

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
December 14, 2012**

PRESENT: President Philip A. Glotzbach, Chair; Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Vice Chair; Michael Arnush, Mary Lou Bates, Beau Breslin, Paul Calhoun, Rochelle Calhoun, Gail Cummings-Danson, Donald Duff, Bill Duffy, David Karp, Wendy Kercull, Jackie Murray, Riley Neugebauer, Denise Smith, Joe Stankovich, Natalie Taylor, Matt Walsh, and Mike West; Barbara Krause (Secretary).

ABSENT: Barbara Black and Michael Casey.

GUESTS: Sylvia Franke McDeavitt, Roy Rotheim, William Tomlinson (Item 5); and Karen Kellogg and Kim Frederick (Item 6).

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the November 16, 2012 meeting were approved as distributed.

2. FEC Chair Membership on IPPC

IPPC voted to approve the following actions that will formalize the decision to add the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) to IPPC's membership:

- a. **Voted to amend Part Three.I.B.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*** to read as follows (new language underlined):

Membership: ...the Vice President for Finance and Administration; the Vice President for Advancement; the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid; the Dean of Student Affairs; the Dean of Special Programs; the Director of Institutional Research; the Chief Technology Officer; the Chair of the Campus Environment Committee; the Chair of the Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding; the Chair of FEC; the Chair of CEPP; one representative from the administrative/professional staff....

This language was previously approved by FEC and the Faculty Meeting; it also requires approval of the SGA.

- b. **Voted to amend the "Function" and "Membership" sections of the IPPC Operating Code** to implement the decision to add the FEC chair to IPPC's membership (additions shown with underlining; deletions marked with ~~strikethrough~~):

Function: The IPPC advises the President with regard to strategic planning, taking a comprehensive view of significant issues affecting the College. In so doing, it serves as the central deliberative body for all-college governance. More specifically, IPPC advises the President on all policy areas, with primary responsibility for those areas beyond the purview of faculty governance (such as budget and financial planning, benefits, environmental issues, admissions and financial aid, student affairs, and advancement).

The President chairs the IPPC; an elected member of the faculty serves as Vice-Chair. The agenda of the Committee is set by these two individuals.

The IPPC may appoint subcommittees to serve as resources for the committee with regard to any area of policy or planning as needed. The composition of such subcommittees is determined by IPPC in consultation with FEC and with other groups or individuals as appropriate.

~~The Chair of the FEC and the faculty Vice Chair of the IPPC shall meet regularly throughout the academic year so that each committee can be apprised of the other committee's work.~~

Membership: The President (Chair); the Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Dean of the Faculty; the Vice President for Finance and Administration; the Vice President for Advancement; the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid; the Dean of Student Affairs; the Dean of Special Programs; the Director of Institutional Research; the Chief Technology Officer; the Chair of the Campus Environment Committee; the Chair of the Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding; one of the two Vice-Chairs of the Subcommittee on Responsible Citizenship (one to be designated to sit on IPPC each year); three faculty members elected for three-year terms, one of whom serves as Vice-Chair; the chair of FEC; the chair of CEPP; one representative from the administrative/professional staff; one representative from the support staff; the President of SGA; and the SGA Vice President for Financial Affairs.

The full text of the IPPC Operating Code is available by linking to it from the IPPC home page: <http://cms.skidmore.edu/IPPC/>

3. CIGU Proposed Statement on Diversity and Inclusion

Professor Jackie Murray, co-chair of the Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding (CIGU, an IPPC subcommittee), introduced a discussion of the proposed statement on “Diversity and Inclusion at Skidmore College” that appears as Attachment 1 to these minutes. An earlier draft of this document was discussed by IPPC on March 23, 2012 (see minutes of that meeting). Comments and questions included the following:

- CIGU respectfully believes that references to an “academic community” are not sufficiently inclusive; however, it has amended the statement to refer to the College’s “educational mission.”
- The statement could be used in the following ways: posting on a web site on diversity and inclusion (now under development), on course syllabi, as part of messages from Admissions and the First-Year Experience program, in strategic planning contexts, etc.
- There are benefits and challenges of enumerating specific “sociocultural characteristics.”
- At President Glotzbach’s request, the Office of Human Resources reviewed the draft statement. While Director of Human Resources Barbara Beck did not cite any legal concerns, she did raise questions including the following:
 - Lack of consistency between the proposed statement and official College policies.
 - Concern that listing specific sociocultural characteristics could be viewed as excluding others.

Following discussion, IPPC voted, without objection, to express support for the statement “Diversity and Inclusion at Skidmore College” set forth in Attachment 1 and to encourage its use in appropriate ways. IPPC noted that the statement does not constitute an official College policy.

4. Policy on College Policies

Following the November Faculty Meeting discussion of the draft Policy on College Policies, the working group constituted by IPPC to develop the policy met to consider the Faculty’s feedback. The working group proposed two substantive changes:

- Revise to clarify that IPPC can recommend the more robust process spelled out in the policy. It was emphasized that any member of the community always can ask IPPC to consider a proposed policy, but the “recommend” language is more consistent with IPPC’s advisory role.
- For consultation with both the faculty and students, revised the “sense of [the faculty or students]” language to read “discussion and comment [by faculty or students].”

It was noted that policies required by law may need to be adopted notwithstanding any processes required by the Policy on College Policies. In such cases, a policy might be enacted pursuant to Section 6 of the Policy on Policies (authority reserved to the President in exigent circumstances).

IPPC voted unanimously to recommend that Cabinet approve the Policy on College Policies set forth in Attachment 2 to these minutes.

5. Standards of Business Conduct Policy

President Glotzbach welcomed Sylvia Franke McDevitt, Roy Rotheim, and Bill Tomlinson; they, along with Michael Thomas and Barbara Krause, have served as the IPPC-constituted

working group charged with developing a draft Standards of Business Conduct Policy. President Glotzbach reminded IPPC that various pieces of the policy are required legally and, in any case, as a matter of best practices in the current regulatory context.

Ms. Krause offered a brief overview of the work, highlighting key points that were reflected in a “Frequently Asked Questions” document that was distributed with the meeting materials. Questions and comments included the following:

- The Standards of Business Conduct Policy is itself a policy; it also references and has attached to it three other separate policies: Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, and Whistleblower. Cabinet, with support of IPPC, approved the Whistleblower Policy in August 2012; it will be implemented as soon as the contract for anonymous reporting services is operationalized.
- The \$5,000 threshold for reporting salary or consulting fees set forth in the Conflict of Interest Policy is based on guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that became effective in August 2012.
- Questions raised that may be the subject of further discussion as the draft policy is vetted more broadly include:
 - Whether certain terms should be defined more precisely, or whether the language as currently drafted provides sufficient guidance.
 - Whether the Conflict of Interest and/or Conflict of Commitment policies should be further revised to reflect various and changing teaching obligations and opportunities (e.g., on-line teaching, contingent faculty appointments, etc.).
 - A suggestion to develop a Conflict of Interest disclosure form for students who handle significant funds (e.g., the SGA Vice President for Financial Affairs).

Professor Rotheim emphasized that the overall intent of these documents is to create a context in which individuals ask the questions – first of themselves and, if appropriate, with other appropriate individuals at the College – as to whether they are carrying out their obligations to the College in the appropriate manner. President Glotzbach added that the documents should create a context in which there are “no surprises” regarding conflicts of interest or conflicts of commitment.

IPPC agreed upon the following next steps:

1. IPPC supports accepting the current documents as drafts to be vetted with appropriate campus constituencies.
2. In light of Ms. Krause’s upcoming departure from the College, Dean of the Faculty and Vice President for Academic Affairs Beau Breslin will coordinate the working group’s ongoing efforts, vetting the draft documents with various groups, and the ongoing work with IPPC and Cabinet.
3. DOF/VPAA Breslin and FEC Chair Barbara Black will meet to discuss the faculty vetting process.
4. Dean of Student Affairs Rochelle Calhoun and SGA President Matt Walsh will meet to discuss the student vetting process.

5. The working group will decide other procedural steps based on those conversations and the newly adopted Policy on College Policies.
6. President Glotzbach expressed his hope that this work can proceed expeditiously in the spring semester.

President Glotzbach concluded the discussion by offering thanks to the members of the working group and others who have been involved in advancing this work.

6. Update on Science Planning

President Glotzbach reported that the Board of Trustees held a special meeting on November 28, 2012, to continue its consideration of science planning. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure that Trustees have a thorough understanding of the transformational programmatic aspects of this initiative, that they understand various facilities planning options, and that they begin a conversation about a funding plan. Trustees expressed great appreciation for the planning work that has been done and excitement about the direction of this initiative.

Associate Dean of the Faculty Karen Kellogg then talked in more detail about the materials presented to Trustees. She noted that IPPC had seen most of those materials but that the project architects, very shortly before the Board meeting, had presented another site option as well as project cost estimates. The new site option, "Option 4," offers advantages that include less intrusion into the green space along the main College entrance, more space between the science facility and the possible siting for the new Admissions Building, and preservation of a more open vestibule as a key design component.

Associate Dean Kellogg also reviewed the preliminary cost estimates for all four design options, with estimates included for construction costs in today's dollars, total project costs in today's dollars, total project costs with an escalator to reflect the increase in cost during the duration of construction, and \$15 Million endowment for operating costs. The total capital costs for the options ranges from approximately \$91.5 Million to \$113.1 Million. Vice President for Finance and Administration Mike West noted that more than \$25 Million will be needed in any case to address necessary repairs and renovations in the science facilities, and this \$25 Million is included in the cost estimates above. Some combination of funding sources (gifts, debt, etc.) will be required to advance this initiative.

Finally, President Glotzbach reported that, with full support from Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid Mary Lou Bates, further design development on the proposed Admissions building will be deferred until the science design work is further advanced.

Associate Dean Kellogg reported that there will be open community meetings this fall and early in the spring semester to seek further input from the campus community.

Please notify the President's Office of any changes to these minutes.

ATTACHMENT 1

Diversity and Inclusion at Skidmore College

Skidmore College is committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive community in which members develop their abilities to *live in a complex and interconnected world*. Consistent with our educational mission, we strive to be a community that respects individual identities based on varying sociocultural characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, gender identity and expression, sexual orientation, national origin, first language, religious and spiritual tradition, age, ability, socioeconomic status, and learning style. We aspire to help create a socially just world that honors the dignity and worth of each individual, and we seek to build a community centered on mutual respect and openness to ideas—one in which individuals value cultural and intellectual diversity and share the responsibility for creating a welcoming, safe, and inclusive environment. We recognize that our community is at its best when all members participate fully in the spirited and challenging conversations that are at the center of the College's educational mission.

ATTACHMENT 2

POLICY ON COLLEGE POLICIES¹

Skidmore College is committed to carrying out its educational mission in a manner that reflects the highest levels of excellence and integrity. In support of that commitment, the College adopts policies to reflect its institutional values and to clarify expectations of individual members of the campus community. Such policies also serve, and are sometimes required, to support the College's compliance with laws and regulations.

This Policy applies to the development, adoption, and amendment of College policies. For purposes of this document, "College policies" are those that are intended to apply College-wide or that will have significant institutional implications.

1. In general, all new College policies and all substantive modifications to existing College policies will be initiated by the appropriate Cabinet member and, where appropriate, by the faculty and students within the context of shared governance.
 - a. Cabinet members will advise and consult with one another regarding College policies being considered in their areas.
 - b. In the case of College policies affecting the faculty or the curriculum, any relevant provisions of the *Faculty Handbook* shall apply.
 - c. Typically, individuals with responsibility for a particular area will develop a proposed College policy, consult with others as appropriate, and (through the appropriate Cabinet member) forward a draft to Cabinet for its consideration and approval. The Cabinet will notify the Institutional Policy and Planning Committee (IPPC) of any new or substantively revised College policy approved by the Cabinet. The Cabinet may determine, before approving a policy, that the policy should undergo a more robust process in accordance with Section 2 below. Independently, IPPC may recommend, after receiving notification of a new or substantively revised College policy approved by the Cabinet, that the policy should undergo the more robust process described in Section 2 below.
 - d. Any member of the community who believes that a College policy is required may propose such a policy in accordance with Section 3 below.
2. If the Cabinet determines that development of a College policy or a substantive College policy revision would benefit from broad community consultation, the following process will apply:

¹ Shared for discussion and comment with the SGA Senate October 2012. Shared for discussion and comment at the Faculty Meeting on 2 November 2012. Endorsed by the Institutional Policy and Planning Committee on 14 December 2012. Approved by Cabinet on [date]. Responsible Office: Office of the President.

- a. The responsible Cabinet member will submit a written proposal to IPPC. The proposal should include a rationale, charge, working group membership, and timeline.
- b. IPPC will review the proposal and take ultimate responsibility for charging and constituting a working group.
 - i. IPPC will consider the proposed charge, make any revisions it deems appropriate, and approve the final charge and timeline. IPPC will notify the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and the Student Government Association (SGA) Executive Committee of the approved charge and timeline. FEC and the SGA Executive Committee will inform their constituencies that this work is under way.
 - ii. IPPC will determine the composition of the working group, conferring as appropriate to identify the membership and the method of selecting or electing various members. In particular, IPPC will confer with the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs (DOF/VPAA) and FEC on the balance of faculty representation and on the selection or election of faculty members, and with the Dean of Student Affairs and the SGA Executive Committee on the selection or election of student members.
- c. The working group will develop a draft policy and bring it to IPPC for review. Once IPPC is satisfied with the draft policy, the working group will identify a process for disseminating and seeking comments on the draft policy.
 - i. Possible groups and committees whose advice may be sought include Cabinet members and their staffs, Human Resources, appropriate governance committees, and the SGA Senate.
 - ii. Members of Cabinet will be responsible for ensuring that the draft policy has been disseminated in their respective areas and discussed by those who may be most affected.
 - iii. The President is responsible for discussing a draft policy with the Board of Trustees, as the President deems appropriate.
 - iv. The DOF/VPAA (as a member of IPPC) and FEC will confer to consider how best to solicit faculty input on the draft policy. Proposed policies of particular significance to the faculty may be presented at an open community meeting, at a Faculty Meeting, at Academic Staff, and/or in other venues.

Depending on the policy, the role of the faculty could include:

- Receiving notification of the policy.
 - Presentation of the policy at a Faculty Meeting for discussion and comment.
 - Deliberation at a Faculty Meeting and a vote of the faculty to endorse the policy.
 - Deliberation at a Faculty Meeting and a vote of the faculty to approve the policy.
- v. IPPC will confer with the Dean of Student Affairs (as a member of IPPC) and the SGA Executive Committee to consider how best to solicit student input on the draft policy. Proposed policies of particular significance to students may be presented at an open community meeting, the SGA Senate, SGA Academic Council, and/or in other venues.

Depending on the policy, the role of students could include:

- Receiving notification of the policy.
 - Presentation of the policy at an SGA Senate meeting for discussion and comment.
 - Deliberation at an SGA Senate meeting and a vote of the Senate to endorse the policy.
 - Deliberation at an SGA Senate meeting and a vote of the Senate to approve the policy.
- vi. Any policy developed through the process outlined in Section 2 will require at least one open meeting, hosted by the working group, with the purpose of the meeting clearly stated in the message announcing the meeting.
- vii. The working group will also solicit e-mail responses to the draft policy.
- viii. In consultation with the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and if and when appropriate, the policy will be sent for legal review.
- ix. The working group will review feedback on the draft document, make adjustments as appropriate, and bring the draft policy to IPPC for review. IPPC may make further revisions. If the revisions are substantive, one or more of the steps outlined above may need to be repeated.
- d. Once IPPC is satisfied with the reviewed draft policy, it will make a recommendation to Cabinet regarding the proposed policy.
- e. Cabinet will decide whether to approve the proposed College policy.
- f. If appropriate, the President will forward the proposed policy to the Board of Trustees for approval.

- g. A report of actions relating to the proposed policy will be recorded in the IPPC Annual Report.
3. Any member of the College community who wishes to propose a College policy should contact a member of Cabinet, the IPPC, or other appropriate committee with a written proposal. Depending on the nature of the policy, the procedures to be followed may be as in Section 1 or Section 2 above.
4. Each approved College policy shall include a designation of a “Responsible Office” that is responsible for administering the policy. The Responsible Office is responsible for notifying affected members of the College community of the adoption or modification of a College policy prior to its effective date and for maintaining the current approved version of the policy.
5. Responsible Offices will ensure that College policies in their areas are available on an appropriate College website. Where useful, links to other appropriate websites (e.g., *Faculty Handbook*, *Employee Handbook*, *Student Handbook*, Human Resources, Financial Services, etc.) will be provided. Responsible Offices also will consider any feedback or concerns about College policies in their areas and, where appropriate, consider proposed amendments.
6. The President of the College retains authority to issue such College policies as may be required, in the event of exigent circumstances, to protect the best interests of the College. The President shall inform the IPPC of any such policy.