



IP3 Executive Committee to the President for Institutional Planning

Meeting, December 10, 2002

MINUTES

Members present: Patty Carl, Sandra D'Arco, De DeGrado, John Frye, Kevin Kennedy, Kay Langston, Mike Pendola, Jim Reynolds, Joe Tidei, Doug Olson, and Brenda Jones Watkins.

Members absent: Patrick Creedon and Rosetta Polizzotto.

De DeGrado, Chairperson of the Executive Committee to the President for Institutional Planning, called the meeting to order at 8:45 a.m.

Ms. Carl noted a correction to the minutes. Page 3, paragraph 1, Priority #4 should read "for excellent performance" and not excellence and performance. A motion was made by Dr. Frye to approve the corrected minutes, seconded by Chief Pendola. Voice vote carried the motion unanimously.

Review Wording of Priority #2

Dean Olson stated that Priority # 2, if left as is, would not include the broad range the Enrollment Committee was looking at. He felt that the original statement captured the committee's views. Dr. Frye stated that he reads the statement as two ideas: assessment programs and institutional decisions based on data. He suggested the statement be reversed to read:

"Enhance research capabilities to provide a basis for making institutional decisions based on data and develop comprehensive assessment programs."

All ayes.

Dr. Frye also suggested that Priority #5 include "infrastructure". He suggested that it read:

"Create or improve programs and services and infrastructures that maintain or enhance an environment of excellence."

All ayes.

Objectives, Years Two and Three

Chair DeGrado stated that when departments write their action plans, they use these objectives as a guide. Next year the objectives could be changed. Years two and three do not have to be approved now; they can be tabled till the spring (2003). Dr. Frye stated that he would suggest next year an objective regarding professional development be included and he will address it at the Academic Senate meeting today. It was clarified that this would be considered for fiscal year 2005, year two, since fiscal year 2004 is year one in the current plan. Chief Pendola urged the departments to consider the entire three years when completing their action plans. Dean Olson added that some of the objectives would take 2-3 years to complete. It was agreed by all that the objectives for year two be finalized in the spring of 2003.

Dean Olson stated that in his opinion, The 10th Day Report is not the best tool to measure Priority #1. The deans are working to put into place new programs that don't all begin by the 10th day, and these students would not be included. Discussion continued regarding other tools in place to count enrollment; use of mid-term exams, or count of completers at the end of the semester. AVP Langston stated that we have been looking at the 10th day report and how it can be improved. It gives a snapshot and it is consistent. She suggested that it be used for the first year, so we have a basis for comparison, and then be modified next year. Any measurement in enrollment for this priority would not be realized for two years. It was agreed by all that The 10th Day Report remains as the tool to measure enrollment, and that a new tool be developed next year.

Review Institutional Planning Budget Timelines and Other Aspects of the Budgeting Process

Chair DeGrado noted the changes in the timeline. Ms. Carl pointed out that the two December 6th tasks have not been completed. Chair DeGrado confirmed that the committee is behind schedule. Dean Olson stated that the construction costs are no longer included in the timeline; this is a huge component that we do not have any information on. Mr. Reynolds invited AVP Stabile into the meeting to explain the construction cost process.

AVP Stabile explained that Phase 1 is obligatory costs and Phase 2 is contractual obligatory costs. Last year, because money was so tight, she broke it down into two phases. Contractual obligations have to be paid or we break the contract. Toilet paper and Xerox paper are not included in either Phase 1 or 2, but in Phase 3. Phase 3 includes expenses such as non-contractual travel.

AVP Stabile went on to say that construction is funded in August based on money left in reserve. In today's mail, administrators will receive a list of construction projects not funded. Copies of the list were requested for the committee's review.

A list of examples of FY 2003 Phase I and Phase II expenditures was distributed. Chair DeGrado asked for approval of the list. Concerns from the committee were that

departments would be confused by the fixed cost of the list, and that the list is not complete. Chair DeGrado stated that the list would be put on the next agenda.

Review and Approve the Action Planning Document

It was asked if the departments complete an action plan for every line item, and Chair DeGrado responded no. The action planning document will be given to administrators and they will give it to their cost center managers. A portion of the action plan will be included in cold fusion, and the action plan will be a summary of that. Chair DeGrado asked that 1) construction plans be included in the action plan and 2) the committee be supplied with a document that explains the construction process: how requests are made and where the money is from. All dollars spent should relate to the objectives.

Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, December 12, 2002 at 2:00 p.m. The location to be announced. The three items to address at the next meeting are: clarify the tools to use for budgeting and action plans, review timelines, and construction cost process.

Adjournment

Chair DeGrado adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.