

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**February 17, 2017**  
**10:30 a.m.**

**PRESENT:** Cerri A. Banks; Erica Bastress-Dukehart; Mary Lou Bates; Beau Breslin; Paul Calhoun; Michael T. Casey; Bill Duffy; Julia Elstein; Cynthia Evans; Philip A. Glotzbach, Chair; Lisa Hobbs; Mark Hofmann; James Kennelly; Kris Leggiero; Eric Morser; Dorothy Parsons; Levi Rogers; Denise Smith; Joseph Stankovich; Debra Townsend; Michael D. West; and Joshua C. Woodfork.

**ABSENT:** Tim Harper.

**GUESTS:** Chris Kaczmarek, Kelley Patton-Ostrander, and Dan Rodecker.

Called to order at 10:35 AM.

In the absence of Tim Harper, Jim Kennelly served as co-chair.

**1. Approval of Meeting Minutes, February 3, 2017**

IPPC **approved** the minutes from the February 3, 2017 meeting.

**2. Protection of Minors Policy**

IPPC Chair Philip A. Glotzbach introduced Chris Kaczmarek, chair of the Safety Committee, for her presentation of the Protection of Minors Policy. Chris acknowledged the work of the subcommittee that included: Loretta Greenholtz, Tim Munro, Alena Llorens Myers, Michelle Lapo, Wendy Kurcell, and Kim Bombard.

Chris reported that work began approximately 20 months ago, with a survey to assess the level of minors that participate in Skidmore activities both on and off campus. The survey indicated that at a minimum, 7500 minors (defined as under the age of 18) are involved on an annual basis. The Committee believes that this is a minimum number, as the survey data was incomplete.

Based on this exposure, our insurance provider, United Educators, has encouraged the College to create a policy related to their safety. The draft policy includes requirements for training and background checks for all students, faculty, and staff interacting with minors.

After reviewing key points of the policy, Chris answered the following questions:

**Q:** If a Skidmore athletics team wanted to run a camp with local school kids, would all athletes involved need to have a background check?

**A:** It would depend on the specific circumstance but if coaches are overseeing the camp and are present at all times, it may be that only the coaches will require the background check.

Q: Does this policy supersede other training or requirements by departments such as childcare?

A: Childcare has specific compliance issues required by the State; however, they will be cross referenced in in this policy. This policy can not supercede those requirements.

Q: Will all faculty need to have a background check since almost all have interactions out of the classroom with first year students who are not 18 years old? For example, in advising and mentoring situations?

A: The Dean of Faculty's office will need to review the policy and determine who meets the criteria outlined in this policy.

Q: Will this policy cover minors visiting campus with their parents?

A: No, minors with their parents are not governed by this policy.

Q: How does this apply off-campus; for example, on a Student Government Association (SGA) service trip?

A: Students would be included, and the policy will cover events off campus that include minors.

Chris pointed out that the purpose of the policy is not only to protect minors; it is also to protect those faculty, staff, and students working with minors, as well as the College. This draft policy raises many questions and still requires clarity on how individual departments and programs will be affected by the policy and/or its implementation.

Member of the IPPC recommended that the Safety Committee consider the differences between constituencies (students, staff, faculty, and trustees) and how such differences might affect compliance with this policy.

Q: If someone refuses to undergo a background check, what are the consequences?

A: Our Committee recommends that an individual refusing a background check would not be allowed to participate in or lead an activity involving minors. If that resulted in a substantial reduction in job responsibilities the College would have a continued employment decision to make.

Q: It seems odd to have a policy that applies to some, and not all of the campus community. Will this policy be applied to Union members? All students? Shouldn't the policy (and background checks) apply to everyone? It was noted that perhaps its best not to create a two tiered system, and that if we are in , we are all in.

A: Administratively, implementation would be significantly easier if it applied to the entire community, but for the initial launch, the idea was to address, first, those areas involving highest risk. It is now standard policy for all new hires to have a background check. Employees who came to the College prior to the adoption of the requirement for background checks most likely have not had a background check provided to the College. Therefore, this policy would need to be retroactive for such employees.

Q: How would background checks affect international students, staff, and faculty, and what are the implications of running a background check on these populations?

A: This will require further consideration by the committee.

Chris indicated that this policy can not be considered a Safety Committee policy if it is to be successful and that its' implementation and compliance monitoring would need to be handled at a department level with strong oversight and commitment from the Cabinet and Committees such as IPPC.

Phil thanked Chris and asked that she please take the IPPC comments and questions back to the Safety Committee members for their consideration, and then bring the policy back to the IPPC. for further review at a future date. Dean Breslin indicated that he would forward additional comments to the Committee.

### **3. Advancement Campaign Update and Advancement Review of Fundraising Plan for the Center for Integrated Sciences**

Michael Casey presented the following key highlights from Advancement:

Fiscal Year 2017 Year to Date Results:

- \$15.8 million in total gifts (cash in)
- Results well ahead of Dec. 31 target of \$10.5 million (year-end goal of \$22.2 million)
- \$15.3 million new campaign commitments (year-end goal \$20-25 million)
- Skidmore Fund tracking slightly behind (\$3.9M vs. 4.0M)
- Donors slightly up (64)

Campaign Results to Date:

- Reached \$132 million in gifts & commitments
- 66% towards \$200 million goal
- \$38 million in gifts & commitments for CIS
- Over 17,000 donors to the campaign
- Total bequests total \$23.5 million
- Continue to thrive in \$1M-5M range

CIS Fundraising:

- \$38.6 million in gifts and commitments
- \$50 million goal
- Emerson Challenge - \$500K
- Spring Campaign – Rated Prospect Push
- Summer Campaign – Collaborative Research Reunion
- Fall Campaign – All Science Majors
- September 15 – November 15
- Social Media, Web, Faculty

Phil thanked Michael for his presentation.

#### 4. Review of Operating Budget

Michael West recognized Dan Rodecker and Kelley Patton-Ostrander who had joined meeting. He indicated that the materials provided to the committee for review were the same as those considered at the prior meeting. Mike reported that since the last IPPC meeting, the IPPC Budget & Finance Subcommittee met and after review, supported the capital budget and key budget parameters, noting there was one dissenting vote from a committee member who did not support the transfer of two million dollars to the Center for Integrated Sciences (CIS).

##### Operating Budget:

Phil called for further questions or comments regarding the Key Operating Budget Parameters. Hearing none, and upon a motion made and seconded, the **committee unanimously approved the key budget parameters.**

##### Capital Budget:

Mike noted that the budget represents \$9M of commitments. He explained this number is down from the last two years, in which the College spent \$15 million on capital items. **Upon a motion made and seconded, the IPPC unanimously approved the Capital Budget.**

Phil thanked Mike, Kelley, Dan, and the President's Cabinet for all of their efforts related to the budgets.

#### 5. President's Report

Phil recognized Collyer Vice President for Advancement Michael T. Casey and acknowledged the recent announcement to the campus community of Michael's impending departure from Skidmore to become the Vice President for Advancement at Trinity College in CT. Phil thanked Michael for his many contributions to Skidmore College over the last seventeen years, including the successful fundraising campaigns, work with the Board of Trustees, donors, alumni, contributions to communications and marketing, and senior leadership.

He also reported that Associate Vice President for Advancement & Campaign Director Kimberly "Kim" Verstandig would serve as the Interim Vice President for Advancement, and that a national search would begin soon.

Joshua Woodfork announced the upcoming four-part President's Office *Community Dialogue Series*. There are three events scheduled for next week, including: "The Contours of Free Speech on Campus," featuring *Phi Beta Kappa* Secretary/CEO Fred Lawrence; "Immigration and the Future of DACA," with David Oxtoby, President of Pomona College; and a panel discussion on "Institutional Values and Investment Decisions," also featuring David Oxtoby. He noted that the last event in the series is scheduled for mid-April and that it will include a three-day program with one event featuring a prominent keynote speaker. Joshua is working with the Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding (CIGU) and Inclusion Liaisons (representatives from each of the College's Divisions) on organizing this three-day program. He asked members of the IPPC to please help spread the word and encourage attendance at all three of next week's events.

**6. Call for Agenda Items**

No additional agenda items were noted. Joshua indicated that he would check in with the leaders of each of IPPC's subcommittees to see if there are forthcoming IPPC agenda items.

**7. Other**

As no other business was brought forth, the meeting concluded at 11:50 AM.

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