

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
July 30, 2009**

PRESENT: President Philip Glotzbach, Chair; Professor Adrienne Zuerner, Vice Chair; Winston Grady-Willis, Susan Kress, Kim Marsella, Erica Bastress-Dukehart, Muriel Poston, Jeff Segrave, Justin Sipher, Michael West, Mary Cogan, Susan Bender, Anne Petruzelli, Barbara Krause (Secretary).

GUEST: Barbara Beck.

ABSENT: Mary Lou Bates, Rochelle Calhoun, Michael Casey, Ann Henderson, Tim Harper, Raina Bretan, James Welsh, Hugh Foley.

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

President Glotzbach thanked members for attending this special meeting of the IPPC. He welcomed individuals who were attending their first meeting as members of the committee.

**2. Early Retirement Incentive Program**

President Glotzbach introduced this topic by reminding members that certain items discussed at IPPC must be held in strict confidence at various points in time. Due to legal requirements and implications related to the proposed Early Retirement Incentive Program, this discussion is one such confidential item.

President Glotzbach noted that at community meetings last spring, he reported that the

however, that this ratio will be affected by other academic planning, and it is possible that tenure track lines may be reallocated among departments as a result of the ERIP.

It is anticipated that non-faculty positions vacated by the ERIP will not be filled and will not be restored (absent compelling circumstances) except as new initiatives.

The ERIP does not anticipate elimination of the current phased retirement plan, although some changes to that plan might be made in the future.

For planning purposes, Human Resources has tentatively projected that 10 faculty members and 10 non-faculty employees will choose to participate in the ERIP. It is virtually certain, however, that the breakdown will not be an even split. The plan allows the administration flexibility to make decisions based on operational needs. Legal requirements ensuring that the plan does not discriminate against protected categories also will need to be met.

This program will be completed before any Reduction in Force (RIF) is implemented. Timelines for the RIF will be announced in the fall. It was noted that it is logically possible that some individual(s) may apply for the ERIP, be denied, and then have their positions eliminated. The group acknowledged that these will be difficult situations for the affected individuals and for the community.

The administration used an actuarial firm to help determine projected savings. Actual savings will depend on which employees apply for and are granted early retirement, their salaries, and whether any of those positions are “back-filled” (and at what compensation level).

In addition to the dollar savings, it was noted that there is a non-monetary benefit to offering the ERIP – namely, as a measure of good faith by the College to assist individuals who might be on the verge of retirement. The elimination of positions through the ERIP will result in savings by the College and, therefore, reduce the number of positions that must be eliminated through the RIF. The ERIP, in other words, will help soften the blow of budget reductions for some number of individuals.

It was acknowledged that both the ERIP and the RIF will have an impact on the morale of employees. The campus as a whole will need to recalibrate its expectations of what work will be done, how often, and at what level.

Following this discussion, President Glotzbach asked for the group’s sense as to whether it supported the proposed ERIP. Members present expressed their unanimous support for the program. The group noted that communication – from the President, Cabinet members, IPPC members, and ultimately throughout the College – will be critically important during the coming year. Listening from the “bottom up” will be especially important.



