INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
November 16, 2012

PRESENT: President Philip A. Glotzbach, Chair; Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Vice Chair; Barbara Black, Paul Calhoun, Rochelle Calhoun, Michael Casey, Gail Cummings-Danson, Donald Duff, Bill Duffy, David Karp, Wendy Kercull, Jackie Murray, Denise Smith, Joe Stankovich, Natalie Taylor, Matt Walsh, and Mike West; Barbara Krause (Secretary).

ABSENT: Michael Arnush, Mary Lou Bates, Beau Breslin, and Riley Neugebauer.

GUESTS: Sarah Goodwin (Item 2) and Karen Kellogg (Items 3, 4, and 5).

1. **Approval of Minutes**

    Minutes of the November 2, 2012 meeting were approved with one correction to the attendance.

2. **Assessment Steering Committee to IPPC Assessment Subcommitee**

    Faculty Assessment Coordinator and Professor of English Sarah Goodwin joined IPPC to continue the discussion of whether the Assessment Steering Committee should be reconstituted as a subcommittee of IPPC. (See IPPC minutes from November 2, 2012.)   The discussion focused on a number of concerns reported by Barbara Black on behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). President Glotzbach clarified that the discussion by FEC, together with IPPC's consideration of FEC's concerns, constitutes the consultative process; it was agreed that IPPC would not need to go back to FEC in order to make a decision about the proposed Assessment Subcommittee.

    The following is a summary of FEC's concerns and responses to them:

    1. *FEC's concern that the proposed IPPC Assessment Subcommittee is too large to be effective:*
        - Current Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) is essentially the same size and was able to find a meeting time.
        - Assessment Subcommittee (AS) would likely meet 2-3 times per year in "retreat" format, with smaller working groups engaging in work with a particular focus throughout the year.

    2. *FEC queries whether the AS should include someone from Finance:*
        - Underlying concern is that the AS should have a representative who is knowledgeable about and can speak to institutional allocation of resources. That role can be fulfilled by the Cabinet liaison.

    3. *FEC asks, because the Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs (DOF/VPAA) is the chief assessment officer, whether the AS should advise the DOF/VPAA (rather than the President):*

- For accreditation purposes, every unit must be responsible for using assessment data – our current structure does not yet reflect that, so reference to the President is important.
- IPPC members favored adding a reference to the DOF/VPAA to address this concern.

4. *FEC's concern that, in attempting to reflect faculty membership from the various disciplinary divisions, the proposed structure will be difficult to administer in light of the annually rotating CEPP member:*
   - A wording change was proposed to provide a preference for faculty representation from different divisions, without requiring it.

5. *FEC's suggestion (although a lesser concern) that the charge more clearly articulate what commitment is required so that those expressing a willingness to serve will better know what to expect:*
   - Until this group becomes more clearly established, a broader, more flexible "function" is preferred.

Concern also was expressed about the student time that will be required by an SGA IPPC representative to serve on the AS. SGA President Matt Walsh expressed the view that this commitment is currently expected and is not a problem.

Subject to the changes referenced above, **IPPC voted to approve establishment of the IPPC Assessment Subcommittee as set forth in Attachment 1 to these minutes (revisions to IPPC Operating Code).**

3. **Update on Science Planning**

Associate Dean of the Faculty Karen Kellogg reported that the Board of Trustees will hold a special meeting on November 28, 2012, to continue its consideration of science planning. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that Trustees have a thorough understanding of the transformational programmatic aspects of this initiative, that they understand various facilities planning options, and

2. *The document indicates that the SPWG will meet "regularly" – what is the expected time commitment?*
   - Edits were suggested to clarify that the group will meet as needed, relative to the project(s) under discussion.
   - The group is intended to serve as a resource to administrators, and those administrators will be responsible for much of the ongoing work.
   - A significant amount of space planning work takes place during the summer months; the SPWG will need to meet and carry out its responsibilities, even if faculty and student members are not available.

3. *Will the IPPC faculty representative serve a three-year term?*
   - No, this appointment will be made in coordination with the IPPC subcommittee assignments at the beginning of each year.
   - Concern was expressed at

6. Report from the Subcommittee on Responsible Citizenship

Associate Dean of Student Affairs David Karp, Co-Chair of IPPC's Subcommittee on Responsible Citizenship (SRC), reviewed the SRC's agenda for the Fall of 2012. The work falls into three main categories: (1) defining civic engagement, (2) promoting civic engagement, and (3) miscellaneous collaborations and activities to advance the work of civic engagement.

ATTACHMENT 1

IPPC OPERATING CODE AMENDMENTS TO
ESTABLISH THE IPPC ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
Approved by IPPC November 16, 2012
(Additions marked with underline

Operating Procedures:

Agenda Setting

The agenda of the Committee is set by the President and the Vice-Chair. The agenda will normally include reports and updates, SGA issues and concerns, and ongoing and new business.

Campus Sustainability Subcommittee

Function: To research, review, recommend, and help support the implementation of sustainability policies and procedures in such areas as waste and recycling, academics,

the Sustainability Coordinator, and the Arthur Vining Davis Program Director (during the

Attachment: Annual Planning Cycle

Date: 22 September 2006

Subject:

- The "Organizing Concepts" articulated in the Major Capital Project Planning Process and the Planning Matrix.
- Program needs of the potential users.
- Consultation with appropriate campus-wide constituencies.
- Type of space and function of space requested.
-