

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**November**

now completed

FY '13 notable variances: Compensation favorable to estimate by \$1.3 million  
Auxiliary Margin favorable to a conservative estimate by \$0.3 million  
Transfers to Capital unfavorable to estimate by \$1.7 million to cover purchasing 954 North Broadway property, which was approved by IPPC and the Board of Trustees.

Student over-enrollment of 25 students provided \$0.9 million net revenue.

FY '14 financial aid expected to be in line with budget. It is important to make anticipated enrollment and stay within financial aid guidelines, as pointed out by Mike West, in appreciation of good work done by Mary Lou Bates in her role as Vice President and Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid.

Rochelle Calhoun asked about ways we categorize students regarding studying abroad and enrollment. It was explained that contingency helps us with risk based on not knowing how many students will choose to study abroad or summer melt, which included 65 students this year compared to 43 last year. Dean Beau Breslin pointed out that the large class because of over-enrollment size matters as to the ways we do business as a College. Mike West pointed out that we came in on target in terms of enrollment because we went to the wait list, noting that we had the most applicants in the history of the College.

Auxiliary Margin is favorable with the additional campus apartments. Somewhat higher Services & Supplies-type expenses related primarily to consulting expenses. Attention will be paid to the market value of our endowment.

Chris Kopec inquired about the market rate of our endowment compared with the market. Skidmore stands at just a bit over \$300 million. Our budgetary prediction was \$297 million. We wait until December 31<sup>st</sup> to see the average.

## **6. Union Update**

Barbara Beck has sent five different communications to the community regarding union negotiations. She explained that we started negotiating with our current Union, SEIU, back in March. She noted who makes up our union members. The contract expired on May 31<sup>st</sup>. Somewhere near the end of the contract, rival employees had enough members to sign cards that they would like to explore a different union. They acquired enough signatures to present to the National Labor Relations Board. The union contract was extended during this time and has continued month to month until the current contract, which goes until November 30<sup>th</sup>. The NLRB scheduled an election for August 1<sup>st</sup>, which included staying with SEIU, moving to UPSEU Local 200, or to stay with the College and have no union representation. During this time bargaining in good faith continued. The election turned out without a majority winner, resulting in the need for a run-

will continue negotiations with the elected union. A student group has endorsed the SEIU and held some activity.

Mike West pointed out that the College has tried to allow employees to make their own decision regarding union representation, particularly creating a fair election. Both unions have requested presence on campus, which the College has honored.

Rochelle Calhoun asked about health care, which was noted in the student petition. Two contracts ago the Union opted for a cost share. So cost sharing for health care is not new. Barbara Beck explained that contracts are negotiated back and forth and finally ratified by union employees. The current cost share, and how it is worded in the contract was mandated to the College by the union and this wording has been certified by a judge. Mike West pointed out that the College sent mandated monies to the union for healthcare so they are able to distribute it as they please.

David Karp asked why employees prefer one union over another. Barbara Beck explained that the SEIU has been here for a long time but that they recently had leadership changes and that this might have impacted desired representation. Mike West explained that there might be dissatisfaction with union employees'

Paul Calhoun asked if the white papers were invited or encouraged. Vice Chair Taylor explained that these were invitations but there would also be other ways for individuals and groups to participate in the strategic planning process. She explained that in the past other forms of participation like town halls have been utilized to solicit feedback.

Beau Breslin inquired whether IPPC would decide the avenues for participation, but he then asked that the subcommittee decide vehicles for participation. He encouraged inclusivity, but also recognized that a timing crunch might prohibit both focus groups and town hall meetings. Rochelle Calhoun expressed that there were benefits for affinity groups and independent departments to provide feedback, but she pushed for the recognition of the importance of cross-group dialogue, including faculty, staff, and student speaking across roles in person.

The subcommittee is continuing to work with Communications and IT to figure out strategies to receive and distribute the information that is received during this strategic planning process.

Vice Chair Taylor adjourned the meeting at 11:48 am.

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