

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
February 15, 2019

PRESENT: Mary Lou Bates; Marta Brunner; Grace Burton; Sean Campbell Lisa Hobbs; Bill Duffy; Max Fleischman '19; Greg Gerbi; Philip A. Glotzbach, Chair; Tim Harper, Vice Chair; Katie Hauser; Michelle Hubbs; Carolyn Lundy; Crystal Moore; Martin Mbugua; Jennifer Mueller; Donna Ng; Michael Orr; Levi Rogers; Abdul Shokur '21; Amy Tweedy; Joshua C. Woodfork.

ABSENT: Cerri A. Banks; Joseph Stankovich.

GUESTS: James Kennelly.

The meeting opened at 10:30 a.m.

1. Approval of Minutes from February 1, 2019

The Minutes were approved without change.

Vice President of Strategic Planning and Institution Diversity Joshua Woodfork gave an update on the College's participation in the 2018-2019 Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) Diversity and Equity Campus Climate Survey. He thanked Institutional Effectiveness Specialist Amy Tweedy and Director of Institutional Research Joseph Stankovich for their help in launching the survey and reported response rates for the first week as follows: students 12%, faculty 31%, and staff 27%. He noted that these current response rates are below some previous surveys, and that the Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding, at their meeting today, had discussed ways of promoting the survey and increasing participation. Committee members asked about tracking response by office or division, but this is not possible since HEDS de-identifies all responses. Amy shared that a reminder email would be sent out on Sunday, February 17, 2019 with the survey link to those who have not yet completed the survey. Committee members were asked to point others to the email and encourage them to complete the survey.

2. 2017-2018 Campus Sustainability Annual Report

Professor and Director of Sustainability for Academic Affairs Jim Kennelly introduced the *2017-2018 Campus Sustainability Annual Report*, explaining that he and Levi would cover key factors, after which they would seek the committee's response. He acknowledged and celebrated the progress that has been made, reflecting an institutional commitment to sustainability, but warned that the report also shows a levelling-off which is somewhat troubling, given that the 2025 end date is not that far off. He said that much effort had been expended in making sure the numbers and were valid and reliable. He characterized the *Annual Report* as comprehensible, but said that its accessibility belies the complexity of the work involved in its preparation, for which he gave credit to Director of Sustainability Programs and Assessment Levi Rogers.

Levi Rogers presented the *Annual Report*, starting with the Energy area. In renewable electricity, the goal is 60%, the college is currently at 40%; in renewable heating/cooling, the

goal is 60%, we are currently at 35%. He noted that this year's *Strategic Action Agenda* tasked Sustainability with identifying the next major energy project; they are currently involved in the New York Higher Education Large-Scale Renewable Energy Project (NYHELP), along with 20 other campuses, to pool resources and move forward on this agenda item. Goal 3 is a 75% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, currently at 40%. The Sustainability Office plans to use a normalized baseline going forward for more accurate assessment, and are asking IPPC's endorsement of that approach. Skidmore continues to make strong progress toward Energy Goals 4 and 5, heating and cooling efficiency and electricity efficiency, respectively.

In the Food area, the goal is 25% sustainable food in dining services; we are currently at 10% and looking at ways to improve. The effort involves not just sourcing local food, but dealing with vendors whose practices include fair treatment of workers, ensuring decent working conditions, humane treatment of animals, ecological growing practices, and ethical business practices. For routine campus waste, Goal 1 is a 60% diversion rate in routine operations; we remain at 34%. Goal 2 is a 50% diversion rate for special projects, which is part of the LEED certification process. The Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS) has an active Lands Working Group to develop a comprehensive lands management plan to meet the goal of the Lands & Grounds focus area. Lastly, in the Lands & Grounds area, Goal 5, Engagement, seeks to establish sustainable decision-making among all stakeholders on campus.

Jim Kennelly added that the question of sustainability as part of operational decision-making is one of education and literacy; thus, it is hard to measure. He posed the question: How do we know whether or not sustainability has a seat at the table? Moreover, he offered that it must become part of the fabric and ethos of the institution. President Glotzbach said that a recent stakeholders meeting had taken up this issue. It has been discussed in President's Cabinet as well, with Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer Donna Ng agreeing to take on a greater role in establishing sustainability as a factor in financial and operational planning. President Glotzbach noted that, like our inclusion and diversity efforts, achievement of our sustainability goals needs to be a distributed responsibility across the institution rather than the work of one office.

Levi then asked the committee for a motion and was seconded:

"Motion: To track greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions against a normalized Year 2000 baseline (this baseline has been recalculated using the more accurate GHG factors and protocols that are now available). Baseline emissions will continue to be updated during each GHG inventory and will be calculated using present-day emissions factors and GHG protocol standards."

The committee affirmed unanimously on a voice vote.

Levi stated that they plan to share the *2017-2018 Campus Sustainability Annual Report* at an upcoming community forum, and that there may be a campus engagement event in Case Center to help assess the College's interest in sustainability. Joshua added that the Report is posted on the College's sustainability website, and suggested placing an item in the *Skidmore Weekly Bulletin*.

Q: Will the Campus Sustainability Subcommittee (CSS) also cover these reviews and recommendations?

A: Yes, the CSS helped produce this report and will continue to be involved in the work ahead.

3. Center for Integrated Sciences (CIS) Update/Q&A

Dean of the Faculty and Vice President for Academic Affairs Michael Orr introduced the agenda item by expressing gratitude to IPPC for suggesting that a community update on CIS (with time for discussion and community input) occur prior to the Board of Trustees meetings, when revised sequencing of an accelerated plan will be reviewed. In turn, he explained that he recently distributed an invitation to a Community Forum on CIS to be held on February 19. Prior to today's meeting, Vice Chair Tim Harper shared three swing space related questions, including:

- 1) decision-making process for planning, siting, and design;
- 2) input and community involvement in planning, siting, and design;
- 3) oversight after CIS is completed (perhaps the Space Planning Working group?)

Dean Orr noted the questions would be part of the Community Forum as well and then yielded the floor to VP Ng. VP Ng's presentation began by addressing the site, using a map from the *2007 Campus Master Plan*. She said that plan had been the result of a community-wide effort to identify opportunities for potential building sites up to the year 2010. VP Ng walked the committee through a map from the *Campus Master Plan* and noted the proposed site of the swing space building that includes availability of utilities and electricity. She relayed that she is aware that there are sustainability concerns with this potential site and explained that Facilities Director Dan Rodecker has had initial conversations on this topic.

Swing Space Questions:

Q: Has the building of a structure and its placement already been decided and what was the process?

A: The *Campus Master Plan* gives a logical starting point to look at sites. It is not yet a final decision, but there are time constraints, and we need to accelerate completion of the CIS project.

Q: Who will use the space once CIS is built, and is this the best site for future uses?

A: The swing space building is meant to be temporary, and as such, offers flexibility. After say fifteen years, the College could decide to build something else.

Q: The original idea was trailers; should we not compare the pros and cons of trailers vs. a building?

A: This topic may arise during the conversation at the 2/19 Community Forum. If so, we look forward to hearing feedback on both options.

Q: Is there space for community input?

A: So far this is an administrative plan, not fully vetted or decided, but I [President Glotzbach] don't see an alternative. Although we usually don't have campus-wide input on these types of building decisions, we are open to discussing it. The deadline for the decision will be upon us soon.

Q: Are there any potential hidden costs that may come up? Drainage of collection ponds, etc.?

A: That has been considered; we did some initial testing and preliminary work on the site.

Q: Who do we imagine being in the swing space for now, and shouldn't we discuss with them?

A: There are two aspects to this: the building itself, which Dan Rodecker is overseeing, and the tentative floor plan, which is being led by Associate Dean of the Faculty Pat Fehling working with the user's group. We want the floor plan to work for the immediate future, but we also have to consider possible future use.

Q: Regarding the pricing of trailers, has anything been done to update that cost? Also, is 40K square feet (sf) what we need, or can that be scaled down? If it is needed, can you explain why that much space is required for this project and for the future?

A: The trailer cost is derived from detailed estimates from architects; we can update it to be sure it still applies. As far as size, we can look at whether it can be smaller, but that would involve possibly reducing the number of classrooms, etc. For the future, a 40K sf building provides greater flexibility, but that is something that should be discussed. Dean Orr noted that the current two spaces to be vacated equal 36K sf. VP Ng added that a detailed inventory will drive the size of the new building.

Q: Is it even possible that the swing space could be used as student housing? Wouldn't that change its construction?

A: No, but if we did retro-fit it to student housing, there would be some conversion cost in terms of entranceways and heating zoning. That may not be a good idea, but is something to consider.

Q: There may be a desire for greater campus community input on the CIS project than can be accommodated by next week's forum.

A (President Glotzbach): Let's wait until after the forum to see what next steps may be needed.

Q: Why can't the swing space be situated closer to North Hall? Distance from the rest of campus is a concern.

A: We are thinking of placing it a little closer. Obviously, we can't rebuild the roadway without significant cost and other sustainability impacts. President Glotzbach added that because it's a prefab building, having it screened behind trees is preferable.

Q: A major consideration is the future-use question; what do we see coming down the pike that this building could be used for? That should be part of the forum discussion.

A (President Glotzbach): We're asking people to be smart about this. CIS is highest priority; other projects (Athletics, Admissions/Financial Aid) have been pushed back and currently have no timelines. The proposed size of the building is driven by relocating the Science faculty.

Q: If we did go with trailers, where would they go?

A (President Glotzbach): In the past, it has been Palamountain parking lot, but throughout campus. That is part of the reason for considering a permanent building.

4. Video: "[Financial Challenges for the Future](#) with David Wheaton," VP for Administration & Finance, Macalester College

Dean Orr commented that this video is an excerpt from a longer presentation on the Association Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) website and that other related presentations can be found there as well. President Glotzbach said that it provides background for our own continuing conversations. VP Ng noted that the presentation is from 2012, and that we have been fortunate in not having to deal with these budget issues until now, but they are the same issues we are facing. Vice President and Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid Mary Lou Bates noted that her staff has known for a while how fortunate we were to have the financial aid resources that we do, although that the increasing demand has been consistently rising. President Glotzbach concluded that the College has grappled with the tuition revenue versus financial aid shortfall every year, but the numbers now are bigger, and that it is a structural issue.

5. IPPC 2/8 Retreat Follow Up, Healthcare, and Next Steps

VP Ng said that she hoped everyone has read the summary of the healthcare discussion from the February 8 Retreat. A consensus emerged from the Retreat that time is needed to educate the campus community and allow participation in determining next steps. She suggested that this begin sooner rather than later with the IPPC Subcommittee on Budget and Finance taking up this work with other community members invited to join that group.

President Glotzbach asked if there should be a charge to the committee at this time. VP Woodfork responded that since the IPPC Subcommittee on Budget and Finance already has a regular meeting, they could map out a schedule, including dates that they would be working with our healthcare consultants to understand the long-term overview, indicating the deadline of when we need the next decision on rates, and ideas on how to move forward with community input. Donna Ng state that a portion of the next meeting on March 8 can be used to get started, with the discussion focusing on healthcare only (of the Retreat items we covered). President Glotzbach asked that IPPC prioritize and sequence the issues (covered during the Retreat and in general) for consideration. Vice Chair Harper requested that all relevant materials be provided for consideration prior to the meeting. VP Ng recommended a brainstorming session with the healthcare consultants be among the steps. VP Woodfork suggested creating a draft of a formal charge by next IPPC meeting (March 1), which could also serve as a model for engagement on and prioritization of other topics. Considering all the topics at hand, he reiterated his earlier suggestion that it may be wise to schedule another IPPC retreat during this semester.

6. Call for Agenda Items

None

7. Other Business

None

Meeting adjourned 12:01 p.m.

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