

**Joint Meeting: FPS-SPS
Minutes, Revised (5/16/12)
April 19, 2012
4:00 – 5:30 pm**

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

Absent: Ned Benton, Staci Strobl, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for April 3, 2012. Minutes were approved with an amendment from Jane.
2. Strategic Priorities Discussion. Jim led a discussion of the Strategic Priorities [*handout is attached with notice of Agenda for May 10*]. **Strategic Priority #1 Restore Full-Time Faculty:** The discussion began with some clarification regarding the *Restore FT Faculty* strategy; the related target of raising full-time faculty coverage to 43% is related to 40 hires (over the next 3 years) and the metric is FTEs. It was noted that there are a lot of assumptions to be made here. It was determined that the current heading should be reflective of what we are actually doing – *Full-Time Faculty and FTE Coverage*. Further discussion ensued and Tom stated that the argument for more faculty is not always FTE related, so FTE should not be included in the priority. Sub-line vs. tenure track makes a difference regarding coverage, but we do not want too many subs; we are looking for permanent faculty. We will omit the reference to coverage and we will say, based on an observation by Rob, that we are “increasing” instead of “restoring” faculty. **Strategic Priority #2 Contribute to Better Retention by Hiring Professional Advisors:** Jim consulted Sumaya regarding professional advisors; there is a general assumption that retention will increase as a result of hiring professional advisors. He pointed to some indirect data in the handout showing that students in a nationwide survey (Noel-Levitz report) valued academic advising more than safety and security. He showed other data from the John Jay Student Experience Survey that indicate students don’t typically see an advisor, but conceded that it’s hard to draw precise conclusions from it. Jane informed the committee that Psychology and Science participated in an advisement pilot (82% and 81% of faculty respectively) where 50% of the target population was advised. Tom added that the Psych faculty really enjoyed advising. Jane would like to offer compensation, monetary or otherwise, for faculty advising. We let the targets stand except for the retention rate for freshmen entering in fall 2012; there we preferred “increase retention above level for entering 2011 freshmen,” a more modest aim. **Strategic Priority #3:** Rob asked for clarification about what was meant by “stabilize.” Richard recommended that the committee think more strategically about ENR and not just the numbers. He felt that the committee needs to begin to think about the dollar amount for each student and not simply and AAFTE (Annualized Average FTE). Targets would have to be established by target groups of students. This would be a fundamental change in how we think about the process; we have to focus on the sub-groups and how they contribute to the budget. For example, the most valuable student in the summer is the visiting student. It was also noted that the quality of students should change; perhaps the College could consider alliances with community colleges outside of CUNY – including New Jersey. This really is a proxy for the

Strategic Planning Group (SPG) initiatives; it is already partially factored in the budget. Richard stated that the AAFTE changes during the FTE process, but it's dollars that matter. Rob posed the question as to whether or not the College is structured to reasonably reach any of the targets. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) expects Distance Learning to fund itself after the first year; Jane stated that two years is more realistic. It is important that we come up with a revenue target and not an FTE target. Pat stated that she is working with Richard and Ric to develop FTE numbers based on ENR; they are working on this for the purpose of better projecting, but this will not be ready for next year. Richard does not expect the target until June; he needs this information in order to plan recruiting efforts. He also stated that it is a little more challenging to project ENR because of retention rates. The retention rate for new students has increased, but the retention rate for continuing students is flat. This is not surprising given the fact that the College has invested more monies in first year students. There was a discussion surrounding philanthropy, and Tom suggested that philanthropy be a separate strategy. The revenue streams interact but there is still a certain sense of functional independence, i.e. new programs, Distance Learning, etc... *The group consensus was to change the name of the strategy to **Contribute to Increased [instead of "better"] Retention by Hiring Professional Advisors.*** **Strategic Priority #3 Stabilize Enrollment and Revenue through new Recruitment and Marketing Plan:** The committee decided to keep the current AAFTE although everyone is aware of the fact that it is going to change. There was a discussion of SAT and CAA scores. It was noted that the College's retention is more related to CAA, which went up almost one full point this year. Karen suggested increasing the minimum CAA score by one point; Richard would like to see the next incoming freshman class before committing to this (around October/November). For now, the committee decided that the minimum SAT score should increase to 955 and the minimum CAA score should increase to 83.5. These numbers are subject to change based on additional discussion. The topic of graduate student targets was introduced. The committee discussed developing an enrollment strategy that relied not solely on increasing the number of students but on strategically targeting out-of-state students and graduate students. The higher tuition paid by out-of-state and graduate students would result in greater revenue and allow the college to be more selective in admissions that would in turn affect retention rates. It was noted that this is a huge discussion about mix of students, who are we admitting, are they getting jobs, etc... It was acknowledged that this is a long and complicated discussion that must occur, but will not happen before the end of this semester. Jim stated that other CUNY schools have a greater ratio of graduate to undergraduate students than John Jay. Richard also commented that we have almost zero non-degree students in our graduate programs; there is growth potential here. *The group consensus was to change the name of the strategy to **Increase Revenue through Strategic Enrollment and Marketing.*** Rob and Jim will discuss a fourth strategic priority for discussion next time.

3. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 pm.