

Joint Meeting: SPS – FPS Meeting
Minutes
July 10, 2012

Present: James Llana (*SPS Chair*), Jama Adams, Ricardo Anzaldua, Warren Benton, Kinya Chandler, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, Pat Ketterer, Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Mariani Mewengkang (*Recorder*)

Absent: Robert Pignatello (*FPS Chair*), Jane Bowers, Carina Quintian, Richard Saulnier, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Anna Singh

Jim called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

1. Approval of Minutes for June 20, 2012. Minutes were approved as proposed.
2. Continued Discussion of Recommendations for Financial Plan FY2013. As the BPC will be meeting on July 25, final recommendations must be made. The BPC will meet again in September and later in the fall semester. VP Saulnier will make a report on the fall enrollment picture at the September meeting, and the BPC will hear a report on distance education at its second meeting of the semester.

Jim reported that the faculty proposal on faculty hiring was discussed at the ESM, and there was general agreement at that meeting to add five more full-time faculty lines to the plan. In addition, it looks as if we can add more faculty lines in the out years than the current plan calls for. Karen mentioned that Jane originally wanted to hire ten more faculty members. Ned suggested recommending to the President that Distance Learning be pushed back by a year. He also said assessment must be done to determine whether or not the “touching” strategy is working. Before trying the same strategies with the Graduate program, we should see if it has been effective at the Undergraduate level. By way of evidence for the success of the touch plan, Jim reported on Richard’s behalf that the enrollment numbers to date suggest we will make the fall targets. Of course we don’t have final numbers, but what we do have is very encouraging. Karen said that while enrollment may be up, she had heard from a reliable source that we have admitted a higher number of conditional students, not a good trend. She would like to know how many of the conditional students there are, and what the targets are. Ned agreed. He proposed having a five year plan to see what the goals are, and to determine if they are met. The committee agreed that having that information would be useful. Jama also added that it is important to have information earlier in the process. It will help us determine if we are adequately funding the agreements that have already been made.

Tom then discussed the importance of having an Enrollment Plan, other than simply getting more students. Currently, John Jay wants more students, but he thinks it is important to reach out to out-of-state students and grad students so we can get

students who pay more tuition, rather than just having more students as a way to meet revenue targets.

Jay asked whether or not the SPG has any plans set. Jim assured him that there are specific enrollment plans in the making, and he thinks it a good idea for the SPG to report more frequently to the sub-committees. The SPG work is fundamental because it is aimed at stabilizing enrollment as the basis for fiscal stability; everything else hangs on it. Ned expressed concern over what he's seen in SPG.

He then asked us to look at the chart he created based on staffing trends from 2007 – 2010 (attached). He raised the point that John Jay trends toward hiring more non-teaching personnel than faculty. Pat told Ned that we shouldn't look at the data in terms of "head count" but rather in dollars spent. Kim agreed with Pat, adding that the numbers do not reflect the number of part-time faculty John Jay hires. John Jay spends about \$12 million on part-time faculty, so using head-count as a metric gives a distorted sense of where the money is going.

Karen would like to suggest operating procedures so work can be more efficient and collegial. Arrangements should be made regarding receiving data. The Vice Presidents should create proposals explaining what the position is for. Jim agreed and said he will urge the other VPs to create short narratives to accompany budget requests in the future, especially if they cannot attend a meeting where the proposals are under discussion.

Ned then moved to adopt the document that he had prepared as the sub-committee recommendation, and it was seconded by Karen. Ned presented the group with a proposed balanced budget (proposals against available balance) based on what was discussed at previous meetings. (attached)

Maki objected because she disagreed with the idea of deleting the Director of International Programs position. Jama questioned whether or not Maki had any input in the budget proposal Ned drew up. There was some discussion of whether or not to select particular items for discussion, and there was agreement not to do that. After further discussion, Pat suggested that we base the recommendations on broad levels of priority rather than assessing each item. At this suggestion, Ned withdrew his original motion, and agreed to have the recommendations restructured to reflect priorities.

The discussion then turned to Distance Learning. Jim wanted to correct the sense that Distance Learning is a new program. John Jay has been doing Distance Learning for some time and at different levels; two task forces have studied it. It is well established and led by the faculty. There is a plan, which we have seen. The current proposal is needed just to ensure the quality of what we already do. We have received from Dr. Wang an explanation of how the proposal benefits current online programming. Ned said that though John Jay has had a Distance Learning program, there is no governance behind it; plans, allocations have never been presented. Tom argued that Distance Education will change what the faculty does. He referred to a proposal that would create a non-credit course for 10,000 students in Forensic Psychology. He also thinks Distance Education will move John Jay into a different direction, and discussions should be held before deciding if that is what the college wants to do.

A new motion was framed by working through the various recommendations with the following result:

Recommendation for the Financial Plan FY2013 from the SPS/FPS Joint Subcommittees:

- 1) *Prioritize hiring full-time, tenure-track faculty, with a goal of hiring 7-10 additional faculty.*
- 2) *Defer the distance education spending, pending completion of "Part A" and other related governance actions.*
- 3) *Stretch out the SPG spending proposals, pending assessment and evaluation of current efforts.*
- 4) *Provide funds for a professional consultant on space planning.*
- 5) *Support spending for student services.*
- 6) *Defer hiring a Director for International Partnerships, pending recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Programs.*
- 7) *Create a contingency fund for unanticipated expenses and other adjustments that may be needed in the course of the year.*

The attached document [Ned's proposals] illustrates a way to reconcile the need for reductions in spending with proposals presented.

The committee voted 6-0 in favor of the new recommendations for the FY2013 financial plan. As Co-Chair, Jim did not vote.

The meeting concluded with a request from Ned that SPS should have three separate meetings in the upcoming semester to address space concerns. Jim will propose a schedule for such.

Meeting ended at 11:45am.