two are necessary, one of which has already been posted. The Summary of Investment Proposals dated 8/20/12 should be revised to indicate that the Distance Learning Instructional Designer (salary = \$55,782) should be deleted and the number of Academic Advisors proposed should be 3 at a cost of \$165,000. On November 2, Feng Wang will do a presentation about Distance Learning. Provost Bowers stressed the importance of building an infrastructure for Distance Learning, and to support their activities going on now and for the future. N. Benton would also like to know what the policies in Distance Learning are.

J. Adams said that the administration seemed to work on an "express track." While he agrees with Provost Bowers on the need to support distance education going on now, he pleaded for some balance. T. Kucharski also agreed with Adams and mentions that

job descriptions for the distance education positions should be brought back to the committee. J. Bowers suggested that the PVN could be reviewed in advance of the actual hiring, but not as a condition for it. She also noted that it was actually the administration that had been deliberate in moving the distance education agenda; it was the faculty that kept pushing for quick approval of the first online program. However, now the essential decisions have been made and distance, education will not stop.

K. Kaplowitz said that while she is not opposed to Distance Learning, she thinks that students are not served due to a lack of full time faculty: "I don't see how we can expand our brand nationally and internationally without supporting the students who are already here."

Provost Bowers shared that 2% of our instructional FTE's are online; the online students belong to us and they are being taught by our faculty. We want better management of the current program and plans for future expansion. VP Saulnier also informed the group that 99% of the online students are John Jay students, so it's not a matter of educating someone else's students.

J. Adams asked for data to show that online learning is good for our students. Dean Lopes responded that online programs have been helpful for the conditional math students. She added that we need the proposed positions just to serve existing online activities. We must improve what we have before we move ahead.

N. Benton argued that there seem to be so many different visions for Distance Learning. Director Wang originally wanted to have a three-year plan, which included plans for new students, master's students, and in time it would be self-funding. Now it seems as though the focus will be on students who are already attending John Jay. He would like clarity on the role of COGS and UCASC with regard to distance education programs. The different versions need reconciliation and to go through governance before further investment.

S. Baumrin said that Distance Learning is nuanced. There needs to be discussions regarding who should be teaching, policies, and compliance issues.

K. Chandler added that great strides have been made with the Center for Advancement of Teaching for online training. While it is important that we take care of the students who are already here, we can still support the building of programs to attract other students. Director Wang's job is to figure out how to approach distance learning generally. Specific programs need to be done with faculty; the Director cannot do this alone.

T. Kucharski is interested in knowing how far we intend to go with distance education.

K. Kaplowitz called for consideration of what other CUNY campuses have done regarding distance education. A. Lopes replied that all the campuses are interested and engaged.

R. Pignatello pointed out that hybrid courses could help with the space crunch, and that we could expect increased revenue with online programs.

Further Questions and Review of Recommendations

Continuing to review the 7 recommendations, N. Benton looked at stretching out SPG funding, pending further discussion. That has been done. He also inquired about using the Auxiliary Corp budget to fund recurring expenses, but VP Pignatello said that the Aux. Corp budget is usually reserved for food that cannot be paid out of tax-levy.

P. Ketterer added that \$46,000 of Aux. Corp already went to pay for a consultant, and the other \$58,000 is used for events, mainly student events with food.

Continuing on the list of recommendations: The Space Consultant has been included in the proposed plan. The International director has been put off, in line with the recommendations. With regard to the recommendation on a reserve fund, R. Pignatello observed that we are approaching that goal, but we aren't there yet.

There was a brief discussion of the Tech Fee, specifically moving staff out of the Tech Fee budget, something that has been discussed before. N. Benton argued that the Tech Fee Committee should be allowed to fund what it wants to fund.

T. Kucharski asked whether the College Assistant numbers were cut. P. Ketterer addressed the question and said that it is not a cut. During FY2012, John Jay largely overspent on the College Assistant budget, and we now have to live within the original allocation.

N. Benton asked if the college will reconcile the College Assistant budget and conversions. The answer was "yes." Kucharski pointed out that ultimately we will have fewer CA hours. That's correct, but we won't lose people, R. Pignatello added.

Discussion then moved to positions that are being filled. Who gives approval for these positions, and should there have been discussions of them?

P. Ketterer said these positions were part of the hiring plan. Some of these positions were outlined in the Compact, or SPG positions from last year. Some are replacements.

N. Benton questioned which positions were prioritized?

VP Pignatello answered by saying if there was a vacancy the President decided whether or not to replace the person. P. Ketterer added that last year there was a pause on replacing vacancies. Since there is additional funding this year, we can now fill those vacant positions. Those positions will still need the President's approval.

Tom K. also asked about the Space Consultant position as we are currently having space problems. J. Llana assured him that the college is proceeding with plans to resolve space issues: getting background information and scheduling SPS meetings. VP Pignatello added that the space problem is one affecting many departments, but they are looking for different approaches to fix it. Currently there is no "finish line."

Seth said that as a Chair, he has a responsibility to his faculty, but he never has any information to share with them when they ask about space.

K. Chandler also assured the group and said that she and Ynes Leon have been working on space concerns as much as possible.

Jeffrey Aikens then asked which spaces Student Affairs can utilize for events. VP Pignatello told him that the dining hall in Westport will be the designated area for student events.

Moving to a Vote on the Financial Plan

Ned then asked whether or not the committee will vote on the plan before it goes out. P. Ketterer informed Ned that the committee can vote on the recommendation that goes to the President.

J. Llana said that the BPC is the President's committee, but if a vote should take place, an official motion needs to be made.

VP Pignatello said that in previous years, the proposal went out late to the Committee, with little prior discussion. At the meeting there was a Powerpoint and a vote taken. But in years past, there was less input and development from the BPC. Considering how involved the BPC was in the development of this plan, he questions whether a vote was still necessary.

T. Kucharski thinks that the committee should vote. There was further discussion, and agreement to take a vote. N. Benton made a motion to approve the financial plan as presented, but he also wanted to vote on two amendments to it. The first amendment was to recommend that 7 to 10 faculty be hired, as opposed to 5 in the plan as presented to the Committee. Provost Bowers told the committee that additional faculty hiring plans will come along in the future. She would not support the amendment because in five years, the college will meet its target for full-time faculty.

K. Kaplowitz thinks that since we will be undergoing the Middle States accreditation process this year, it is important that there be a better balance between full-time and part-time faculty. Sixty-five percent of undergraduate courses are taught by part-time faculty members. This means that most students don't see a full-time faculty member until their junior year.

N. Benton remarked that the college wants to fill 66 administrative positions, but it is more important to hire full-time faculty.

Mehak Kapoor asks what the breakdown of faculty hired will be. Provost Bowers assured her that hiring will be based on departmental needs.

Jeffrey A. asked what the impact of hiring seven faculty instead of five would have on the budget. VP Pignatello said that the budget would need to be shifted. He also added that if a proposer wants to add more faculty hires, they need to indicate where the money would be coming from.

N. Benton suggested taking money from SPG, or looking at the list of 66 administrative positions.

The Committee voted on the following amendment to the resolution to accept the financial plan as presented: to fund seven to ten new faculty lines (instead of the five lines specified in the recommendation as presented). The results of the vote are: 10 votes in favor, 4 against, 4 abstentions. The motion to amend the recommendation carried.

There was considerable discussion of the second motion of how to pay for the additional faculty and related issues, and in the end it was withdrawn. The Committee finally took up the motion to recommend the FY2013 plan presented to the Committee, as amended by the preceding motion. The motion carried, 12 in favor, 3 against, with 4

abstentions. The Budget and Planning Committee endorses the Financial Plan for 2013, as presented to the Committee and subsequently amended.

Meeting ended at 1:03