Joint Meeting: FPS/SPS
Minutes
February 27, 2012
12:15 – 1:30 pm New Building Conference Center

Present: Jane Bowers, James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Karen Kaplowitz, Staci Strobl, Francis Sheehan, Harold Sullivan, Thomas Kucharski, Carina Quintian, Maki Haberfeld, Ricardo Anzaldua, Virginia Moreno, Ben Rohdin, Pat Ketterer, Richard Saulnier, Inez Brown (Recorder), Gina Galligan

Absent: Ned Benton, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for February 7, 2012. Minutes were approved without amendment.

2. Discussion: Planning Targets for the Committee. Jim led a discussion of the planning targets for the SPS-FPS subcommittees and informed the group the CUNY had recently published its goals & targets; the JJC goals and targets must align with CUNY’s. In developing the college’s plans he recommended that we identify strategic priorities that are few, consequential, and subject to measurement. When developing plans it is important to be inclusive of the wider college community because the Chancellor will ask the college in the PMP report to describe its consultation process on the PMP. Rob stated that it would be good if the SPS-FPS had enough meeting time to discuss the budget/financial plan, and stressed that the college should have a financial plan before the end of the fiscal year. He reiterated that we want to open the process up to other constituencies/college community.

3. Discussion: Meeting Schedule. Some of the suggestions regarding the SPS-FPS meeting schedule were as follows: Have shorter meetings with greater frequency; it was stated that community hour meetings are pretty booked so time slots should be considered. Another suggestion was to have very focused meeting agendas and perhaps address one key issue at a time. It was also recommended that applicable reports be distributed prior to the meetings so that committee members have time to read and digest prior to discussion. In response, additional SPS-FPS meetings will be scheduled for this semester.

4. Discussion: Expanding Consultation: The question Rob posed to the group was, “How can we make the College feel more a part of the process regarding how we spend funds?” Some of the suggestions given were as follows:
   a. Take the decision making process to the other college constituencies.
   b. FYI: Jane will be giving a special presentation regarding Strategic Positioning at the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) meeting scheduled for later this week.
   c. There should be a BPC meeting that is consultative and not merely a presentation.
   d. There is an inherent challenge in consulting with so many people. As plans are developed, they should be discussed widely in a number of areas and not just with this group.
   e. It would be a good idea to establish deadlines for input/feedback.
f. We could perhaps put up a website, mimicking the Gen Ed model, which allows the College community to input feedback regarding upcoming plans and/or recommendations.

g. Have the BPC host a public forum; the SPS-FPS could propose this idea to the larger BPC.

h. The proposed recommendations should incorporate the Chairs.

i. FYI: At the last meeting Pat distributed a document that lists the current budget reports available on Inside JJ. Some financial presentations are also available online and eventually all funds will be added. A suggestion was made that the reports be annotated so that they could be read and understood with greater ease.

5. Report: Mid-Year Budget and University Outlook for FY2013: Pat presented a budget report based on handouts distributed at the last meeting. Rob reported that outlook numbers are currently being revised. The revised plan will have assumptions about future year COMPACTS and breakdowns by categories. The big assumption is FTE growth; everything else is tied to this. 

Financial Plan FYIs: There are no COMPACT hires in the outyears; 40 new full-time faculty hires have been built into the plan – this would cover the new FTEs and have faculty teaching 70% of the additional courses. In response, some committee members felt the 70% coverage is not realistic based on the current teaching percentages for their respective departments.

Budget revisions also include the following items: $797K removed because it is not a recurring outlay from CUNY; reduction in tuition – the College met enrollment but the FTEs were not projected accurately because of issues related to FT, PT, Transfer, Freshmen and Graduate students; greater accruals in areas (may result in a ONE-TIME surplus); the College is projected to overspend for College Assistants in the areas of security and offices where there is a shortage of FT staff; $3.3 million is still available as of mid-year.

In summary, Rob stated that the College must continue to align budget operations and planning – revenue with expenditures. We do not want to rely on surplus from the previous year in order to make up the budget; we need to have recurring revenues in order to support recurring expenditures.

6. Report: Enrollment for fall 2012 and beyond. Richard gave an enrollment report [I will try to get these handouts sent electronically to members, Jim]. A question was posed regarding the increased number of FTEs projected, “Where will the growth be?” Richard responded that the student profile, mix, graduate programs and other things will determine growth. It was noted that a deeper conversation is needed just to understand where our capacity is because we are basically at 2007 levels for faculty and students.

7. Discussion and vote: Exemptions from the hiring pause. There was a very brief discussion regarding the positions to be exempted from the hiring pause (see handout from Pat). The committee members voted in favor of the exemptions.

8. Discussion of recommendations from item 2 above. To be addressed at a future meeting.