

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
January 20, 2012**

PRESENT: Denise Smith, Vice Chair; Susan Kress, Michael Casey, Michael West, Mary Lou Bates, Rochelle Calhoun, Beau Breslin, Paul Calhoun, Joshua Ness, Cori Filson, Joe Stankovich, Justin Sipher, David Karp, Anne Petruzzelli, Gail Cummings-Danson, Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Ethan Flum, and Barbara Krause (Secretary).

ABSENT: President Phil Glotzbach, Chair; Peter von Allmen; CEC chair (TBD); Jonathan Zeidan.

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the December 16, 2011 meeting were approved with minor corrections and the following addition to the final bulleted list in Item 2 (RCTF/SRC):

- Vice President Kress indicated that there might indeed be a community-wide discussion; the *Faculty Handbook* makes clear that amendments to Part III (All-College Governance) must be agreed upon by IPPC, FEC, and SGA.

2.

for the time members have devoted to considering budget matters. He reviewed the following materials:

- Actual Enrollments for Skidmore and peers for FY07 to FY11
- Matriculated Students at Skidmore FY07-FY13 (projected)
- Skidmore Enrollment and Projections spreadsheet
- NFE Analysis and Options Being Reviewed (noting that all scenarios project a reduction in NFE compared to last year's actual enrollment)
- Skidmore and Peer Discount Rates (based on audited financial statements; includes study abroad)
- FAQ on NFE (Net Fiscal Enrollment)
- Key Budget Assumption Scenarios (preliminary discussions as of 1-19-12)
 - Projections as approved in Trustee budget approval in May 2011 (2280 budgeted NFE, plus 85 over enrollment.
 - Options A, B, C, and D, based upon IPPC direction to Budget & Finance Subcommittee at IPPC's December 2, 1011 meeting.
 - At this time, the Subcommittee anticipates presenting two alternative budget scenarios to the Board: one based upon May 2011 budget projections, and one based on one of the other options being considered.

At this time, the Budget & Finance Subcommittee has not formed a recommendation but asks that the full IPPC consider the merits of Option B, which would produce a balanced budget. Option B provides for a budget NFE of 2330 (an increase of 50 over the previously budgeted NFE projection), plus a range of 0-50 over enrollment. Mr. West invited the IPPC to consider two questions:

1. How should the "50 below the line" aspect of Option B be characterized? (Is it a true range in any give year? Does it mean an average over time? Other interpretations?)
2. Should the below-the-line over enrollment revenue be designated for some particular purpose (e.g., science)?

IPPC then engaged in a robust discussion of both questions.

Key concepts regarding the **characterization of "50 below the line"** included the following:

- Whether the Admissions Office will be able to enroll a class with the desired attributes (academic excellence, diversity, male:female ratio, etc.) at 2330.
- The approach of the Admissions staff if the number below the line is stated as a goal (i.e., will Admissions manage to that number as a minimum?).

Key concepts regarding the **suggestion to designate any over enrollment revenue to science** included the following:

- The benefits and concerns of using the budget to clearly signal support for a specific strategic priority vs. the importance of retaining institutional flexibility to address unanticipated operational or capital needs.
- Exploration of ways in which a commitment to invest over-enrollment revenue in science might be articulated:
 - How specific an expression?
 - Could it be addressed by a reference to science in Line 40 of the College's Financial Mode Scenario?
 - Budget is not the only way in which commitment to a priority is expressed; other ways include commitment to fundraise, allocation of time and attention by administration, etc.
 - How to make clear that the first investment of some amount of over enrollment revenue will be to science?

With the meeting time coming to a close, Mr. West suggested that the conversation be carried over to the next IPPC meeting to be held on January 27, 2012. **Stressing the sensitivity of various information (especially proposed comprehensive fee options), he asked that IPPC members treat the current budget documtingomp00404(pPE(u)3(m)16(i)StroC**