

**Joint Meeting: FPS-SPS  
Minutes  
May 10, 2012  
2:50 – 4:20 pm**

**Present:** James Llana (*SPS Chair*), Robert Pignatello (*FPS Chair*), Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Karen Kaplowitz, Harold Sullivan, Carina Quintian, Ricardo Anzaldua, Pat Ketterer, Richard Saulnier, Maki Haberfeld, Inez Brown (*Recorder*), Ned Benton, Staci Strobl, Feng Wang, Bonnie Nelson

**Absent:** Jane Bowers, Francis Sheehan, Harold Sullivan, Kinya Chandler, Gina Galligan, Anna Singh

---

1. Approval of Minutes for April 19, 2012. Tom suggested that an important part of the discussion from the meeting was not reflected in the minutes. Since the matter seemed to involve more than adding a few words, Jim asked Tom to take some time to propose language for the minutes, and once that is done the minutes will be brought back to the group for approval at the next meeting.
2. Presentation on Distance Learning. Feng Wang, Director of Online and Distance Learning, presented his multi-year plan for distance learning – see *PowerPoint presentation for details (attached)*. Following the presentation several committee members expressed their concerns. Ned (*Re: page 13*) stated that there is a lot of attrition in the MPA program and asked several key questions: Have we looked at competition? What is our projected market share? Feng responded by stating that attrition was built into the numbers and that a market survey is currently being done. Tom expressed his concern about how the online program would get rolled out and the impact on FT faculty teaching on campus, and wanted to know how the College planned to manage this. There have been no conversations with the department chairs. Where is the plan for additional faculty? Certainly there will be an impact on FT and ADJ faculty, so a hiring plan is needed. The hiring plan must take into account the need for additional faculty, and there has to be an enrollment cap. Tom is concerned that the online program has not been fully thought out. It was noted that the proposed class size of 25 is in fact comparable to current graduate program classes. Feng stated that he was asked by President Travis and Provost Bowers to develop a revenue-sharing program which will allow for hiring faculty. There was discussion about several of the ideas and numbers presented by Feng. Ned felt it important to note that many students switch from a two- to three-year track, thus effectively reducing the number of students; Virginia noted that the average number of courses per student per semester is two. Ned suggested that instead of rolling out a brand new online program, that the College put the PMT program online in order to gauge the market and then take the next step(s) based on the response. The College could take the PMT degree and re-launch it as an online program of high quality with enhanced services for people in the area. Rob stated that the College does not have the discretionary dollars to adopt the model as presented; the College may have to implement a small pilot really well before embarking on the larger project. He posed two key questions: 1) Where are the funds going to come from? 2) How much can the College afford to invest in anything? Virginia informed everyone that there are high attrition rates for new online programs. No decisions were made and it was noted that this discussion will be continued in the future.

3. Tech Fee Committee Perspective on Distance Learning: Bonnie Nelson, Tech Fee Committee representative, discussed the Tech Fee's concerns regarding the monies used from tech fee to cover personnel services (*see handout attached*). The committee's plan was to take on the expenses for the technical personnel services temporarily, but the plan has gone in the opposite direction. There are now seven FT positions funded by the Student Tech Fee. The committee wants to have these positions removed from the tech fee; it is very costly because the tech fee has to cover benefits (33% of each position) and contractual increases for every position. A question arose regarding whether or not OTPS items could be covered instead of personnel. Rob stated that the College is currently looking into this, and reiterated how important it is for the College to be careful not to violate the guidelines regarding the use of tech fee funds. The College has relied on tech fees to help out with expenses, i.e. OTPS. Approximately one-half million dollars has historically been used to staff labs and supply departments with people and technology, and there have been very good results in terms of student satisfaction with labs. There is only \$250K to invest in new technologies. There needs to be a plan to reduce the personnel costs on the tech fee budget over time. Bonnie stated that they understand that the positions are valued and needed, but they need to come off the tech fee. Rob would like Pat to work with TAC to come up with a plan.

The next Budget Planning Committee is May 23<sup>rd</sup>. Jim requested that another meeting of the SPS-FPS be scheduled in late June in order to have a comprehensive look at the budget, in light of further requests that will be coming from the Vice Presidents. On Karen's advice, we will schedule that meeting right away. Rob noted that there is no commitment to when CUNY allocations will come out; the College will get it over the summer and be required to submit a financial plan in September. There is reason to believe that the COMPACT will be slightly higher. Tom expressed his concern that commitments will be made to the online program without further consideration of the issues. A key question needs to be asked regarding the online program: "Is this the vision of the College?" Karen noted that there was no time on the Faculty Senate agenda this semester to review the proposed online program plan. Ned believes that a version of an online program could be done in a less expensive manner. Pat believes that the College should do the market research up front to determine if in fact there is a demand. How much research has been done?

4. The remaining agenda items will be discussed at a later date. The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.