



IP3 Executive Committee to the President for Institutional Planning

**Meeting, April 2, 2003
Board Room**

CORRECTED MINUTES

Members present: Bob Burnson, De DeGrado, Jonita Ellis, John Frye, Mike Pendola, Rosetta Polizzotto, Jim Reynolds, Joe Tidei, and Doug Olson.

Members absent: Patty Carl, Patrick Creedon, Sandra D'Arco, Kevin Kennedy, Kay Langston, and Brenda Jones Watkins.

De DeGrado, Chairperson of the Executive Committee to the President for Institutional Planning, called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Corrections were noted to the Minutes of March 31, 2003. Page 2, paragraph 2: "President Granados replied that it has been suggested that the committee is making the decision arbitrarily". The secretary, Connie Ganschow, stated that the President used the word "we" in place of "the committee". Ms. Ganschow recorded "the committee". Dr. DeGrado will ask President Granados for clarification of her statement.

Also, an amendment to the list of Obligatory Institutional Expenses from Operating Budget Phase I was suggested by Chief Pendola that was not recorded. Chief Pendola suggested that "Contractual" be added to "Professional Development" under Other Expenditures. Voice vote carried the amendment unanimously.

Finally, page 3, paragraph 6, "Priority 2, we need to ensure the new hiree knows that there will not be any raises for 3 years" should read "Priority 2, do we expect new hirees to work for three years without a salary increase?"

A motion was made by Dr. Frye to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Chief Pendola. Voice vote carried the motion unanimously.

Institutional Initiatives 1-5

Dr. DeGrado explained that he has only been able to contact VP Scism to invite him to the April 9th meeting to explain and discuss the budget related to his initiative. VP Scism has agreed to attend the next meeting. The others he was not able to contact. AVP Kennedy is on vacation till April 7th and Ms. Carl is on family leave till May. He did leave messages, but has not had a response.

Institutional Initiatives 6-122

Dr. DeGrado stated that the decision has not been made as to what to do with the remaining initiatives. He would like to turn them over to the VPs and Deans for their review. He asked for suggestions from the committee.

Dr. DeGrado distributed a draft of a memo that will be sent to all staff, thanking them for submitting institutional initiatives.

Dean Olson asked for clarification, as a committee, are we going to review all of the initiatives? Dr. DeGrado replied that the President requested the committee obtain more detail on only the top 5 initiatives. The committee will listen, endorse and recommend changes. Dr. Frye added that President Granados was concerned that not enough detail was provided on how the money will be spent. Mr. Reynolds added that the President also mentioned benefit costs were not included. Ms. Polizzotto stated we should scrutinize the whole plan from the beginning to the end of the budget process.

Dr. DeGrado asked the committee if they would endorse the memo. Voice vote carried the endorsement unanimously.

Fixed Cost Alternative

In response to the discussions regarding fixed costs, Dr. DeGrado suggested the term fixed costs be replaced with “amount budgeted last year” and “projected cost for next year”. He stated that this change provides long term budget planning. Mr. Reynolds added that what is ideal in a budget is to indicate what was the amount spent last year and what are our future projections. He added that AVP Stabile stated that it doesn’t matter what it is called, but if it has a contract it cannot be changed. If a department is required to cut 20% of it’s budget, it can do that with items such as supplies. It might be tight, but it can be done. But a contract cannot be reduced.

Ms. Polizzotto asked if the administration tells department heads what to cut when they ask for budget reductions. The response was that the administration does not tell department heads what to cut from their budgets. Further to this, Ms. Polizzotto indicated that she feels it is difficult for department heads to accurately determine what cost areas should be reduced unless there is a better definition of what “discretionary costs” actually refers to. She stated that a good indication of the future is past performance and suggested the term “discretionary” be replaced with more appropriate terminology such as “actual costs.” In addition, she added that budgets as well as planning should be based on “last year actual costs” and “current year actual costs” in

order to “forecast” budgets for the next fiscal year. She feels that this format would more accurately reflect and determine not only what budget areas can be increased or decreased but also what areas can be cut from year to year and what areas monies can be shifted to for new and existing initiatives.

Dr. Frye stated that he believes the President was saying she is disappointed. College people are becoming more aware that nothing is sacred and he believes the President expects this committee to have a more critical view. He fears that we are missing the larger picture.

Dr. DeGrado added that the budget-planning tool for every item should be projected out for 3 years so that you can get a picture of everything. Dean Olson said that you are asking for a three-year budget and you can’t do that. You do not know what is going to happen in three years. He added that the committee only reviews IP3 initiatives and not the whole budget.

Ms. Ellis stated that is the problem. This process has turned into the strategic plan. We should look at the entire budget and determine if it is in line with the department’s mission. IP3 was not intended to be just special initiatives, but the entire budget going toward the priorities.

Chief Pendola added that he agrees with Ms. Ellis. Initiatives should be funded by the department budgets and not by discretionary funds. If the initiative is not in line with the institution, then the committee should pull it. There are no golden cows. Our job was not to look at every line, but to see that department spending was in line.

Mr. Tidei asked if we could do that? Chief Pendola replied that it is not up to us, but for the administration. He added that budgets are so slim now it’s hard to purchase anything. We are all just trying to maintain the status quo. AVP Burnson pointed out that President Granados referred to discretionary funds to fund initiatives.

Vision, Mission, core Values Review Process

Dr. DeGrado stated that the committee is required to review the process and he does not want to wait till May to do the review. He suggested the committee discuss the process to review vision, mission and core values.

Dr. Frye stated that it doesn’t matter if the process is done in June, but that it takes a year to massage statements. He added that it is reasonable for the committee to review documents in May on an annual basis.

Dr. DeGrado asked if that plan goes along with the alignment of priorities? Dr. Frye replied that the process is reversed. Vision, mission and core values should be reviewed every few years and the priorities every year. He added that he thinks teaching/learning should be added to the priorities.

Ms. Ellis stated that she concurs, but you do need the vision, mission and core values for the year prior. She also agrees that priority review must be earlier.

Dr. DeGrado stated that the committee could decide the vision, mission, and core values we are comfortable with and can continue, but if we feel it is necessary we could review them. Dr. Frye replied that he thinks the committee should review them and make recommendations. He believes the process should be formal.

Dr. DeGrado added that what we have now is in place for FY04; in June we begin looking at FY05. Also, we go ahead and work on priorities and in June start the process for FY05.

Ms. Ellis stated that the process should be started early, prior to the review of priorities. She also concurs that this should be a formal review.

Dr. Frye clarified that if we look at mission, vision and core values in June, we are looking at FY06. We need them to establish the priorities. Dr. DeGrado added that we are working with a 2-year lead on the mission, vision and core values.

Dr. DeGrado suggested the committee review the priorities at the next meeting to see if they fit for next year. He added that he would like to have open forums for outside viewpoints. He asked the committee if it should be reviewed within the executive committee or should the sub-committees be reactivated? The committee agreed that the sub-committees should be reactivated. Dr. DeGrado appointed AVP Burnson, Chairperson of the Communication Committee and Ms. Ellis, Chairperson of the Human Development Committee, in the absence of Sandra D'Arco and Patty Carl.

Dr. Frye asked if he could respond. He has heard discussion regarding budget integration and linkage, and it brings images of 140 plus faculty teaching. He believes that we have overlooked our main goal. Faculty members look at the priorities and ask where do they fit into this? A teaching/learning component should be included.

Chief Pendola responded that faculty is very active in enrollment. Many faculty, John Augustine for example, work very hard for enrollment. Also, program quality. All faculty should be looking at improving program quality.

Dr. Frye responded that the best marketing tool for any school is good quality instruction.

Chief Pendola suggested that AVP Kennedy bring the flow chart, from the original IP3 document, to the next meeting. The flow chart gave a better sense of how the process should work. Ms. Ellis added that it is a circle process.

Dr. DeGrado stated that the flow chart could be put on the next agenda. He asked if anything else would be helpful? Chief Pendola replied the environmental scan. It would be helpful to see the community needs.

Dr. DeGrado responded to Dr. Frye's comment. Our number one priority should be student success. It may be implied in the priorities, but it is not specific. Mr. Reynolds asked Dr. Frye what would be the priorities of the faculty? Dr. Frye responded that faculty focus on their disciplines, and they do not focus on the institution.

Assessment Evaluation

Dr. DeGrado explained that the end of next year, the committee must develop an instrument to measure our success. Ms. Ellis stated that Southern Illinois University has a three-year planning process with a built-in assessment of their goals. Dr. DeGrado asked who the committee works with to develop something like that? Ms. Ellis responded, her department, Academic and Research Services. Dr. Frye said that he thought we were referring to assessment of the process. Dr. DeGrado replied that we were. Ms. Ellis added that we need both.

Dr. DeGrado added that the time lines also should be reviewed. Mission statements should be reviewed in September, so the committee can review the initiatives. Our committee started too late. We also need to include the deans and the administrators in the process.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Dr. Frye to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Reynolds. Voice vote carried the motion unanimously. Meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Submitted by: Connie Ganschow