

the range of 8 to 10 to 1. These figures include all teaching faculty, including contingent faculty members. Skidmore has a larger population of contingent faculty than some of our peers both as a function of our curriculum and our financial resources. The data provided by Mr. Stankovich also included information on the number of full-time, first-time degree-seeking undergraduates, the number of all undergraduate degree-seeking students, and the number of bachelors degree completions.

With regard to various statistics on financial aid, Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid Mary Lou Bates reiterated that Skidmore's limited financial aid is our biggest impediment to admitting stronger, more diverse classes with a higher yield. Skidmore would need approximately \$400 million (or perhaps higher) to provide financial aid to 60% of our student body.

President Glotzbach noted that there had been a proposal at the previous meeting to increase our budgeted NFE from 2280 to 2330 (an increase of 50) and to retain another 50 NFE over enrollment "below the line" in support of the College's science facility project. He invited thoughts from IPPC members as to how to consider this proposal. Comments included the following:

- Faculty must be involved in this discussion.
- A suggestion was made to use existing structures – i.e., IPPC's Budget and Finance Subcommittee and IPPC as a whole – to develop scenarios and propose options for final consideration. In that context, IPPC members reviewed the composition of the Budget and Finance Subcommittee.
- It was suggested that various other individuals could be invited to participate in conversations with the Budget and Finance Subcommittee if the subcommittee felt that would be helpful.
- Given that student enrollment levels could affect educational policy and delivery of the curriculum, it was noted that the Committee on Educational Policies and Planning should have a role in the conversations.
- More broadly, the significance of this item suggests that IPPC and Cabinet should over-communicate with all constituencies regarding the Optimization conversation. It was noted that the budgeted NFE figure is just one question with many implications, including (1) revenue projections for the budget; (2) the costs of supporting the various enrollment options; and (3) how to allocate the revenues from the various NFE options. Several members indicated that a fourth question must be considered: namely, what initiatives will Skidmore stop doing or curtail in order to support the strategic initiatives that are identified as having priority?

There was considerable discussion about whether the framing of the current discussion implies that Skidmore already has moved to a budgeted NFE number higher than 2280. Several members urged that one option that must be fully interrogated is the possibility and implications of living within the budgeted NFE of 2280. Other comments include

- The allocation of revenues must be in the context of what Skidmore hopes to accomplish to advance its educational mission.
- Some members expressed concern about a framework that would suggest that Skidmore is increasing enrollment in order to support a particular initiative. Such a framework suggests, long-term, that the only way to advance new initiatives is to increase enrollment.
- While support was expressed for the discipline of maintaining over enrollment funds below the line, some members expressed concern that such a model is not sustainable long-term because it avoids the question of what are our core educational values and what budget is required to support them.

President Glotzbach expressed his commitment to taking a hard look at how Skidmore can streamline its existing operations.

The discussion then turned to various implications of class sizes. Comments in this regard included the following:

- CEPP agreed several years ago

It is understood that the Budget and Finance Subcommittee will invite additional individuals as it feels necessary to provide information or participate in discussions of these options.

Operating Procedures:

Agenda Setting

The agenda of the Committee is set by the President and the Vice-Chair ~~in consultation with the President's Staff, FEC, and SGA.~~ The agenda will normally include reports and updates, SGA issues and concerns, and ongoing and new business. Agendas and supporting documents will be distributed by email prior to each meeting, with lead time sufficient to permit committee members to review these documents carefully.

Minutes

Minutes of IPPC meetings will be recorded by the Executive Director of the Office of the President and Coordinator of Strategic

Function: To recommend and review admissions policies and goals; to plan with the administration the student aid policies of the College and to consider problems relative to the implementation of those policies; to serve as a resource for CEPP and other committees on admissions and student aid matters.

Membership: The Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid; the Director of Student Aid and Family Finance; member of the DOF staff; member of the DOSA staff; two faculty, one of whom serves on IPPC (appointed by the co-chairs of IPPC and serving 1-3 years, depending on the IPPC membership term) and one faculty member appointed by FEC to serve a 3 year term; and two students, one who is an SGA Senator and one who is appointed through the SGA willingness-to-serve process.

Campus Environment Committee

Function: To review and recommend environmental policies and procedures in such areas as land management, construction, waste management, purchasing, recycling, energy use, and water and air quality.

Membership: Three members of the faculty, at least one of them from the natural sciences; two members of the administrative/professional and support staffs representing the departments of Purchasing Services and Facilities Services; an administrator from Financial Planning and Budgeting; and two student members, one who is an SGA Senator and one who is appointed through the SGA willingness-to-serve process. The Chair (who sits on IPPC) and other members will be appointed by the President, in consultation with the FEC in the case of the faculty; a/p/support staff and faculty members will normally serve staggered three-year terms.

process administered by the Faculty Executive Committee, the SGA Vice President for Diversity Affairs, one student member appointed through the SGA willingness-to-serve process, one support staff member elected for a three-year term by a willingness-to serve process administered by the Office of the President, one representative from the Office of Admissions appointed by the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, one representative from the Office of Off-Campus Study and Exchanges appointed by the director of that office, one representative at-large from the Office of Student Affairs appointed by the Dean of Student Affairs, Director of the Office of Opportunity Programs or her/his designee, one representative from the Office of Advancement appointed by the Vice President for Advancement, one representative from the President's Cabinet appointed by the President, and the Executive Director of the Office of the President.

The Chair of the CIGU will be elected by its members from among the faculty representatives and shall sit as a member of the IPPC. The Chair may designate a Co-Chair from among the CIGU membership; in that case, the agenda for the subcommittee will be set by both.

Attachment: Annual Planning Cycle

Date: 22 September 2006

Subject: Annual Implementation-Planning Cycle

The IPPC has approved the following structure for an annual Implementation-Planning cycle