

Faculty Senate Minutes #353

Monday, February 22, 2010

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (37): William Allen, Spiros Bakiras, Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Adam Berlin, Marvie Brooks, Elise Champeil, Demi Cheng, Shuki Cohen, Edward Davenport, Virginia Diaz, Edgardo Diaz Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Janice Dunham, DeeDee Falkenbach, Joshua Freilich, Robert Garot, Jay Paul Gates, P. J. Gibson, Jessica Gordon Nembhard, Maki Haberfeld, Richard Haw, Heather Holtman, Karen Kaplowitz, Richard Kempter, Tom Litwack, Vincent Maiorino, Evan Mandery, Tracy Musacchio, Richard Perez, Nicholas Petraco, Raul Romero, Richard Schwester, Francis Sheehan, Robert Till, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Valerie West

Absent (12): Luis Barrios, Erica Burleigh, Beverly Frazier, Gail Garfield, Katie Gentile, Jay Hamilton, Nivedita Majumdar, Peter Manuel, Rick Richardson, Shonna Trinch, Cecile Van de Voorde, Joshua Wilson

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Announcements & reports
3. Approval of Minutes #351 of the December 4, 2009, meeting]
4. Election (by secret written ballot) of the 6 faculty members on the Search Committee for Associate Provost & Dean for Research and Strategic Partnerships
5. Election (by secret written ballot) of the 5 faculty members on the Student Admissions & Recruitment Committee
6. Presentation and discussion about the proposed protocol regarding students in crisis and the role of the faculty: Invited Guests: Vice President for Student Development Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Chair, Students in Crisis Task Force, and Director of Counseling Ma'at Lewis-Coles
7. Report on the February 16 meeting of the College Budget Committee: Senators Tom Litwack, Karen Kaplowitz
8. Report on the February 17 meeting of the College Council

1. Adoption of the agenda. Approved.

2. Announcements & reports. Noted.

3. Approval of Minutes #351 of the December 4, 2009, meeting. Approved.

4. Election by secret written ballot of the faculty members for the Search Committee for Associate Provost & Dean for Research and Strategic Partnerships

The Senate elected: Jama Adams, Bettina Carbonell, DeeDee Falkenbach, Josh Freilich, Cynthia Mercado, Nicholas Petraco, Karen Terry.

5. Election of the 5 faculty members on the Student Admissions & Recruitment Committee

The Senate elected: James DiGiovanna, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, David Shapiro, Keith Thomas

6. Presentation and discussion about the proposed protocol regarding students in crisis and the role of the faculty: Invited Guests: Vice President for Student Development Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Chair, Students in Crisis Task Force, and Director of Counseling Ma'at Lewis-Coles.

Because a student was in crisis, VP Eanes and Director Lewis-Coles were unable to meet with the Faculty Senate as scheduled.

7. Report on the February 16 meeting of the College Budget Committee: Senators Tom Litwack, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz [Attachment A]

Senator Litwack reported that we cannot know our exact deficit in the next two years because the budget from the State is unknown, but we will clearly have a large deficit and we will need to make cuts in our current spending.

Full-time faculty members are being exempted from the budget cuts. Adjunct faculty members are not being exempt. Our adjunct budget is about 10 million dollars but we need our adjunct faculty to cover all the course sections that our students need and so some of the savings must come from elsewhere. Senator Litwack explained that a proposed expenditure reduction process has been developed and was approved by the College's Budget Committee on February 22 [Attachment A].

Senator William Allen asked Senator Litwack to describe the process of prioritizing the budget; Senator Litwack walked the Senate through the document [Attachment A] and said that we had never done anything quite like this before and that there has never been a clear policy in the past about taking such actions. A question was asked about whether departments would be

allowed to keep the lines of people who retire to which President Kaplowitz replied that departments are never permitted to keep such lines; whenever a faculty member retires or resigns, the line goes back to a pool which the Provost allocates according to departmental need. She added that if a faculty member is non-reappointed in the personnel process, the line stays with the department; this is a way of ensuring that departments are not faced with the dilemma of having to decide between keeping a person who does not merit reappointment or losing a line.

Senator Litwack said he thinks the College may have to choose between filling vacant lines and firing other employees.

Senator Berlin asked whether the money paid for the Keeling report was really necessary. He said that such expenditures as those for consultants is a good place to start saving, and the Senate applauded. Senator Litwack said that even though he does not think the Keeling Report is very good, he sees the Report as being supportive of our need for higher standards at the college. Senator Berlin asked why the seal of approval of this Keeling group is needed, given that we all know that much higher standards are needed. He and many others spoke about their unhappiness with the January faculty retreat led by the Keelings; President Kaplowitz reported that she has informed Provost Bowers that the faculty were very, very unhappy with the Keeling retreat.

Senator Evan Mandery asked whether the contract with the Keelings can be disclosed to us and several Senators then spoke in support of our reviewing the contract with Keeling and Associates. Senator Litwack then made a motion, which was seconded, directing Karen Kaplowitz to obtain from the College administration copies of all contracts, including the scope of work, between the College and Keeling Associates. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote. A motion directing Karen Kaplowitz to inform President Travis and Provost Bowers of the negatives views of the Faculty Senate about the work thus far of Keeling and Associates and especially about the anger and disappointment with the all-day retreat on January 26, 2010, also passed by unanimous vote.

10. Report on the February 17 meeting of the College Council

The proposed major in Philosophy was approved; the new grade of FIN was approved; the creation of a Committee on Student Admission and Recruitment was approved; but the proposal for the creation of an A+ grade failed because the student members of the College Council opposed the addition of an A+ grade.

N.B. This document and the process described in it was approved by unanimous vote by the College Budget Committee on February 16, 2010, with two amendments clarifying language in the text.

ATTACHMENT A

Overview of Proposed Expenditure Reduction Allocation Review Process FY 2009-2010 though FY 2011-2012 *Draft February 9, 2010*

During the Spring 2010 semester, JJC will conduct a comprehensive review of its allocations, expenditures, and priorities for the next fiscal year and beyond. This is necessary due to several factors: it is anticipated that CUNY campuses will undergo another year of allocation reductions in FY 2011 with the possibility of even greater reductions in FY 2012; the College faces its own financial challenges with a projected multi-million deficit next year; and due to the College's continual transformation, existing resources and new ones must be steered toward high priorities. This exercise will involve developing and assessing a set of options in a very dynamic budget and economic environment.

Current expenses will be examined and placed into one of three categories: (1) expenditures that are necessary to carry out our core mission; (2) expenditures that, though not absolutely necessary, do support our core mission; and (3) expenditures that would serve some college or social good, but are not essential to carrying out or core mission.

There are a number of guiding principles that will underpin this process. They include:

- Everything is on the table;
- Protect staff to the extent possible;
- Minimize to the extent possible reductions that directly impact the instruction and direct student services or otherwise maintain core academic functions and capacity to serve students;
- Institutional Strategic priorities should guide decisions ;
- Safety should not be jeopardized;
- Focus on areas of investment and opportunities that can be achieved through strategic realignment of resources. Investments that leverage other funding sources should be encouraged/preserved;
- Preserve and enhance quality;
- Sustain and reinvigorate functions central to mission of the College;
- Eliminate redundancies and activities not essential to core mission;

- **Transparency-** process is open and inclusive. College community will be encouraged to share ideas on how to cut costs, operate more efficiently, increase revenue and improve institution effectiveness;
- **Actions considered** will be discussed with affected units and clearly communicated to College community;
- **Assessment of Impact** - What does the reduction mean to operations? How do the options we consider reflect strategic goals? Short and long term consequences should be identified;
- **Strategic choices** should be made as opposed to across the board actions. Vertical reductions can best preserve quality of academic programs and direct student services. Clear and explicit connections to college priorities must be included; and
- **Personnel reductions or action options** can take the form of- elimination of vacant positions, reorganization (transferring staff for existing areas to high priority areas), reduction of part time staff, increased use of revenue offsets.

The review will be designed to assess and prioritize expenditures in decision-making increments that encompass entire programs and associated positions. This is a departure from past practice, where budget management has focused on partial and across-the-board cuts and allocations made based on an historical basis and incrementally adjusted. Here budgets will be developed on the basis of analysis of the need for strategic investments in College priorities. However, current and anticipated fiscal conditions require substantial multi-year budget reductions that can only be achieved by cutting at the program scale. These ratings are intended only to identify positions for further review, and are not intended as a final determinant of the process. There are no plans for elimination of full-time active personnel.

Each position and program will be evaluated and classified by tier:

1. **Positions /Programs/Units** that are necessary to carry out our core mission of educating students;
2. **Positions/Programs/Units** that, though not absolutely necessary, do support our core mission; and
3. **Positions/Programs/Units** that would serve some college or social good, but are not essential to carrying out or core mission.

All positions and programs will then be classified according to the following additional attributes that are relevant to the strategic budget process:

- A. **Self-funded:** The salary and benefits are paid for out of non-tax-levy funds that are generated as a result of the function of the position involved.
- B. **Title Adjustment or Reallocation Potential:** The position or program is needed but may be re-allocated, assigned additional functions or reclassified.
- C. **To be considered for Consolidation:** The position or program might be consolidated with other positions into a new or existing more efficient unit.

- D. To be considered for Elimination: This position or program could be discontinued without significant impairment of the core mission.
- E. To be considered for Enhancing Efficiency: The unit might satisfactorily accomplish its objectives with reduced resources (for programs/Units only).

In addition there will be a major focus upon how revenues can be increased through new programs or initiatives that will allow for further preservation of priority programs, enhancement to such programs or new ones deemed strategically important.

The following is a summary of the proposed process that is designed to support the assessment and prioritization exercise and suggested target dates for completion of each phase. The participants in the process will include the President's Executive Staff (ESM), the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC), the Financial Planning Subcommittee of the BPC (FPS) and Chairs, Directors and key personnel. Throughout this exercise, the Budget staff will analyze costs and revenues of suggested proposals with input from subject matter experts.

Proposed Schedule of Activities and Timetable

	Activity	Description	Assigned to	Target Completion
1	Identify Savings Goal	Develop Dollar Target for total savings/revenues from all proposals.	Budget Staff will calculate , BPC /FPS /ESM to recommend	Feb 5
2	Provide Preliminary Data to ESM	Distribute list of current active employees by dept for confirmation and return to Budget Office by 2/1	Budget Staff	Feb 5
3	Provide info to ESM	Distribute Budget Review Instructions and list of all active employees and vacancies by dept to VPs for Review.	Budget Staff	Feb 5
4	Kick-off Sessions	Advise College Community of the planned Budget Review Process. Convene BPC meeting.	Sr VP Finance/Admin	Feb 16
5	VP Review of Positions	ESM will classify all positions in their departments by tier and attributes and make recommendations for further review.	VP's/ESM	March 2
6	VP Review of Programs	ESM will classify all programs in their departments by tier and attributes and make recommendations for further review. Develop investment opportunities that could strengthen programs or reduce costs/increase revenues long term.	VP's/ESM	March 2
7	Identify Revenue Enhancements and Management Initiatives	Brainstorm session(s) with BPC and key college personnel to elicit ideas for generating revenue, improving	BPC, members of Presidents cabinet, others tbd	March 5

		efficiency of programs, delivery of services and investment opportunities that will result in cost savings.		
8	Review of 3,4,5	Review classifications and suggestions for revenue and cost savings, add to list.	FPS	March 26
9	Develop Recommendations	Based on review of classifications, make recommendations and share with BPC.	ESM/FPS/BPC	April 20
10	Final Determination	Make final decisions and establish timeframe for implementation.	President/ESM	May 7
11	Notification	Notify affected parties, ensure appropriate steps are taken.	All	June 1
12	Implement	Incorporate changes in Financial Plan	All	July 1