

Budget & Planning Committee Meeting
Minutes
July 25, 2012

Attendees: See attached list.

Associate Provost Llana called the meeting to order at 11:05 am.

1. Approval of Minutes from May 8, 2012.

Karen Kaplowitz would like the minutes to be amended on page 3, second sentence. She is suggesting the removal of the statement “if plans are due prior to that date, the BPC will review plan as submitted to the University.”

The minutes are approved as amended and will be recirculated to reflect the changes.

2. Update on SPS/FPS Recommendations for FY2013.

Associate Provost Llana opened up the meeting by describing the joint SPS/FPS meetings since the start of the spring semester. In total, the group met about nine times. The purpose of those meetings was to develop recommendations and proposals for the FY2013 financial plan. He asked the committee to look at the “Financial Plan FY2013 Recommendations” document, as those recommendations have been approved by the committee. (attached)

SVP Pignatello noted the fact of greater consultation with this financial plan and that we are discussing it with time yet to make further recommendations. Currently there is no set Financial Plan, nor is there a due date for the Financial Plan, but SVP Pignatello would like the BPC to be more involved in the plan. We ended the last year with a larger surplus than anticipated; we are carrying over \$3.2 million into this year, due in part to accruals and underspending in OTPS. We received the budget allocation in June, earlier than we expected based on the past. The Compact allocation is about \$4.4 million, but there are required deductions and constraints. And since we spent money against it in advance, we have a net at this point of about \$1.4 million. Expenditures such as fringe benefits for the full-time faculty members John Jay plans on hiring is included in the Compact. He also says the College is in better shape this year, than ever before. With enrollment at John Jay increasing, so does revenue. This will have a positive effect on our budget as it will give us funding to hire full-time faculty, lift the hiring pause, and market John Jay to recruit and attract more students to the College. This in turn will lead to more revenue for John Jay.

Ned Benton pointed out that some positions in the plan were never approved explicitly by the planning subcommittees. Patricia Ketterer reminded Ned that agreements were made in advance for certain critical positions, but Ned argued for explicit approval for all positions.

On the SPG positions, Jim Llana said that SPS/FPS did discuss the commitments, along with those for new faculty and new professional advisors, but a vote was not taken for each particular position. The SPG initiatives were discussed and approved in general,

and targets set for enrollment and academic preparation. Tom Kucharski said that the decision was approved conceptually, but there was no discussion of each position, which should have taken place.

Rob then discussed the recommendations the subcommittees made to President Travis. The ESM took those recommendations under advisement and made changes to them based on their thinking. Their recommendations were presented in the document "Summary of Investment Proposals." (attached)

According to this plan, faculty hiring is a priority. John Jay is looking to hire 24 faculty members. With enrollment numbers increasing, it is important for John Jay to hire more faculty members to support the increasing number of students.

Ned requested a line by line comparison of the budget plans. Pat agreed to send Ned these documents, which has a side by side comparison of the original proposal, the SPS/FPS proposal, and the proposal presented at the July 25 meeting. She also wanted it to be understood that the initial goal was to hire five additional lecturers, which would be funded by the Compact. The 7 – 10 tenure-track hires were based on the recommendations of the subcommittees. SVP Pignatello reminded the group that the recommendations were broad.

Provost Bowers moved the conversation to Distance Learning. There was a "pre-meeting" on this subject with faculty, so there is no need to discuss now. She stands by her intention to pursue distance education. There was some discussion of distance education funding, particularly with regard to personnel funding from the student technology fee. There is some urgency to move tech personnel lines off the Tech Fee budget, since it must also carry fringe benefits, but the Tech Fee Committee agreed to fund the Distance Education Director for this year.

Charles Nemeth recommended combining the position for Multimedia Designer, and Instructional Designer into one position. He thinks it is too grandiose to hire two separate people for those jobs, when ideally one person can fill those roles. Karen agreed with his recommendation.

Karen also discussed the initiatives for Veteran Affairs. While the committee approved the proposal Berenecea recommended, Karen thinks there should be room for an additional advisor.

Rob went on to discuss SPG. Commitments to SPG were made last year, but it was pushed to this year. SPG is also asking for more funding for marketing purposes, and research in 5/6 different areas. Jane acknowledged the committee's request to see evidence of efficacy of these strategies, and has agreed to present data to support the budget request.

Karen would also like the report to include the number of conditional students enrolled at John Jay.

In reference to the document "Summary of Investment Proposals," Ned asks why the SPG budget is \$358,401, but in document "FY2013," the budget is about 1 million. If the budget has been cut, where has that money gone? Rob responded that the \$358,401 is the amount from last year. The request for additional funding is for FY2014, and it is to the amount of \$900,000. The College will need to prioritize what will be necessary to meet the enrollment targets and goals.

As the University requires a minimum one percent surplus, John Jay cannot spend revenue to the last dollar. As such, International Partnerships will be pushed back a year. However, a Space Consultant, recommended by SPS/FPS, remains in the proposal. SVP Pignatello suggests that Scott Paige may be the consultant John Jay picks, but it is imperative that one is hired, especially if John Jay is hiring more people.

SVP Pignatello would also like to discuss funding for student housing, as it can make John Jay more attractive to prospective students. Ned would like to know, "What are the priorities? What are the risks, and commitments we are willing to make?" in relation to student housing. He recommended a written plan be drawn up before the next meeting. Interim Student Affairs VP Tom Stafford added that student housing will require significant funds and require careful planning.

As the meeting drew to an end, Tom K. asked whether or not a Space Consultant has been approved conceptually. SVP Pignatello answered and said that John Jay cannot hire a consultant if their duties have not yet been decided. However, Ned reminded the group that Associate Provost Llana will set up three meetings in the fall with the SPS to specifically discuss space.

The meeting ended at 12:20

Next Meeting: September 14, 2012, 1:40 pm