

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
September 22, 2006

PRESENT: President Philip Glotzbach, Chair; Professor Mark Huibregtse, Vice Chair; Susan Kress, Muriel Poston, Michael West, Michael Casey, Pat Oles, Paula Newberg, Ann Henderson, Beau Breslin, Mehmet Odekon, Bill Lewis, Barbara McDonough, John Chaplin, Dan Moran, Kelly Carr; Justin Sipher (regular guest), Fred DiMauro and Bob Kimmerle (guests) and Barbara Krause (Secretary).

ABSENT: Mary Lou Bates.

President Glotzbach called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

1. Review of Minutes.

Draft minutes of the September 8, 2006 meeting were received. Professor Lewis requested that additional detail be added to the item describing IPPC's discussion of the Strategic Action Agenda; in particular, he asked that the minutes reflect President Glotzbach's agreement to seek input from FEC earlier in the process.

Revised minutes will be circulated at the next meeting.

2. IPPC Operating Code Draft 6.

Items related to the Campus Environment Committee and the Finance Committee are still in progress. Footnote 7 will be stricken; it is understood, however, that the President typically will ask the faculty vice-chair of IPPC to report at faculty meetings. Although not a final document, members agreed that the Operating Code is sufficiently close to final form that it should govern IPPC's operations.

3. Planning Cycle Document.

Reflecting comments made at the last meeting, the annual planning cycle document has been revised to indicate that in May, "IPPC (and other groups as appropriate) advise the President on priorities for the next fiscal year." With this revision and the correction of one typographical error, the annual planning document was approved. (Final version attached.)

4. Integrity Board report.

Kelly Carr presented a written and oral report on the status of issues related to the Integrity Board (IB). The current controversy focuses on two issues: (1) who "owns" the

College's IB policies and procedures; and (2) is it appropriate for the IB to apply concepts of "restorative justice" when deciding cases that come before it.

A lengthy discussion ensued. Points and concerns raised included the following:

- SGA Senate Resolution 16-21, adopted April 18, 2006, claims that the IB is an SGA Committee, that all policies and philosophies carrying implications for the IB fall under SGA's purview, and that restorative justice was instituted as a guiding philosophy of the IB without the consent of the SGA Senate or the student body. The resolution called for creation of "Honor-focused" training and procedures for the IB.
- A Task Force appointed to work over the summer has not been able to reach consensus on how to proceed. Disagreement exists over historical aspects of the IB's operations and over the rights and responsibilities of the administration and SGA. Dean Oles stated that the SGA resolution adopted in April 2006 presents an inaccurate history of the IB.
- Ms. Carr emphasized that the SGA does not claim "sovereign authority" over the IB – for example, SGA recognizes that IB decisions ultimately are recommendations to the President. SGA claims, however, that it retains authority over policies and processes of the IB.
- President Glotzbach noted that ultimately, the Board of Trustees is responsible for campus conduct, with that responsibility distributed on campus under the direction of the administration.
- IPPC members expressed many concerns about the Task Force and its process:
 - Composition of the Task Force is not sufficiently broad to ensure that a full range of views are considered. (There was concern about representation from different academic disciplines as well as the need for a representative from Academic Affairs.) If the Task Force is not able to persuade the campus community, especially designated bodies such as IPPC, that the best thinking on issues has been considered through the process, it is unlikely that IPPC will be able to support recommendations from the Task Force.
 - The term "ownership" is not clear. In the end, all constituencies on campus must "own" the judicial system to the extent that its procedures and adjudications are regarded as fair.
 - It was strongly recommended that this matter should be referred to IPPC's Student Affairs Subcommittee (although members acknowledged that SGA has the right, through its IPPC representatives, to bring the matter directly to IPPC).
 - Dean Oles indicated that the IB has been operating under current documents since at least 1999.
 - Professor Lewis recommended separating questions of governance from the merits of the philosophy of restorative justice.
 - Pending resolution of the controversy, the IB will continue to operate under its current philosophies and procedures.

Mr. Moran and Ms. Carr indicated that they had heard the sense of the group. They will confer with SGA and will report back.

5. Campus Planning.

Fred DiMauro and Bob Kimmerle joined IPPC for an update on campus meetings that will be held to share the proposed campus plan with members of the community. Communication will happen (in order) with the campus, governmental officials, the local community, and the media.

The group guiding the presentations is attempting to balance wide distribution of information against the need that information be presented in context. There will be multiple opportunities and methods to hear and share information and concerns.

President Glotzbach emphasized that IPPC must help communicate the message that the plan, while already based on significant community input, is still subject to change, and that IPPC and the administration welcome feedback on the current plan.

6. Informational item.

Due to a scheduling conflict, Kim Marsella, Teaching Associate in Geosciences and Environmental Science, will attend IPPC meetings for the fall semester in place of Sue Van Hook.

President Glotzbach adjourned the meeting at noon.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Krause, Secretary. Please notify of any corrections.

SKIDMORE

C O L L E G E

Date: 22 September 2006

Subject: Annual Implementation-Planning Cycle

The IPPC has approved the following structure for an annual Implementation-Planning cycle that will allow us to move forward to achieve the goals of the *Strategic Plan* in conjunction with our annual budget cycle. The outcome of this work will be an annual Action Agenda that will identify strategic priorities that will receive administrative priority for a given Fiscal Year (F.Y.).

June-July	August-September	October	January-February	May
President's Cabinet develops draft Action Agenda for new F.Y.	President confers with IPPC before finalizing Action Agenda for new F.Y.	Beginning of budget planning for next fiscal year (President's Cabinet and IPPC).	Preliminary budget review by Board.	Board approval of budget for next fiscal year. Administrative review of Action Agenda for current F.Y. with report to IPPC and Board. IPPC (and other groups as appropriate) advise the President on priorities for next fiscal year.