

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**March 4, 2011**

PRESENT: Acting President Susan Kress, Chair; Hugh Foley, Vice Chair; Mary Lou Bates, Rochelle Calhoun, Michael Casey, Winston Grady-Willis, Mark Huibregtse, Bob Turner, Muriel Poston, Paty Rubio, Jeff Segrave, Justin Sipher, Michael West, Adrienne Zuerner, Anne Petruzzelli, Gail Cummings-Danson, Denise Smith, Joseph Stankovich, Alexandra Stark, and Jonathan Zeidan.

ABSENT: Barbara Krause (Secretary)

**1. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes of the February 18, 2011 meeting were approved as distributed.

**2. Report on the February Board of Trustees Meeting**

Acting President Susan Kress reported on the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees. She asked Vice President for Finance and Administration Michael West to begin, and he reported anticipation of a final approval in May. He said that Trustees also voiced concern about certain trends for the future.

Mr. West noted that the Board approved several other budgetary adjustments including:

- an increase in the spending rate from 5.0% to 5.1% to provide for the hiring of three gift officers to begin work on the next campaign
- the release of up to \$2.5 million to begin the Library/IT project, which will include both the renovation of space in the Library and the repurposing of the boiler plant to long-term storage
- the release of \$400,000 in IT purchases

Mr. West then updated IPPC members on the recent acquisition of 200 acres of land located some 1000 feet behind the riding facilities. This is an anonymous gift of largely undeveloped land. The opportunity arose quite quickly at the end of 2010 and was consummated with the support of Trustee William Dake Executive Committee.

The land has some challenges in terms of access (and we are working with another landowner to help with that) but also offers many potential uses for the academic program, a topic that was explored in January with department and program chairs. He added that it is possible that there will be future additional gifts from the same donor.

Acting President Kress moved on to review the other topics covered at the Board. One of these was the optimization study that is being planned, and which had been discussed previously on this topic, but it was productive and the Board has encouraged the administration to pursue the next phase in this effort, which is to consider whether we should further interrogate the core assumptions underlying our current, budgeted size of 2,280. (These assumptions include our targets for gender balance, diversity, discount rate, and several more.) At the conclusion of that conversation, Trustee John Humphrey asked each member of the Strategic Planning Committee to write down his or her top three takeaways from the conversation. Those responses are being tabulated and will be shared with the Board and the Administration.

Another major topic of conversation, per Acting President Kress, was the science planning, which was the focus of the lunchtime discussion on the first day of the meetings. Acting Vice conversations. The first part of the conversation was a led by a panel of science faculty and focused on the science vision; the second half was led by Art Lidsky, a consultant hired to advise the College on its science facilities needs.

Acting President Kress did agree that these were challenging discussions but very much in line with previous Board conversations about major new initiatives such as the Tang Museum and the Zankel Music Center. Concerns were raised both about the plan and the cost, and it was clear that there was more work to be done in terms of planning. IPPC members asked whether for the project. Mr. West and Vice President for Advancement Michael Casey joined Acting President Kress in responding that they believed the Board to be very supportive but, as Acting President Kress noted, wanting to make sure that we came forward with the very best project possible.

group reviewed the draft provided and asked a number of questions about its genesis, the development process for the new policy, and a number of particulars about the policy, particularly around the allocation of funds generated by inventions. Acting VPAA Poston noted that they had convened a special group for this work but that several members were expressly chosen from the Faculty Development Committee. They also consulted with several alums with particular expertise in patent law.

A question was asked as to how this comported with the existing copyright policy, and Acting VPAA Poston responded that that policy had been largely written into this one. Another member asked for clarity on the issue of ownership. Dr. Poston stated that any invention developed at Skidmore using our facilities would be owned by the College, although any royalties or other income generated by that invention would be evenly split (50/50) between the College and the inventor.

portion was described as going to the home department of the inventor, the Office of Sponsored Research, and the College in general. There was considerable discussion as to whether this division should be proscribed on a specific percentage basis and it was resolved that the phrase included to indicate how much would accrue to the department. Mr. Tomlinson explained that the funds going to the Office of Sponsored Research were intended to be used to provide matching funds in the case of future applications for grants, while Acting Vice President Poston added that they had initially wanted to keep the language

Office of Academic Affairs more latitude in responding to the particulars of each situation. She was, however, quite sympathetic to the desire to return a considerable amount to the department and supportive of the suggested change in language.

**The committee endorsed the new policy unanimously with no abstentions.** The next step would be to share the policy more broadly for discussion and consultation. One issue that still remains is where the policy should live and whether it would reside in the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Employee Handbook*, or both. Acting Vice President Poston stated that she would like to revisit this issue when we discuss the Business Code of Conduct, which she sees in a similar light.

Acting President Kress thanked Mr. Tomlinson and Acting Vice President Poston for their work and asked that the names of those involved be included in the minutes to acknowledge their hard work on this project. Those names are as follows:

**Intellectual Policy Working Group**

Muriel Poston  
Mark Hofmann  
T.H. Reynolds  
Steve Frey  
Flip Phillips  
Sylvia McDevitt  
Susan Zappen  
Hunt Conard  
John Danison

### **Intellectual Policy Legal Review**

Steven Coyle, Partner, Cantor Colburn LLP (Intellectual Property Attorneys)

David Joyal, GreenbergTraurig LLP (Alumnus, Intellectual Property Attorney)

#### **4. Transition and Transformation**

Dean of Student Affairs Rochelle Calhoun led an abbreviated discussion of the draft of the Transition and Transformation planning document. She noted that it has already been reviewed by SGA, the Board, two roundtable discussions among department and program chairs, and several off-campus town hall meetings.

Vice Chair Hugh Foley began the conversation by asking for more clarification on what problem we were trying to solve and also how we would then measure our success. He added that, given the size of the investment, we needed to also think about this in the context of other investments we are either planning or not planning, that is, things we are choosing not to address. In the latter case, he particularly cited for consideration the idea of looking at increasing the GSA (paying individuals who are already here more before we hire new) and the possibility of hiring more faculty to do more of the high impact activities cited in the report.

Dean Calhoun agreed with his critique regarding the lack of metrics and said that the committee was well aware that this was an obvious hole in the current draft and that they planned to address in the next iteration. Professor Turner added that his support for this effort was driven not so much by career outcomes but rather by what it would do for students in pedagogical/academic terms and how the activities that would be supported have been shown to drive student engagement.

It was suggested that we needed more data to understand the issues. Dean Calhoun both agreed with that assessment and noted that we were, currently, operating in a somewhat data-poor environment, something she expected the new Career Development Director would help us address. It was further suggested that we consider surveying students as to their assessment of the current performance of the relevant offices (Student Services, Career Services) to help develop baseline data on future performance and to drive any new investments.

SGA President Stark stated that there was some dissatisfaction with Career Services and that the current initiative had been strongly supported by SGA. Acting President Kress brought the conversation to a close, apologizing that we had not had as much time as hoped to discuss this issue but also promising to bring it back for further review in the near future.

#### **5. Diversity and Inclusion Update**

Professor Winston Grady-Willis reported briefly that CIGU was preparing a number of added that Pre issues and that she had initiated an outreach effort to local community leaders to engage them as

partners in this work as well. She closed the meeting by committing Cabinet to reviewing its current slate of proposed new initiatives in light of the conversation regarding the Transition and Transformation initiative and the various ideas springing up around diversity.

*Please notify Barbara Krause of any changes to these minutes.*