

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
December 5, 2008**

PRESENT: President Philip Glotzbach, Chair; Professor Sue Bender, Vice Chair; Mary Lou Bates, Rochelle Calhoun, Michael Casey, Winston Grady-Willis, Ann Henderson, Susan Kress, Kim Marsella, Dan Nathan, Phyllis Roth, Jeff Segrave, Justin Sipher, Michael West, Mark Huibregtse, Barbara McDonough, Jackie Shydrowski, Mary Cogan; Barbara Krause (Secretary).

ABSENT: Muriel Poston, Alex Stark.

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the meeting of November 21, 2008 were approved with the following amendments:

Item 3 (FY '09 Budget Reductions) – first paragraph, third sentence: strike “(annualized)”.

Item 3 (FY '09 Budget Reductions) – first paragraph, revise the final sentence to read: “December 31, 2008 is a key date in terms of valuing the endowment and determining income from endowment to be reflected in both the current and next year’s budgets.”

2. UWW Working Group Report

President Glotzbach introduced a discussion of the UWW Working Group report by thanking the individuals who worked very hard over the summer and into the fall. He noted that several members of IPPC were engaged in this work. He suggested that the purpose of today’s discussion would be to understand the report and consider next steps.

Interim Dean of Special Programs Jeff Segrave reviewed the work that had taken place over the summer and into the fall. Summarizing from the report document, he noted the composition of the two working groups, reviewed the charge (included as an appendix to the report), described the academic plan, the administrative structure, and the financial models that were developed, and summarized the conclusions. He noted that a majority of the working group members believe that the assumptions underlying the restructured academic model are overly-optimistic and not workable. A minority of the members believe that the restructured academic plan is workable and worthy of trying. In all cases, however, the working group recognized that trying

to see if the model works will require the allocation of significant institutional resources over the next few years.

President Glotzbach then opened the floor for discussion. Questions and comments included the following:

- What would the marketplace be for the restructured program? Interim Dean Segrave noted that although a formal market analysis had not been conducted, the working group did confer with Trustee Elliott Masie and had the prior work of Eduventures at its disposal.
- In response to questions about the inclusion of indirect costs in the financial models, it was noted that indirect costs are being reviewed elsewhere in Special Programs and that they do represent real costs in terms of time and energy. It was further noted that even without inclusion of indirect costs, the financial models demonstrate the difficult financial challenge the program faces.
- President Glotzbach reminded IPPC members of the assumption – based on conversations last spring and in the work of the current report – that the current UWW program cannot be continued as is.
- To provide context for the deficit figures in Table Two, \$400,000 represents almost 1% of a general salary adjustment pool or approximately 15 (average) financial aid packages. \$500,000 is the amount the College would hope to allocate in a normal year for new initiatives. The report and all of the financial models acknowledge that continuing to include employees and/or Antiqua students at the current low or no-cost arrangement would make any of the scenarios unworkable.
- Several IPPC members suggested that if UWW is no longer available to Skidmore employees, the College should explore other options for allowing employees to make progress toward a degree.
- The proposed new model would result in additional barriers to access, including a significantly higher cost and additional classroom hours required.
- The increased proposed tuition remains low compared to the Skidmore residential rate, but is high in comparison to other distance learning programs.
- Pages 14-16 of the report indicate the additional demands that would be placed on faculty in order to sustain the restructured program. It was noted that the demands do not fall equally on all departments and that the proposed capstone project (which would be substituted for the current final project) would require significant additional faculty resources.

- The new admissions process for the proposed restructured model would require active involvement of the Admissions Office. It was noted that this also represents an opportunity cost, and that the work for UWW would involve a very different student profile, evaluation, and decision process.
- It was suggested that the “elephant in the room” is that recent changes in the economy have changed our reality. Hope was expressed that readers of the report will appreciate the discussion of the academic plan and how a re-envisioned UWW could be a part of the College’s academic vision. Another view, however, is that the College should ask the question of whether, absent the economic crisis, the College should go forward with the proposed restructured model as a strategic matter.
- It is important to consider what the College’s central core mission is, and how it is delivered. It was suggested that many newer faculty members are not invested in doing the work of UWW.
- The current economic situation does not change the strategic question of whether we should move forward with UWW, but it does sharpen the issue of choices.

Mary Cogan, an IPPC member who is also a long-time staff member of UWW, spoke about the many great contributions that UWW has made over the years. While she remains devoted to the program, she expressed her hope that the community can move to the point where a decision is made so that students, staff members, and faculty members associated with the program can move to a positive place. While she believes that the restructured program is doable, she urged that if a decision is made otherwise, that UWW be honored for its history and that its students and graduates be celebrated. President Glotzbach thanked Ms. Cogan for her comments and for the thoughtful and professional way in which she has participated in the conversations.

President Glotzbach then invited thoughts on the appropriate role of IPPC in the conversation. Vice President for Academic Affairs Susan Kress noted that the report has been shared with CEPP as well as with IPPC, and that it would be helpful for both of those groups to offer advice and recommendations. She further noted that the Academic Staff will consider the report at its retreat in early December. She also has spoken with the Faculty Executive Committee about the process.

President Glotzbach noted that the additional work reflected in the current report is very helpful and has clarified the issues. He thanked Susan Kress for issuing a thoughtful, comprehensive charge; Jeff Segrave and Jim Kennelly for their leadership of the Working Groups; and all individuals who gave so generously of their time to do this important work.

The conversation concluded with a discussion of the confidentiality of the report. In order to allow the various groups who will need to take up the report to receive it first, it was agreed that for the moment, IPPC members would not distribute the report. Any requests for the report should be forwarded to Vice President Kress. A decision will be made at a later date as to whether to post the report online.

3. FY'10 Budget Planning Update

Vice President Mike West has provided a presentation on the next fiscal year's budget planning at two community meetings earlier in the week and will present the same report at the faculty meeting today. These meetings will provide essentially the same information that was presented to IPPC at its prior meeting.

4. Other Updates

Campus Environment Committee Report: Kim Marsella, Chair of the Campus Environmental Committee, reminded the group that Erica Fuller, Co-chair of CEC, will attend IPPC meetings next semester. She further reported that CEC has been working on a definition of "sustainability" that encompasses not only the environment but economic viability and social justice. CEC also has been working on a temperature set-back policy (Facilities has been very helpful in this regard) and announcements will be made shortly regarding the College's Focus Skidmore campaign (information available on the Sustainable Skidmore website). CEC also continues to review best practices for energy reduction and printing and paper policies.

Bias Response Team: Dean of Student Affairs Rochelle Calhoun reported on various bias incidents that have occurred over the past semester. *Skidmore News* did an informative piece that was well received. In addition, the Bias Response Group will host an open dialogue on Tuesday, December 9th, at 7:30 p.m. The purpose of the open meeting will be to bring the community together, raise awareness, consider how the Bias Response Team should respond to such incidents, and consider how the community (individuals and as a whole) should respond.

Next Meeting: President Glotzbach requested that IPPC members continue to hold the meeting time scheduled for December 19th until further notice.

Minutes prepared by Barbara Krause. Please notify of any changes.