Minutes from the
Special Meeting of the Academic Senate Budget Committee (ASBC)

Meeting of November 19th, 2018

Monday 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
Room 4339 FAB

Present: Richard Smith (Chair), Leela Arava, Linda Beale, Paul Beavers, Stephen Calkins, Dante Dixson, Rayman Mohamed, Bryan Morrow, Charles Parrish**, Heather Sandlin, Ricardo Villarosa, William Volz

Absent with Notice: Kristen Chinery**, William Decatur***, Sudip Datta, Mahendra Kavdia, Santanu Mitra

Liaisons: Victoria Dallas, P.C., Jasmine Coles*, Thomas Anderson**, Lou Romano

Invited guests: Susan Burns, Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs; Sharon Progar Director of Business Affairs; Peter Caborn Edelman, Associate Vice President for Alumni Affairs and Advancement Services; Steve Henrie, Associate Vice President, Development and Alumni Affairs; Tracy Utech, Associate Vice President, Principal Gifts Campaign Director

*Student Liaison
**AAUP-AFT / UPT Liaison
***Administration Liaison

The meeting began at 11:00am.

I. Approval of Minutes from October 15th.

II. Pivotal Moments Recap and Next Steps**.** Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs Susan Burns.

VP Burns presented the results of the Pivotal Moments Campaign. Some of the analysis is still in process and will go to the Deans in December 2018. Total raised was $776.5 million including $255 for the endowment, $120 million endowed scholarships from 83,000 donors. *(RJS-I will ask VP Burns for a copy of the presentation for the committee).

Linda Beale asked if the totals included FMRE. VP Burns showed the totals with and without FMRE. FMRE accounted for $156 of the PM total or $620 million without FMRE.

Bryan Morrow asked if the gifts were designated for undergraduate v. graduate programs. We were informed that they were not coded that way, but could be.

Stephen Calkins noted that the numbers on the infographic did not add up. We were told that the infographic was an illustrative snapshot and not a full accounting because many gifts are not restricted and more analysis is to be done.

There have been some reorganizations in Development and Alumni Affairs, including the elimination of two AVP positions. Special Events and Services has been folded into Alumni and Advancement Services.

Bryan Morrow asked if there was a comparable institution in terms of fundraising targets. VP Burns replied that Temple and Cincinnati were on the list.

Linda Beale and Stephen Calkins engaged a discussion about return on investment (i.e., total donations / total budget of Development and Alumni Relations) as benchmarked by the Marts and Lundy report. VP Burns indicated that they have improved since the report was issued and she would be meeting with the authors shortly to get a sense of current standards of peer institutions.

Dante Dixon asked about expenses counted in the denominator of the ROI calculation, for how does Special Events fit into the overall mission of Development and Alumni Relations? VP Burns agreed that it was like apples and oranges, but it did support their work generally.

William Volz asked if the staff salaries were adequate to attract talented people. VP Burns replied that it was more competitive than in the past and difficult to get diversity in gift officers. The discussion continued to the diversity of donors. Development is working harder to get more diversity from the donor base, especially to engage Black alumni.

Linda Beale asked about the progress of software and database for alumni. VP Susan Burns said that it has come a long way with 30,000 new records updated. We have data for 200,000 of 270,000 alumni. They have been working with Daren Hubbard of C&IT to coordinate with admissions and student management so that that data will make it to Alumni Affairs going forward.

Charles Parrish asked if this information was getting to department chairs and if students, faculty and staff were engaged in calling alumni. Peter Caborn Edelman noted that the Deans' alumni officers are tasked with working with chairs. The Student Alumni Council is a vetted organization that volunteers to engage with alumni, but there are also 40 students paid in a phone bank to call alumni.

Bryan Morrow asked if we can donate through an annuity. Yes.

Lou Romano asked how we target wealthier donors? VP Burns and staff discussed how they purchase databases, merge with our data, conduct internal validation, and

review past gifts and engagement at events and on social media to determine potential for gift giving.

Lou Romano followed up and asked if there was a “grateful patient” program in partnership with the hospitals. Steve Henrie responded that we cannot get access to the patient data because we do not own the hospitals.

Linda Beale asked if the UPG does its own fundraising? No.

> We closed the meeting with a robust discussion of named faculty gift levels. Charles Parrish indicated that he raised the issue when he came to the university in the 1970s. These named faculty titles would be below the level of an endowed professorship or endowed chair. Stephen Calkins indicated that it is important in law to have such titles on a CV, but could understand why WSU would not want to give away the farm by setting the price too low. The group discussed whether to set the price between $100,000 to $300,000. VP Burns agreed to have her team look into practices at other universities.

Rayman Mohamed and William Volz discussed some of the challenges that new faculty who are hired into these named positions often expect higher salaries and perks like course releases, student assistants, etc. One should write the terms of reference for these positions carefully to ensure that unusual expectations are not associated with these positions.