

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
January 27, 2012

PRESENT: President Phil Glotzbach, Chair; Denise Smith, Vice Chair; Susan Kress, Michael Casey, Michael West, Mary Lou Bates, Beau Breslin, Paul Calhoun, Joshua Ness, Michael Ennis-McMillan, Joe Stankovich, Justin Sipher, Peter von Allmen, Gail Cummings-Danson, Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Jonathan Zeidan, Ethan Flum, and Barbara Krause (Secretary).

ABSENT: Rochelle Calhoun, CEC chair (TBD), David Karp, and Anne Petruzzelli.

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the January 20, 2012 meeting were approved with minor corrections.

2. Starbuck Center Update

Vice President for Finance & Administration Michael West updated IPPC members on the situation at Starbuck Center.

In a message sent on January 18, 2012, Associate Vice President for Finance & Administration and Director of Human Resources Barbara Beck notified the campus community of health concerns that had been reported by employees who work in Starbuck Center. That message, and subsequent messages from President Glotzbach and Dean of Student Affairs Rochelle Calhoun, reported that the College has engaged an industrial hygienist to assess the situation. Erring on the side of caution and with concern for employee health as its paramount concern, the College also has decided to re-locate the 50 employees in the building until the situation can be better understood.

Vice President West added that the College also is finalizing an agreement with an epidemiologist who will investigate the reported health concerns. The College will be diligent in respecting the privacy of individuals who have reported such concerns. It is expected that the building will be closed for some number of months.

Vice President West expressed appreciation for the very high level of cooperation being demonstrated by everyone involved in this matter. He also noted that there is a range of responses among employees who work at Starbuck: some have expressed a desire to re-locate immediately; others would prefer not to move at all.

President Glotzbach echoed his appreciation to all involved – the employees who have shared personal health concerns, the employees in the building for their cooperation and patience, and for all who are working very hard to address the situation.

3. FY13 Budget Planning

President Glotzbach began by reminding IPPC members of the budget approval process:

- Early February: Board of Trustees Budget Workshop to review preliminary thoughts on major budget parameters.
- February Board meeting: Board, upon recommendation from the President, approves major budget parameters.
- May Board meeting: Board, upon recommendation from the President, approves budget for coming fiscal year.

President Glotzbach expressed his appreciation to IPPC's Budget & Finance Subcommittee and to IPPC as a whole for their careful consideration of the budget planning issues – including the Optimization planning scenarios identified by IPPC on December 2, 2011. He then invited IPPC members to return to the conversation that was carried over from IPPC's previous meeting – namely, a discussion by IPPC as a whole of the Optimization planning scenarios and proposed budgeting for FY13.

The proposal under consideration is "Option B," which would provide for a budgeted NFE of 2330 (an increase of 50 over the previously budgeted NFE projection), plus a range of 0-50 over enrollment. The questions for discussion remain the same:

1. How should the "50 below the line" aspect of Option B be characterized? (Is it a true range in any give year? Does it mean an average over time? Other interpretations?)
2. Should the below-the-line over enrollment revenue be designated for some particular purpose (e.g., science)?

IPPC continued its discussion of these issues, with a robust discussion of the same issues raised at the IPPC meeting on January 20, 2011 (see the previously approved minutes of that meeting). Members continued to debate how best to identify sufficient revenues to advance the College's strategic priorities and how best (or how specifically) to reflect a commitment to various strategic priorities in the College's budget. Other key points not previously reflected included the following:

- Members were reminded that there are already several calls on over enrollment revenue (e.g., use of such funds to support the Library/IT co-location project).
- All NFE scenarios currently under discussion represent a decrease from current enrollment figures (and, therefore, less revenue).
- There is a sense in which some sort of commitment to use over-enrollment revenue to support a strategic priority demonstrates institutional commitment to that priority; it also is true, however, that over-enrollment funds alone will not be sufficient (at least for a very long time) to significantly advance a major strategic initiative such as science.

- The budgeted NFE number is just one of several major budget parameters that are interrelated. If Trustees went in a different direction on any one of the other parameters, it would affect the discussion of above- and below-the-line NFE.

Following an extended discussion, President Glotzbach proposed the following:

1. Increase the budgeted (“above the line”) NFE figure by 50 to 2330.
2. Identify an acceptable range of 0-50 “below the line” NFE. (This is a true range, intended to allow flexibility to Admissions as it strives to enroll a class with the desired attributes. Zero NFE in any year would be an acceptable result – i.e., that result would not affect the College’s operations.)
3. The “first call” on any over enrollment revenue would go to support the College’s science initiative, with the intention each year being to allocate a substantial portion of any such revenue to support science.
4. It is understood that the decision regarding this allocation will be made each year, with the understanding that other more urgent needs could affect the allocation made to support science.
5. This framework will be thought of as a “five-year look” to see how the admissions picture develops and to test the College’s ability to “live” at the new budgeted numbers.

IPPC members, without objection, expressed support for the approach outlined above.

Please notify Barbara Krause of any changes to these minutes.