

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
April 23, 2010

PRESENT: President Philip Glotzbach, Chair; Professor Adrienne Zuerner, Vice Chair; Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Mary Lou Bates, Rochelle Calhoun, Winston Grady-Willis, Ann Henderson, Susan Kress, Muriel Poston, Jeff Segrave, Justin Sipher, Michael West, Mary Cogan, Susan Bender, Raina Bretan, James Welsh, and Hugh Foley.

ABSENT: Michael Casey, Kim Marsella, and Anne Petruzzelli.

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the April 9, 2010 meeting were approved with a minor correction.

2. Strategic Planning

“Strategic Renewal”: President Glotzbach reported that he and Trustee John Humphrey, Chair of the Board’s Strategic Planning Committee, had discussed the most current version of the President’s “Strategic Renewal” document. Mr. Humphrey offered several comments and suggestions, which the President will consider. President Glotzbach then asked Vice Chair Zuerner to lead IPPC’s discussion of the document, carried over from the last meeting.

There was considerable discussion about the “Transition and Transformation” section of the document – particularly certain phrasing and passages that some thought could be read to suggest a movement away from core liberal education principles and toward a greater focus on moving students successfully to their post-Skidmore lives. It was recognized that faculty members do serve as mentors and help their students identify and explore multiple pathways beyond Skidmore. Nevertheless, faculty members might enhance their advising through workshops or other resources that would better support them in their advising and mentoring roles.

President Glotzbach noted that the “transitions and transformation” theme emerged very strongly at on- and off-campus Town Hall Meetings earlier in the year – with the suggestion that this is an area in which the College can improve. It was noted that efforts in this area offer significant opportunities for collaboration, both across divisions of the College and with external constituencies, particularly alumni. While much of this work will be focused outside of the classroom, it was suggested that some of the “Transition and Transformation” work may well be reflected in conversations about the curriculum. Faculty clearly will be involved in any such conversations related to the curriculum.

President Glotzbach noted that a number of student focus groups were held earlier in the spring to invite student comment on a proposed list of the College’s “differentiating attributes.” A report of those exercises will be made available; results also will be reported (either in full or in abbreviated fashion) in the “Strategic Renewal” document.

Town Hall Meeting Synthesis Group Final Report: Vice Chair Zuerner reported that since the completion of the Synthesis Group’s Final Report, the “Strategic Renewal” document has

evolved in a way that has led some of the group's members to question the phrasing of one recommendation. IPPC supported a revision to the Synthesis Group's Final Report consistent with this discussion. The Synthesis Group will confer and agree upon the revised language.

3. Rationale for Standards of Business Conduct Policy

At President Glotzbach's request, Barbara Krause briefly reviewed a proposal to begin work on a Standards of Business Conduct Policy that would include Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment language. A memo from President Glotzbach outlining the rationale for this work was distributed in advance of the meeting and is attached as Appendix A to these minutes. The proposal comes to IPPC because the policy would apply to all members of the campus community.

With regard to the two faculty members proposed to take part in this work, it was suggested that the Dean of the Faculty include a faculty member from the humanities or social sciences as well as from the natural sciences, since faculty members in the former two categories also serve as external reviewers and engage in other activities that could be covered by such a policy.

One member asked if the faculty will need to vote to approve the policy. President Glotzbach responded that a definitive answer to the question should wait until the work is done and the content of the proposed policy has been developed – but that under the College's current *Faculty Handbook*, approval by the faculty likely would be required.

The IPPC endorsed the recommended process outlined in President Glotzbach's memo.

4. Budget Updates

Vice President for Finance and Administration Michael West provided the following updates:

- The College's endowment as of 6-30-09 stood at approximately \$240 million (approximately \$96,000 per student) and, according to the annual NACUBO survey, ranked 10th on our list of 16 peer institutions. The estimated market value of the endowment as of 2-28-10 was \$271 million.
- The AAUP faculty salary survey has been released. Skidmore's goal is to be at the median of our peer groups. We have slipped in all three faculty categories compared to last year, likely reflecting the fact that Skidmore provided no GSA for FY '09.
- Based on comprehensive fee announcements by several of our peer institutions and the comprehensive fee increase that Skidmore is currently modeling, it appears that the College would make progress in moving down the list of "top 25 most expensive" schools. Moving down on this list was a strategic goal for the College.
- NFE for the spring semester was lower than originally projected.
- IPPC's Budget & Finance Subcommittee is reviewing the capital budget, which is proposed to include \$9.5 million in FY '11. Cabinet members, who already had screened for their highest priorities, submitted requests totaling more than \$27 million.

Vice President West distributed the FY '11 Capital Budget Summary for informational purposes at this time.

Mr. West also reported that IPPC's Budget and Finance Committee had considered the request by FEC that all committees review their membership to consider whether the work could be done by fewer faculty and administrators. The Budget and Finance Committee believes the group functions well and would like to retain its current membership, including all of the faculty representatives.

5. Science Vision – Needs Study

Dean of the Faculty Muriel Poston provided an overview of the planning that has led to the current draft of the Science Vision statement. That document and other work of the Science Working Group led to the issuance of a Request for Proposals for a science program planner who would complete a space allocation and utilization study of current science facilities at Skidmore, benchmark Skidmore's space use in the sciences in comparison to our peers, assess future needs, and prepare a conceptual summary of new and renovated science spaces and associated costs for various scenarios. An interim report is due in May 2010 with a final report due by September 30, 2010.

President Glotzbach noted that this update was being made to IPPC consistent with the provisions of the Major Capital Project Planning Process document. There were no objections to proceeding as outlined.

6. Scribner Village Revisions

Dean of Student Affairs Rochelle Calhoun reported on conversations that have taken place with input from a task force of Trustees, in response to various questions raised about earlier architectural renderings of the proposed Scribner Village replacement. Based on those conversations, the campus planning group and the architect have realigned their focus to achieve three goals: (1) replace Scribner Village; (2) de-triple most underclass students; and (3) provide as many sophomores as possible the opportunity to live in singles.

With those three goals in mind, the architects have prepared a revised approach that would eliminate the proposed new residence hall and replace Scribner Village with the previously planned units plus 3 additional new structures in two different styles to accommodate the topography. The Health and Wellness Center is on hold at the present time due to cost concerns.

Conceptual drawings of the new approach were distributed in advance of the meeting and will be presented to the Board of Trustees in May. An open community forum will be held next week; the architects will present at that meeting and will meet with the Environmental Action Group. The revised plan does add cost to the proposal; cost estimates are still being finalized.

7. Filene Use

IPPC members received, in advance of the meeting, a recommendation that had been made by the Space Planning Working Group (SPWG) to President Glotzbach and the Cabinet on June

1, 2009, regarding the use of Filene Hall following the opening of the new Zankel Music Center. President Glotzbach reported that following receipt of that report, a question arose in Cabinet discussions as to whether Filene might be an appropriate space for the Admissions Office. Given the strategic importance of the College's admissions work, a decision was made to consider the possible location of Admissions in Filene. (The College's *Campus Plan* calls for Admissions to be relocated to Harder Hall.)

President Glotzbach indicated that IPPC would discuss the SPWG recommendation at its next meeting. He has decided, however, that it would not be appropriate to move Admissions to Filene Hall. Accordingly, he will accept the SPWG recommendation that Filene remain academic space and house the Office of Special Programs. Additional conversations will be necessary to determine further implications of this decision.

Minutes prepared by Barbara Krause; please notify of any changes.

APPENDIX A



TO: IPPC
FROM: Philip A. Glotzbach, President
RE: Recommendation to develop “Standards of Business Conduct” policy
DATE: April 5, 2010

Skidmore is committed to the highest standards of excellence and integrity in carrying out its educational mission and all aspects of its operations. That commitment is reflected currently in the College’s expectations of faculty members and other employees with respect to their work on behalf of the College, in Conflict of Interest reporting forms that various individuals must complete, and in various other policies and procedures of the College.

Rationale for developing a “Standards of Business Conduct” policy (including provisions related to conflict of interest and conflict of commitment)

In recent years, regulatory agencies, legislative bodies, and the public have demonstrated an increased demand for both for-profit and not-for-profit corporate entities to clarify and codify expectations regarding legal and ethical behavior. Congress’ passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (“SOX”), for example, strengthened requirements for corporate governance and responsibility of publicly traded companies and has been a source of guidance for not-for-profits, including institutions of higher education.

One requirement of SOX is an employee code of conduct that prohibits illegal acts, identifies procedures for reporting them, and ensures “whistleblower” protection for employees who report violations in good faith. External auditors now frequently inquire as to whether colleges and universities have such a code of conduct. In addition, the recently revised Internal Revenue Service Form 990, which colleges must submit each year, specifically asks whether institutions have adopted various policies, including a written conflict of interest policy and a written whistleblower policy. And finally, institutions that receive external funding (e.g., research grants from federal agencies) typically must affirm the existence of appropriate safeguards against scientific misconduct, including policies that promote compliance with applicable laws and regulations and that address conflicts of interest.

For all of these reasons, following consultation with members of the Cabinet and the College’s auditors and legal counsel, I have determined that the College should develop policies articulating our “standards of business conduct” and that we should clarify and formalize our expectations related to conflicts of interest (including conflicts of commitment).

Recommended process

Because the types of provisions described above would apply to all members of the Skidmore community, the Cabinet and I believe that IPPC is the appropriate College body to advise the administration on the development of such policies. Accordingly, I ask that IPPC consider a process for doing this work. Mindful of current conversations and legitimate concerns regarding the time that faculty and staff members commit to campus governance matters, I offer the following for your consideration:

1. I propose that Barbara Krause, Executive Director of the Office of the President, coordinate the work of developing a “standards of business conduct” policy, including formalizing and clarifying the expectations related to conflicts of interest (including conflicts of commitment).
2. Identify a small group of individuals to work with the coordinator. Those individuals should include people on campus who are familiar with legal and regulatory requirements in this area, who are familiar with Skidmore activities and procedures and will be able to identify others with whom they should confer, and who will be able to produce a draft document for review by the President’s Cabinet and me, IPPC, other governance groups as appropriate, and ultimately, by the Board of Trustees.

I propose that the following individuals develop a draft policy, consulting with others on campus as appropriate:

- Barbara Krause, Executive Director of the Office of the President, Coordinator
- William Tomlinson, Director of Sponsored Research
- Mike Thomas, Director of Financial Services
- Two Faculty members to be identified by the Dean of the Faculty

3. I propose the following timeframe for completion of this work:
 - Initial draft policy to President and Cabinet: September 2010
 - Draft policy to IPPC: October 2010
 - Proposed policy to Faculty Meeting: November 2010
 - Proposed policy to Board of Trustees (through the Audit Committee): February 2011