

Budget and Planning Committee Meeting
Minutes
March 25, 2024

Attendees: Karol Mason (Chair), Allison Pease, Andrew Sidman, Anthony Carpi, Cat Alves, Claudia Calirman, Daniel Oresanya, Daniel Matos, Dyanna Pooley, Ellen Sexton, Erica Bond, Gail Garfield, Heath Grant, Helen Cedeno, Helen Keier, Holly Clarke, Janet Winter, Jean Mills, John Gutierrez, Justin Barden, Karen Kaplowitz, Katherine Killoran, Kinya Chandler, Kira Poplowski, Maki Haberfeld, Mark Flower, Maxwell Mak, Michael Lee, Ned Benton, Oswald Fraser, Paul Narkunas, Susannah Crowder, Robert Till, Robert Garot, Rulisa Galloway-Perry, Sajma Jahic, Shu-Yuan (Demi) Cheng, Shweta Jain, Roger Szajngarten, and Alena Ryjov (recorder)

1. Approval of minutes for January 29, 2024 meeting: The minutes were approved unanimously as proposed.
2. Update on FY24 Budget and status of cost savings efforts: Karol started the meeting by thanking the committee for working diligently on the current budget challenges. She also gave an update on the lobbying efforts in Albany and mentioned that we are engaging alumni in this process, and the outcome has been good, however, we still don't know what the final Governor's budget will look like. We all want the collective bargaining to be covered but what we heard from the legislative leadership is that without a signed contract they can't put the money in the budget. Something different we did this year was that we lobbied the legislature with our union leadership. Other campuses did the same. And it resonated with the legislature to see that we are all on the same page. She then turned to Mark for the main presentation. Mark said that we'll focus on two things: the status of the budget, and the hiring plan under the 2-for-1 requirement. He started with sharing good news that our enrollment for the spring was much higher than we had originally anticipated. As a result, the average enrollment for the year is up 122 students, which is resulting in an about an additional half a million dollars in revenue. He thanked Daniel Matos, EMSA, Academic Affairs, and everyone who works for student success and retention. We went from 10,509 for the average from the fall in the spring up to 10,631, which is a really good improvement. We've also had some cost savings, primarily on the administrative side of almost 1.5M, primarily due to the 2 for 1 plan. The other big saving is in the area of adjuncts. We originally planned to reduce \$1.5M of adjunct expense, but the Spring 24 had 400 fewer sections than in Spring 23, and that saved an additional \$613,000, which resulted in more than \$2M savings in adjunct expenses for the year. Mark thanked the whole academic affairs team, Andrew Sidman and all of the department chairs for the hard work at looking at sections and seat efficiencies. In addition, the reductions of our temp services budget for the spring semester are paying off as well, resulting in about another \$180,000. So, the good news is that we have lowered our structural deficit from \$7.5M to \$4.9M, or lowered it by \$2.6M. We're really working towards driving down that structural deficit to a zero. As Karol had mentioned, we did a good job in terms of planning for the future. We have the CUTRA balance of \$16.9M available, so we'll end this year with almost a \$12M in CUTRA balance, and then that will roll over. That means our balance is still positive through 2027. We currently still have a structural deficit through

2027 but it's down to less than a million dollars. By 2027, with the continued effort looking at section sizes and increasing our enrollment we will be able to close that gap. Ned B. asked a question about additional money the 9 colleges of concern were supposed to receive. Mark and Karol explained that the colleges of concern that met their reduction target but still have a structural deficit are going to get money, but every college will get something based on FTE, and it's supposed to be recurring money. We don't know what to expect for the out years, but for this year they will allocate something-we just don't know how much yet. Here's no clarity on the future allocation rules. Holly C. asked a question regarding a methodology for course and adjunct savings. Karol responded that we offer classes that are fully enrolled, and continue to work on analyzing the class schedule to identify efficiencies. Mark explained the approach in more detail, including enrollment projections, historical comparisons, etc. Rulisa asked if the lack of approved budget is concerning at this point of time. Karol and Mark explained that this is not unprecedented, and operationally speaking, we are doing ok. It is the hiring component of the budget that's holding it up. Ned asked if the report on the distribution of modalities of courses by level, particularly online and hybrid and face-to-face can be shared with the committee. Allison answered yes. Mark moved on to the next agenda item on the hiring plan. He reminded everyone that, as being one of the 9 colleges of concern, we were required to adopt a 2-for-1 hiring plan (we can hire 1 position and leave 2 vacant). Mark shared a hiring plan with the committee, showing vacancies from the onset of this requirement. We have created a rubric with a scoring matrix to identify what our priorities are. It's a complex systematic process to evaluate what our needs are. Gail G. asked if chairs have any input for the plan in terms of the departmental needs, and how far the plan goes. Karol responded that it goes back to July 2023. Mark responded that the position request form accounts for chairs feedback as well when requesting a position. Robert G. shared his department's request to preserve online courses with enrollment stating that students seem to prefer them. Karol acknowledged the message. Cat A. asked to clarify how the rubric is populated and who makes decisions. Mark responded that the senior leadership team makes a collective decision, which a VP of each area representing an interest of that area. He also explained how the HelioCampus benchmarking analysis works. Ned asked if there's a similar process for faculty hiring. Karol answered that we are leaving faculty out of this equation for now. Rulisa asked if the college will be rehiring people who left or vacant positions in the future or if we move forward in a different way. Karol answered that we have been looking at positions and jobs differently and we have to continuously evaluate our staffing levels and assess certain jobs for efficiencies and new practices and prioritize college's needs. Ned asked to clarify a misalignment in perception between college's push to in-person instruction and CUNY's efforts to promote on-line instruction. Karol and Allison said that CUNY's efforts are not contradictory to our needs, they are just trying to figure out how to have students register in online classes at different campuses to incentivize other campuses into online offerings. We are ahead of the game in online instruction, but we are not an online college, and we are trying to balance the two modes to provide the best experience to students possible. Andrew and Daniel explained in more details the CUNY's online effort, its rationale and challenges. Robert G. said that he would like to see a comparison of student satisfaction for online courses vs. in-person classes. Mark spoke about Campus Office Services and budget, and reminded everyone about important deadlines for purchasing. Karol answered more

questions about enrollment, allocations, and collections. In conclusion, Karol thanked the group for their diligent work and continued engagement, and adjourned the meeting.