

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
February 13, 2009

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

ABSENT: Muriel Poston, Phyllis Roth.

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the meeting of January 30, 2009 were approved as distributed.

2. UWW: Joint CEPP-IPPC Motion

Vice Chair Sue Bender reported that members of IPPC had met with members of CEPP to craft a rationale in support of the motion to close UWW. The motion and rationale are attached to these minutes as Appendix A. The motion was introduced at the Faculty Meeting on February 6, 2009, and will lay over for consideration at the Faculty Meeting on February 27, 2009.

In accordance with the provisions of the *Faculty Handbook*, CEPP will host a faculty-only informational meeting on February 13. John Brueggemann, Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee, will preside over that meeting, allowing Dan Nathan and other members of CEPP to answer questions.

As previously agreed, IPPC will host a forum open to all members of the community on February 17, 2009. Although it was previously announced that Dan Nathan and Sue Bender would moderate that open forum, it was agreed that John Brueggeman should be asked to preside over the IPPC forum (as he will do for CEPP's faculty-only meeting).

Other comments related to the process included the following:

- Asking the chair of FEC to moderate the community meetings mirrors the process that was used last year.
- The CEPP informational meeting is intended to allow faculty members to talk among themselves; CEPP decided, therefore, not to invite administrators or other non-faculty members of the staff.
- All members of IPPC are encouraged to attend the IPPC forum on February 17.
- The joint CEPP-IPPC motion has been shared with the Curriculum Committee.

- There was discussion of what information should be provided at the faculty-only informational meeting and at the IPPC open forum.
- It was noted that the rationale accompanying the joint motion is the result of truly collaborative work. Dan Nathan, as chair of CEPP, expressed his appreciation for those who were involved in the drafting.
- Dean of Special Programs Jeff Segrave noted that his office has communicated twice with UWW students and alumni to update them on the status of current conversations. He has received very few responses.

In closing, Dean Segrave expressed his appreciation for the UWW staff. They have conducted themselves in a highly professional manner, attending to their jobs and delivering the academic program to students at a very difficult time.

3. New Residence Hall Project Proposal (Replacement of Scribner Village)

President Glotzbach opened this agenda item by reminding the IPPC that it had approved the major facilities planning process last October. The process is being used for the first time with the Scribner Village replacement project. Because of the project's scope, a Task Force was constituted to do the program planning; Dean of Student Affairs Rochelle Calhoun has led that Task Force. At this point, IPPC is being asked to consult and share its thoughts on the draft report that has been prepared by the planning Task Force.

President Glotzbach indicated that the next step in the process would be to share these documents with the Board of Trustees and to seek approval to retain an architect to engage in preliminary design. The College will not be able to build the Scribner Village replacement until significant additional funds are in hand. It is important to engage an architect, however, to develop a design and cost projections that will allow the College to approach potential donors and otherwise decide how the project might be funded. The cost for this architectural work would be paid from the \$12 million gift from Trustee Donald Sussman and his family that was announced last fall.

President Glotzbach then invited Dean Calhoun to speak about the project proposal that was distributed in advance of the meeting. Dean Calhoun suggested that the document be viewed as a vision statement that will evolve as the architects help the College think through various options. She noted that the report makes a number of assumptions: (1) that the site will be as indicated in the College's *Campus Plan*; (2) that the replacement Scribner Village will be primarily for upperclass students and therefore should incorporate apartment-style living; and (3) that the replacement project will be at least two and perhaps three buildings.

In addition to providing beds for students, the planning Task Force hopes that the project will provide gathering and/or community space. There is considerable sentiment in support of Scribner Village that relates to the sense of community and the way students see each other and

engage in that space. Dean Calhoun hopes that the new project can include spaces for health and wellness, a living-learning community, and community gathering.

Comments on the proposed project included the following:

- In this time of constrained resources and with very difficult budget years projected to come, one member questioned whether the Task Force had been diligent about asking what it could do without. Dean Calhoun responded that while this stage of the process typically articulates a broad vision that will be scaled back as the process evolves, students have commented even at this stage that the planning should not be lavish.
- The Task Force has looked seriously at sustainability features and is aware that the project cannot be extravagant. At the same time, residence halls do represent a factor in attracting future students.
- It was noted that one Trustee had described the Northwoods Apartments as “elegant but not extravagant” – it was suggested that such a concept is appropriate for the Scribner Village replacement as well.
- Scribner Village is seriously past its useful life and is now very expensive to operate (e.g., heating costs). Going from fifteen energy-inefficient buildings to two or three energy-efficient buildings will generate considerable efficiencies and savings.
- Many students are skeptical about the ability to replace the sense of community currently existing in Scribner Village with a project that includes two or three buildings. It was noted, however, that replacing the current Scribner Village with a similar constellation of fifteen buildings is impractical for a number of reasons. First, from an environmental point of view, the footprint of two or three buildings (and the associated energy savings of that configuration) are preferable. In addition, repeating the current model of fifteen buildings would be cost prohibitive.
- A couple of members expressed concern about how well public gathering spaces in that location would be utilized. Both Case and Falstaff’s were described as public spaces that are not well utilized. It was suggested that in order for public gathering spaces to be widely used, especially later in the evening, a food option must be presented. Dean Calhoun noted these concerns and agreed that the Task Force, with the help of the architects, must continue to think intentionally about the inclusion of gathering spaces.
- It was noted that the College has had some unsuccessful experiences trying to incorporate classrooms into residence halls, and that we should learn from those experiences.

President Glotzbach thanked committee members for their observations and comments and indicated that, if there were no objections, the report would be shared with the Board of Trustees. There were no objections to moving forward as described. Dean Calhoun will report back to IPPC after the Board meetings. If the Board does authorize the administration to enter into an

agreement with an architect, there will be much more communication across campus and the opportunity for many more voices to be heard.

4. Budget Update

Vice President for Administration and Finance Mike West handed out materials that were previously shared with the IPPC's Budget and Finance Subcommittee. These materials also were presented to the Board of Trustees Budget and Finance Committee at its budget workshop and will be presented to the Board of Trustees at its upcoming meetings. Vice President West stressed that these materials should be treated as confidential at this time.

Mr. West noted that the market value of the College's endowment as of December 31, 2008, was on target with projections. January, however, has been tougher than expected. He also reviewed the projected deficit for the current fiscal year budget and for FY '10, as well as the steps that have been proposed to address those deficits. He noted that progress on various elements of the *Strategic Plan* will be slowed.

The Trustees' Budget and Finance Committee supported all of the key planning assumptions reflected in the FY '09 and '10 budgets, including the use of over-enrollment funds to address projected deficits in those years. The reductions in services and supplies and other planning assumptions will allow the College to achieve a balanced budget in FY 2009 and FY 2010.

Mr. West next directed attention to planning assumptions for FY '10 through FY '14. He noted that there is a great deal of uncertainty in these assumptions (for example, with respect to market performance). In addition, the smoothing technique that is incorporated in the College's endowment spending formula means that Skidmore will be even more challenged in future years, when the full effect of market declines is reflected. Finally, he noted that the document describing future budget scenarios, which show significant deficits in the out years, would materialize if the College took no action. He emphasized that the Cabinet, in consultation with the Trustees and the IPPC, will engage in planning in the coming months to ensure that these deficits are addressed.

Comments on these materials included the following:

- It was noted that the future budget scenarios show a tuition discount rate increasing from approximately 31% to approximately 35%. The objective stated in the *Strategic Plan* was to hold the tuition discount rate at or under 30%. The current economic climate and increased student need will make it unlikely that the College can achieve that goal.
- A member asked whether these budget scenarios created pressure to reconsider the optimization question. It was noted that some colleges have announced increases in their student body size, and that in any event, coming in exactly at a precise number is a difficult proposition for the Admissions Office. The current budget projections, however, do not assume over-enrollment funds. In the meantime, although there is no intent to

IPPC Minutes
February 13, 2009

over-enroll the first-year class, Admissions is operating on the assumption that they should “miss high” rather than “miss low”.

Vice President West suggested that there is no one solution to achieving balanced budgets in the out years; rather, the College will need to have a series of solutions. We must first address the deficits of the current year and complete the budget for FY ‘10, and then focus attention on the following years.

4. Other Reports and Updates

Jackie Shydowski reported that the SGA is working to dissolve the Pavilion Corporation (owner of Falstaff’s). A two-thirds vote of all students is required to approve the dissolution.

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

Appendix A: JOINT CEPP-IPPC MOTION ON UWW

MOVED: That the faculty recommend to the administration that Skidmore terminate its University Without Walls (UWW) program, and that the process of termination extend for a reasonable period of transition to allow currently enrolled students to complete their degree requirements.

RATIONALE

The UWW program has been the subject of study for several years, as the College has attempted to address critiques of the program and respond to the serious challenges facing it. These critiques and challenges are identified in the program's own self-study report issued in June 2006; the charge to the Special Programs Study Group (SPSG), January 2007; the review of the UWW program conducted by external consultants, April 2007; and the report of the SPSG, October 2007. After assessing feedback from the College-wide discussions of the SPSG report, the VPAA, with the endorsement of the President's Cabinet, made a recommendation to close the UWW program in March 2008, seeking the advice of FEC with respect to moving the recommendation through the shared governance system. FEC advised that CEPP should take up the matter.

In April 2008, CEPP brought to the faculty a motion to terminate UWW, a motion that was narrowly defeated. That vote occurred in the context of an understanding—as expressed by the VPAA and CEPP—that the program could not continue in its current form because of its serious academic, administrative, and financial challenges. These challenges were reiterated in the VPAA's charge to the University Without Walls Working Group (UWWWG), which undertook the task of developing a plan for a restructured UWW program.

CEPP and IPPC have carefully studied the UWWWG report and acknowledge that its proposed academic program is more rigorous and more fully integrated with the College's residential program. However, the proposed model is also more costly in terms of faculty time and commitment and makes significant continuing demands on the College's financial resources. CEPP and IPPC agree with the majority of the UWWWG members that the proposed model is not feasible and that it represents "an inappropriate allocation of institutional resources particularly in this time of economic uncertainty and volatility" (UWWWG report, p. 32). Further, CEPP and IPPC have reached this conclusion recognizing that UWW was approved in the early 1970s with the explicit agreement (by the faculty, administration, and the Board of Trustees) that the program be self-supporting.

CEPP and IPPC unanimously conclude that, as a matter of educational and institutional policy, the continuation of the UWW program is not in the College's best long-term interests. Closing UWW, while painful and difficult, is appropriate and responsible.

CEPP and IPPC offer this joint recommendation with the understanding that, if the decision is made to close the UWW program, the College will be committed to celebrating the accomplishments of UWW and its graduates and to honoring the work of the many longtime and dedicated faculty and staff members who have devoted themselves to the program.