

**Joint Planning and Budget Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, April 11, 2019  
8:30 – 10:30 a.m., 220 Seymour**

**ATTENDEES:**

**Voting Members**

Sondra Aman  
Mike Andriatch  
Davida Bloom  
Steven Breslawski  
Frances Dearing  
Scott Haines  
Tom Hernandez  
Katy Heyning  
Sara Kelly  
Kadathur Lakshmanan  
Brooke Leddon  
Teresa Major  
Jose Maliekal  
Dave Mihalyov  
Kathy Peterson  
Summer Reiner  
Jay West  
Katy Wilson

**Non-Voting Members**

Denise Copelton: Co-Chair  
President Macpherson  
Karen Riotto  
Jim Wall: Co-Chair  
Melissa Wight  
Jim Zollweg

**Guests**

Dawn Footer  
Celia Watt – *attending  
on behalf of Susan  
Stites-Doe*

**REGRETS:**

**Voting Members**

Debbie Jacob  
Cherise Oakley  
Susan Stites-Doe

**Non-Voting Members**

Crystal Hallenbeck

The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m.

**Approval of the Minutes**

Dr. Copelton asked the committee to review the minutes from the March 28, 2019 meeting. With no corrections, Dr. Peterson motioned the minutes to be approved, Dr. Lakshmanan seconded the motion, and all present voting members were in favor. Therefore, the minutes were approved.

## **Announcements/JPBC Appointments**

*Note: The new roster can be viewed on Blackboard*

- Dr. Copelton announced the approved JPBC appointments that will fill the upcoming vacancies. Co-Chairs, Dr. Copelton and Mr. Wall, President Macpherson and the College Senate Executive Committee approved these appointments. The appointments are as follows:
  - Faculty Co-Chair Elect (Co-Chair Elect 2019-20, then Co-Chair 2020-23)
    - Lerong He
  - Faculty Representatives
    - Elliot Weininger – School of Arts & Science (3 year term – 2019-22)
    - James Cordeiro – School of Business and Management (3 year term – 2019-22)
    - Kathy Peterson – Open Faculty Position from any School (2 year term – 2019-21)
  - Professional Staff Representatives
    - Craig Ross (2 year term – 2019-21)
    - Pat Maxwell (3 year term – 2019-22)
  - Administrative Services Unit Staff (appointed by COSAC)
    - Kandie Gay (3 year term – 2019-22)
  - College Senate President Elect – will be officially determined after the College Senate Elections.
  - Student Representatives – will be appointed in a different manner and this will be discussed when members review the Charge.

Dr. Copelton also noted that the two-year terms are included in this appointment process only to create staggered terms, but after this appointment process all terms will be for three-years as indicated in the Charge. In addition, these appointments are effective July 1, 2019 but meetings will not start until the fall.

## **Proposed Changes to Charge**

*Note: The updated Charge can be viewed on Blackboard*

Committee members reviewed the updates to the Charge. The following questions, answers and discussion points occurred:

- The question was raised regarding the change from an annual update on the Strategic Plan to a bi-annual update on the Strategic Plan. Dr. Copelton stated that first, in the past we have always requested division reports. What we are going to do in the fall, instead, is we are not going to have presentations by divisions but we will ask for annual reports from divisions. There will not be presentations on them, but they will be posted to Blackboard as a resource that can be referred to. As far as the Goal Group presentations, it is listed in the Charge to be bi-annual. The main presentation would be in the fall and this is where the budget prioritization requests would be presented. Specific dollar amounts would not be presented; only needs, initiatives or programs that should be prioritized in the next budget year that the goal group believes will help the college succeed within the strategic plan. The major update is the fall one because the goal group leaders will be able to report on the activities of the prior year as the full report would come in over the summer and they would be able to present this information in the fall. We would also ask in the spring for an update in progress. There would not be any budget prioritization requests with this presentation because that would occur in the fall.

- The concern was raised that the committee would be reviewing prioritizations without knowing what else is in the division budget. That could put the division leader in a difficult spot if the committee states that an item is a priority when there is nowhere in their budget to find funding for the priority. Dr. Copelton stated that we are trying to shift the focus so that our purview is not so much division budgets, but the Strategic Plan. Each Goal Group Leader has certain initiatives that they are responsible for and ensuring that they happen, but these initiatives are across multiple divisions. Mr. Wall stated that there would be a reconciliation to ensure that when a goal group requests funding that a conversation has occurred with the division leader as well as a review of financial resources within the division budget. We want to make sure there is transparency and reconciliation between the two. Dr. Breslawski asked if the goal group would be presenting where the funding is coming from and what might be being cut when presenting the prioritizations. Dr. Copelton stated that is the ideal situation. We need to remember that it is up to Cabinet to determine where the funding will come from. This committee is a recommending body to Cabinet. We are the voice for the campus. President Macpherson added that with the Strategic Plan, the goal groups and JPBC, we are trying to have a multi-layered approach so that it is a campus wide initiative with guidance and knowledge from all areas and less of the division approach so that we are not divided.
- The question was brought up regarding our role in assessment and how we are “closing the loop”, as it is not defined in the Charge. Dr. Copelton stated that over the past couple of years, we have tried to focus on assessment, specifically with the investment funds. This is requiring projects to have good assessment plans and reports on assessment data when the project is complete. We have also asked BSG in their presentation to report on their assessment data. In addition, it will be included in the goal group presentations. This year we provided feedback regarding the assessment plans that were not to the level they should be and they are required to revise them. President Macpherson added that having the goal group presentations would allow us to hold the goal groups accountable. Ms. Dearing stated that we focused heavily on the investment funds this year and next year we can work with the goal groups as we prepare for our Middle States Self Study. Dr. Reiner expressed concern that a report is never given to the committee or the campus as a whole as a follow-up to some investments or initiatives and how the campus has changed. President Macpherson stated that a new initiative that will be starting hopefully next week, is a Presidential Monthly Update where this follow-up can occur. The update on the goal groups would probably be more in the fall but maybe a little update in the spring after the presentations. We can also offer the links to the larger documents for the campus community to review.
- Concerns were brought up regarding the wording of footnote two and that lecturers are being excluded from serving on the committee. The footnote will now read, “Faculty refers to all full-time faculty and librarians, including those teaching in programs reporting to the Vice Provost”.
- A concern was brought up that there is a need for representation for Graduate Studies. Members agreed to add the Director of the Center for Graduate Studies as a technical consultant for one year. After that year, the committee will evaluate to see if the Director of the Center for Graduate Studies should remain a technical consultant or become an administrative voting member. If the committee decides to make this position an administrative voting member, the committee will discuss ways to add another faculty member to ensure that there is a balance to the voting structure.
- A concern was brought up regarding the possible lack of Brockport Downtown representation on the Campus Based Fee Review Subcommittee. Ms. Riotto stated that the Director of the Center

for Graduate Studies is a voting member on the subcommittee, but there is no objection to adding a faculty or student to represent the Brockport Downtown population.

Dr. Watt put forward the motion to vote on the amended Charge with the discussed changes and Dr. Peterson seconded the motion. The results of the present voting members were as follows:

**Approve – 18**

**Not Approve – 0**

**Abstain – 0**

### **Items from Campus Based Fee Subcommittee**

*Note: The Course Fee Requests and Credit-By-Exam Fee Proposal can be found on Blackboard*

Ms. Riotto presented the course fee requests for summer 2019 and fall 2019. Ms. Major put forward the motion to vote on the presented course fee requests and Mr. Haines seconded the motion. The results of the present voting members were as follows:

**Approve – 18**

**Not Approve – 0**

**Abstain – 0**

Ms. Riotto presented the Credit-By-Exam Fee proposal. The following questions, answers and discussion points occurred:

- The question was raised on whether a student receives credit and how many credits after completing the exam. Ms. Riotto stated that the student is awarded transfer credits for the amount of credits that is equivalent to taking the course.
- The question was raised on whether the student still has to pay the fee if they fail the exam. Ms. Riotto stated that the student pays the fee before they take the exam.
- A concern was brought up that this exam fee in comparison to other credit bearing exams is much higher. There are CLEP exams that are anywhere from \$80-\$120, where similar amount of hours are required by the proctor and the examinee. Some committee members pointed out that these exams are given nationally and have a higher volume of students taking them, so they can afford to charge this amount, where as a credit-by-exam is usually offered to one student. This amount is not compensated to the faculty member, but it is to recognize the time resources involved in the exam process.
- The question was raised if the intent is to decrease the amount of students taking the exam and increase students enrolling into courses. Ms. Riotto stated that is not the intent, the intent is to recognize the effort involved and the current fee does not do that.
- The question was raised on the statistics of the students taking this exam in terms of adult learners. Dr. Peterson stated that for the nursing exams, that is the case, but with the new utilization of the nursing licensure, these requirements would be fulfilled and those exams will not be needed anymore. In the past, these exams have been offered and students have been awarded six credits for \$40. President Macpherson added that there is a changing nature to higher education and there has been a movement towards competency-based education. Credit-by-exam may be something that more students look into because of this movement. In this instance, we need to be charging the right amount of money to recognize the value for the student and the amount of work the faculty member completes.
- A question was raised about the financial aid implications to the fee. Ms. Riotto stated that the fee is not covered by financial aid.

- A question was raised if it will be clearly stated that the fee will not be covered by financial aid. Ms. Riotto stated she would work with Registration and Records to update the form so that it is clearly stated.
- The question was raised regarding what other schools are charging. Ms. Riotto stated that there is a wide range of difference between what other schools are charging and there is not a consistent amount.

Dr. Peterson put forward the motion to vote on the approval of the Credit-By-Exam Fee proposal and Dr. Reiner seconded the motion. The results of the present voting members were as follows:

**Approve – 13**

**Not Approve – 2**

**Abstain – 1**

### **Project Updates**

Mr. Wall presented on the 2018-2019 project updates. The following are questions, answers and discussion points that occurred during the presentation:

- The concern was brought up that there is not a female on the Space Utilization Core Team. There may be some gender concerns that need to be considered and it was recommended to add a female to the team. In addition, it was added that there is only one faculty member on the core team and with the review looking at a lot of academic space, there should be a consideration to increase the number of faculty on the core team. Mr. Wall stated that they are currently completing the first step by going through the data and analyzing it. Once that is complete, we can look at expanding the team.
- The question was raised regarding how the information regarding the different budget models will be offered to the campus community and when the new budget model would be implemented. Mr. Wall stated that the new model would be implemented in fiscal year 2020-21, as we need a year to transition to the new model. Dr. Copelton encouraged the idea of multiple town halls within the transition year as having a new budget model is a high impact issue and it will affect all units.

### **Other Items from the Committee**

None at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.

Next Meeting: April 25, 2019, 8:30-10:30 AM

DC/JW/mw