

INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

December 5, 2025

Present: Adrian Bautista, Claudette Castillo '28, Marc Conner (Chair), Amy Frappier, David Hargadon, Timothy Harper (Vice Chair), Michelle Hubbs, Zhenelle LeBel, Ting Li, Yueqi Li, Samantha Majiedt '27, Kerry Nelson, Jess Ricker, Tarah Rowse, Joe Stankovich, Elizabeth Stauderman, Natalie Taylor, Amy Tweedy, Sarah Vero, Joshua Woodfork, Murat Yildiz, Aiwu Zhao.

Guests: Associate Dean of the Faculty Oscar Perez Hernandez.

This meeting was called to order at 10:31 a.m.

1. Approval of November 21, 2025 Meeting Minutes

With no proposed changes, the November 21, 2025 minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Recommendation to Establish a Campus-Wide Group on Access

The Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding (CIGU), the Bias Response Group (BRG) and the Space Planning Working Group (SPWG) submitted a recommendation to the IPPC and to the President's Cabinet to convene a shared governance (students, staff, faculty and administrators) group focused on access and accessibility. The purpose of the group would be to identify, evaluate, and prioritize access and accessibility plans and actions to help Skidmore achieve its goals outlined in the *Strategic Plan's* "Foundation 4: Building the Inclusive Community"; specifically to: "identify, evaluate, and prioritize accessibility improvements across campus to our existing facilities and technologies, strive where possible to exceed ADA requirements, including exploring Universal Design principles, and emphasize accessibility goals in all new construction and renovation projects, in accord with our commitment to a welcoming, navigable campus experience for all."

CIGU Co-Chairs Aiwu Zhao and Joshua Woodfork, Co-Chair of the SPWG Oscar Perez Hernandez, and Chair of the BRG Adrian Bautista explained that the three groups received unanimous support from all members supporting this recommendation. They outlined: primary considerations:

- A. Accessibility plays a crucial role in sustaining inclusive community
- B. Current workflow is distributed across multiple offices, groups, and units—needs more focused coordination
- C. Represents urgent response to needs heard from constituents across campus, particularly student voices

Suggested Next Steps in Proposal:

- Clarify the new group's goals, scope, and relationship to existing groups and offices
- Develop and approve formal charge
- Determine proper membership
- Identify priority, tangible outcomes, and timelines

- Consider internal and external expertise, best practices, and provide resources for the group's work

Committee members expressed strong support for the recommendation.

Key Questions and Clarifications:

- Relationship to existing structures: How will this group coordinate with offices like Academic Advising & Accessibility Services, Residential Life, Facilities, IT?
- Scope concerns: Could this become unwieldy given the breadth of accessibility issues across campus?
- Timeline: When would this group be formed and begin work?
- Physical vs. broader accessibility: Discussion of whether focus should be primarily on physical space accessibility or encompass broader access issues (digital, programmatic, etc.)

Notable Points Raised:

- Oscar emphasized this is a response to pressing needs heard throughout campus
- Recognition that accessibility work is currently fragmented across multiple offices without central coordination
- Space Planning Working Group identified accessibility gaps that need systematic attention
- Student representatives expressed strong support for centralizing accessibility efforts

President's Response:

- Expressed support for the recommendation
- Noted this aligns with *Strategic Plan* priorities
- Indicated President's Cabinet would need to determine appropriate structure and charge
- Acknowledged urgency while recognizing need for thoughtful implementation

Action Items:

- SGA VP Castillo made **a motion that the IPPC endorse formation of a Task Force on Access**; it was seconded by SGA President Majiedt. **The motion was unanimously approved.**
- Cabinet to work with CIGU, BRG, and SPWG on developing formal charge and structure
- Determine appropriate format (task force, working group, or IPPC subcommittee)
- Clarify relationships to existing offices and groups
- Bring back to IPPC for further input in spring semester

3. 2024-2025 Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Annual Report

Institutional Effectiveness Specialist Amy Tweedy explained that the committee members had been assigned to read the comprehensive *Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Annual Report* as homework before this meeting. She covered the report highlights including:

- Comprehensive overview of institutional effectiveness measures
- Aligned with Middle States accreditation requirements
- Documented progress on strategic plan implementation
- Previously noted: report utilized AI in its creation (disclosed in document)

Committee members provided this feedback:

- Members thanked Amy for the thorough and well-organized report
- Described as educational about how the institution works

- Recognized as crucial prelude to continued Middle States review work
- Tim Harper requested that members provide any additional feedback directly to Amy

Next steps included:

- Committee members to send specific feedback/questions to Amy Tweedy via email
- Report to be posted online
- Report to inform ongoing Middle States preparation

4. Artificial Intelligence (AI) Baseline Policies

President Conner presented a draft framework for baseline AI policies, building on the previous two meetings' extensive discussions with AI Working Group members and the AI Resisters faculty group. The proposed policy structure includes, scope and purpose:

- Applies to all faculty, staff, and students using AI tools in institutional context
- Aims to establish baseline guidelines while respecting disciplinary differences
- Balances innovation with responsible use

Core Principles (discussed)

- Transparency in AI use
- Academic integrity
- Data privacy and security
- Equity and access
- Environmental responsibility

Permitted Uses (areas of discussion)

- Administrative efficiency (drafting communications, analyzing data)
- Research support (literature reviews, data analysis with proper protocols)
- Teaching support (course design, creating learning materials)
- Student learning (brainstorming, research assistance when properly disclosed)

Prohibited Uses (areas needing further refinement)

- Submitting AI-generated work as original without disclosure
- Using AI to complete assessments without authorization
- Uploading sensitive data without proper anonymization
- Bypassing security protocols

Data Privacy and Security

- Data must be anonymized prior to upload to AI services
- IRB-approved research data or data involving human subjects may not be uploaded
- Comply with FERPA, HIPAA, and other relevant regulations

Academic Context (faculty autonomy emphasized)

- Faculty determine AI policies within their own courses
- Students must follow individual course guidelines
- Syllabi should clearly state expectations regarding AI use

Student Perspectives (SGA President Samantha Majiedt and SGA VP Claudette Castillo):

- Strong desire for clarity and consistency across courses
- Current situation creates confusion—some faculty allow AI, others prohibit it, many don't address it
- Concern about equity: students with access to premium AI tools have advantages
- Request that faculty be encouraged/required to address AI in syllabi
- Suggestion that AI use in grading should be disclosed to students

Faculty Autonomy Concerns:

- Agreement that IPPC should not dictate pedagogical decisions
- Recognition that disciplines have different needs regarding AI
- Baseline policy should provide framework without mandating specific classroom practices
- Some faculty may choose to prohibit AI entirely; others may integrate it—both should be supported
- Data privacy clarity wanted

Grading and AI Disclosure:

- Student representatives argued AI use disclosure shouldn't negatively impact grades
- Committee recognized this enters territory of faculty pedagogical authority
- IPPC policy would not address grading practices
- CEPP (faculty governance) would be appropriate body to develop faculty guidance on this front

Environmental Considerations:

- Reaffirmed importance of understanding institutional AI's environmental impact
- Commitment to sustainability values should inform AI adoption
- Need for ongoing monitoring and mitigation strategies

Next Steps:

- President to work with IT, HR, AI Working Group, and other stakeholders
- Draft policy to be refined based on IPPC feedback
- Aim to bring actual policy draft to IPPC in early spring semester IPPC meetings

Community Engagement:

- After IPPC review, policy will be shared with entire campus community
- Feedback mechanism will be established (likely email-based)
- Open comment period before final adoption
- Goal: ensure all constituencies can provide input

Rationale for Urgency:

- Community clearly needs guidance sooner rather than later
- Cannot wait until May 2026, end of the academic year, to establish basic parameters
- Balance between thorough consultation and timely response
- Most stakeholders (both pro-AI and AI-critical) will likely feel reassured by institutional care and caution

Committee Sentiment

- Recognition that policy framework is reasonable and addresses key concerns from both AI advocates and critics
- Appreciation for balancing institutional guidance with faculty autonomy
- Support for transparency and responsible use principles
- Acknowledgment that some aspects (like prohibited uses) will generate continued discussion
- General readiness to move forward with policy development while maintaining inclusive process

5. Call for Agenda Items

- AI baseline policy (February)
- Event publicity guidelines/policy (February)

- Speech and expression policy work (University of Chicago principles)
- Accessibility group (Task Force recommendation follow-up)
- Budget review (February meetings)
- Subcommittee reports (various IPPC subcommittees reporting on their work)

6. Other Business

SGA President Majiedt provided an updated on the food pantry, which is officially opened and located on second floor of Case Center by the information desk. It is available to students and campus community members needing support. One may access items via QR code. The limit is 15 food items every 2 weeks. The opening represents the culmination of years of student advocacy work.

President Conner concluded by expressing genuine appreciation for the committee's work throughout the fall semester. The meeting demonstrated:

- Strong collaboration across campus constituencies
- Responsiveness to community needs (both accessibility and AI concerns)
- Thoughtful balance between urgency and inclusive process
- Commitment to shared governance principles
- Productive engagement even on complex, contentious issues

The committee adjourned with clear direction for spring semester work and recognition of significant progress made during the fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

Summary document assisted by Claude AI.

Please advise the President's Office of any suggested changes to these meeting minutes.