

Joint Meeting: FPS-SPS
Minutes
April 3, 2012
2:50 – 4:00 pm

Present: James Llana (*SPS Chair*), Robert Pignatello (*FPS Chair*), Ned Benton, Jane Bowers, Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Karen Kaplowitz, Staci Strobl, Harold Sullivan, Carina Quintian, Ricardo Anzaldua, Pat Ketterer, Inez Brown (*Recorder*),

Absent: Richard Saulnier, Maki Haberfeld, Francis Sheehan, Anna Singh, Gina Galligan

1. Approval of Minutes for March 19, 2012. Minutes were approved with amendments from Jane.
2. Strategic Priorities Discussion. Jim led a discussion of the Strategic Priorities. Using examples from the Provost (*see handout*), Ned presented his strategy for determining the impact/priority of the goals in a way that shows how each goal would affect the achievement of objectives. Several agreed that this would be a good way to present the results. A suggestion was made that the last two columns be used to describe exactly what the money will be spent on. Jim asked that we state the goals as particular targets where possible, to focus attention on specific actions and to make assessment of progress easier and more obvious. For example, instead of listing retention or hiring advisors, we should aim for an increase in the percentage of students who see advisors.

There was a brief discussion of some key issues that need to be addressed under retention. Tom pointed out that Degree Works falls out of date, and thus offers bad information, unless it is continually updated. Jim reported that Cheuk Lee will be reprogramming Degree Works to reflect the recent curriculum changes. There is currently a time lag between changes approved by governing bodies and implementation in various systems. With the new Pathways everything will have to be reprogrammed and there is concern regarding what this project entails. Jim will pose the question to Richard and ask him to respond to the group. It was suggested that perhaps this could be more sustainable if consultants were used to address this matter. Some felt as though consultants would not suffice because the project is more than just programming because knowledge of the curriculum/courses, and other institutional knowledge, is required in order to effectively implement the changes. It was stressed that this group really needs to evaluate these types of scenarios.

Tom expressed his ideas of having a fourth goal focused on space planning. Jane agreed and stated that despite the new building, there are several departments that are already pressed for space. There is no additional room available, but perhaps repurposing could be a viable option once the college receives the Certificate of Occupancy. He noted that there is open space in Psychology that could perhaps be reconfigured for some other use. Rob followed up with some comments regarding additional space by stating that the idea of getting a new building or additional space from the University is not likely or even feasible right now. Also, there is no additional space available at 54th Street because it was recently occupied by several large departments, HR and Business Services. Karen commented that we should fully utilize North

Hall so that when the time comes to move out of that space then the argument for additional space is stronger.

Discussion around a fourth goal: Ned agreed that there should be a fourth goal but it should encompass more than space; it should be integrated planning that encompasses ENR, financial, space and personnel. He also suggested that perhaps the goals should be divided into two categories: programmatic and instrumental. Pat explained that integrated is more of the “How?” the college achieves its goals. The challenge is focusing our attention on making sure we actually do this. It was also noted that there are several aspects of planning that are beyond the control of the college, i.e. the monies for space come from elsewhere. Karen believes the fourth goal should be to increase staff (HEOs) – non-teaching instructional. Jane would like to put this in more of a context regarding where and how and would also include increasing revenue as a top goal as well. It was also noted that stabilizing enrollment and increasing revenue should be separate goals. Carina questioned what exactly does the “stabilizing environment” mean? There seems to be a real problem with the connection between revenue and enrollment. Jim stated that recalibrating is necessary so that ENR provides us with a budget, but we do not have a grasp on the numbers. Jane commented that as of right now the college’s budget really depends on meeting the stated objectives: 1) stop the decline; 2) meet our projections; 3) move in the direction of a different mix and profile of students (level, quality and identity). What is our target? What do we aspire to? We are doing a disservice to students if we bring them in and they cannot succeed or if they have challenges meeting the basic qualifications. Rob commented that before the college can grow it must first stabilize and that there should be different categories: *Stabilizing and Strategically Growing; Grow/Develop Other Revenue Streams; Restoring Faculty and Increasing FT Coverage*. We should be as specific as possible because we are creating an actual budget document. Jim will come up with more precise language that reflects what was discussed, in order to write the goals.

3. Updated Financial Projection Including Budget by Division. Pat led an in-depth review of the original financial plan and out-year projections (for 3 years) and reviewed the 3rd quarter preliminary budget report [see attachment]. The budget by division was not distributed or discussed. Facts about the financial plan projection: there was an increase in adjunct spending; an increase in some Administrative Staff; an increased Year-End surplus due to assumptions regarding OTPS savings. The out year projection assumes the same level of COMPACT funding as what the College received in FY 2012. The compact funding is net Philanthropy, Financial Aid and Productivity (target has to be met). The increase in adjunct spending was due partially to an increased number of sections taught (the shift in the ENR mix has had an impact and there are more upperclassmen), and the fact that the college lost some faculty. It appears the adjunct projection was not realistic; as we are currently spending \$800K over the budget. The spending on full time faculty decreased, however; the initial workload report states that FT faculty taught roughly the same number of courses. It was noted that faculty attrition in the out years has not been factored in. The nine subs are budgeted for FY 2013 and at some point they will be converted to FT lines; they are being funded by the increase in ENR. Pat noted that the tuition

increase provides the funding for- the COMPACT allocation; there has been no word yet about the actual allocations for next year. She also stated that the hiring plan assumes that people who leave will be replaced. However, there is \$770K worth of savings because there is a time lag between when people leave and when they are replaced. All faculty being paid now will be paid in 2013 and 2014.

The joint committees decided to discuss the Master Plan (MP) further at the next meeting. Jim will place this item on the agenda.

The exception to the pause for a new position related to Special Opportunities was brought to the floor, but those in attendance decided not to vote on this item today. There was concern regarding programmatic investments until other things are resolved. Jane stated that she understood the concern and offered commentary that Brooklyn College has a robust Special Opportunities office and they have the highest number of Rhodes Scholars; to be successful in this area the College will have to invest in it.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.