In attendance:
Doug Knerr (Provost), Connie Creech, Matt Wyneken (for Sharman Siebenthal-Adams), Adam Lutzker (for Amelia Biehl), Cathy Miller (Chair), Matt Wolverton, Mehrdad Simkani, Tess Barker (Chancellor’s office), Cathy Larson, Sarah Lippert

Guests: Kristin Lindsey and Jay Nussel were invited for a presentation later in the meeting.

Old Business:
- CACBSP asked for the financial representative to come to one of our meetings once a month.
- Fall meetings will be as follows, with possible additions to account for holidays: Thursdays September 8, September 22, October 13, October 27, November 10, December 8, 1:00-2:30pm in Chancellor’s conference room.

Approval of July Minutes: Will disseminate minutes at next meeting. Process is for draft to go to Chair (from the Faculty Secretary), who will send them to the faculty for review. Following faculty approval of minutes, Tess Barker will assist with posting them on the Chancellor’s website.

Discussion of how the committee represents the committee’s business externally:
- Formal business, including decisions of the committee, should not be shared/represented as official until minutes are approved.
- Faculty should feel free to discuss committee business with the faculty whom they represent, understanding how to do so responsibly.
- Business that needs to be explicitly confidential can be identified as such during a meeting.
Committee agreed on these approaches by discussion and consensus.

Selection of AAAC and Faculty Council Representatives:
- Sarah Lippert will serve for Faculty Council
- Connie Creech will serve for AAAC
Decided by discussion and consensus.

Discussion of Alignment of this Committee’s Business with the Strategic Plan:
- Current Strategic Plan ends in 2016. Need to determine if the plan ends with the academic, annual, or fiscal year.
- Committee members are invited to consult with their faculty on priorities for the strategic plan that can be brought back to the committee. Perhaps town halls within the larger units could be of assistance.
- The Chair will consult with the Chancellor to help shape agendas and to get a sense of her input on priorities as well.

Discussion of the CACBSP Priorities for the upcoming year:
- Strategic plan development, budget model and process adjustments, space/building utilization, and strategic enrolment management are the areas of focus for the upcoming year of CACBSP business.
- Cathy Miller (Chair) will meet periodically when invited to the Council of Deans to assist with communication between the administration and our faculty governance group.
Space:
- Suggestion that this committee might make some recommendations regarding faculty participation in the processes regarding space, including when and how faculty should be woven into that process.

Regular CACBSP meeting ended to hear from the guests concerning the ongoing Capital Campaign

**Presentation from Kristin Lindsey (Vice Chancellor for University Advancement) and Jay Nussel (Director of Development) on the Development Campaign:**

**Capital Campaign Discussion:**
- Handout—see appendix A to the minutes “Capital Campaign Update” provided by the Vice-Chancellor.
  
a) **Student Success:** The following are considerations in advancement and development:
  - Student support includes scholarships and financial support, as well as bringing students to our campus, as well as regional work with local schools and other initiatives.
  - How do campus inclusion and student life contribute to retention?
  - Need to assess where infusions of support make the most difference.
  - Need to consider range from small support grants to full funding for students.

b) **Academic Excellence:** The following are considerations in advancement and development:
  - What support is needed for engaged learning? How does the campus engage students in experiential learning and offer unique opportunities? How does that kind of opportunity manifest itself on our campus?
  - How can fundraising promote academic goals?
  - We have centers of gravity in the areas of entrepreneurship, health sciences/professions, STEM, and the arts.

c) **Big Bold Ideas:** The following are considerations in advancement and development:
  - BBI could be anything, but these are ideas that are transformational.
  - May take the form of capital projects.
  - These will be ideas that impact our place in the community, including the focus on placemaking.
  - Because of recent events (water crisis) the role and expectations for leadership in community engagement has changed.
  - Consider breaking down priorities and ideas from the larger schools/college to the departments/programs.

**Discussion of Fundraising Approaches:**

1) **Major gifts:**
- These tend to be $10,000 and above.
- Major gift officers are assigned to each of the schools (in process of hiring for CAS, so Director Nussel will meet that need until the position is filled).
- Rebecca Pettengill and Ken Sylvester offer leadership on the private and public ideas for funding.
- This area of effort includes corporate and foundation work.
- Trying to develop an international strategy by identifying funders who might fund international exchange. A fundraising committee has been established that is cross-campus. All of the schools are represented on that committee.

2) **Annual Giving:**
- This effort includes Giving Blue Day and the Faculty/Staff Retiree campaign.
UM-Flint is the most successful in the region in terms of the faculty/staff/retiree generation of support.
Annual Appeals are partnerships across the schools to reach out to alumni to engage them through giving.
New ideas are being considered to grow the alumni campaign.
New campaign is the 60 x 60 celebrating the campus’ 60th anniversary: will involve a homecoming for alumni—hopefully to capture 60 new donors for each of the decades in the campus’ history. Hope to generate $60 000 in the new 60 x 60 campaign.
Includes mail and phone appeals.

3) Stewardship:
Addresses the ongoing relationship with donors after giving takes place.
This year for the first time we had students fill out large cards as thank-you notes to donors for scholarships.
There is a need to find additional ways to acknowledge donors, involving students, faculty, and visits to campus.
We need to monitor and expend donations. There should be no unexpended funds. Donations should be on things we’re prepared to do.
Stewardship helps donors to see the results of their contributions.

Capital Campaign Purpose and Goals:
1. Financial Campaign Goal
We have a $40 million goal, which includes in-kind, planned, and one-time giving.
To date, we have raised $35 million ($15 million Riverfront building gift and $20 million for other purposes, including $7 million for student support. Original goal is to raise $20 million for student success.
Our campus has other needs not yet supported by funds raised within the campaign goal, so we need to be ambitious to exceed the original $40 million goal. Goal is to finalize the priority list by a month from now and to share with the campaign committee and the campus.

2. Secondary Campaign Goal
Part of the campaign’s process is to refine the fundraising process.
There are a lot of efforts to narrow priorities.
Donors need specific understanding of how their contributions will make a difference.
We need to build the capacity of the campus to participate in fundraising.

Discussion of the Presentation between Presenters and Committee:
One of the charges of the committee is to discuss with and advise the Chancellor on strategic planning. The faculty is currently unaware of what the Deans have conveyed as their top priorities. This committee, and more generally the faculty, need to be involved with the discussion of initiatives with Development.
How might the Vice Chancellor and her staff involve herself in the CACBSP’s strategic planning process so that we aren’t duplicating efforts or working on different priorities?
Our upcoming strategic plan might need to be broken down in 5 and 10 year stages.
We have made decisions on this committee in the past based on the past strategic plan. We need to have bench marks on the horizon to make appropriate decisions in the future.
Could CACBSP have periodic updates and exchanges with the Vice Chancellor and Development?
Question: Is the remaining $5 million ($35 of the $40 million is already received for contributions of Riverfront building and for other areas) supposed to cover all of academic excellence and other areas?
Answer: Money that has been raised is for the conversion of the Riverfront Building (as an asset); $10.4 million has come as endowed funds, but all as yet have not been recorded to identify specific purposes or department – working on this with Ann Arbor. Money to support all campus priorities is not yet raised, since the priorities are still being established. Some existing funds might be allocated to priorities that match those donations, but we will likely have to go past the $40 million in order to address some of the priorities that will be newly identified.

- Question: Are we raising money to match the Murchie gift and what is the deadline?
  Answer: Project will cost $39 million, of which we have to provide a match of $9 million. Match needs to be done in 2-4 years.

- Question: How was the Riverfront donation valued?
  Answer: Based on contributions of assessed value and comparable analysis of nearby buildings. There was no tax deduction because it was donated by a non-profit entity.

- Question: How do individual faculty needing even small amounts of funds work into the larger priorities? Are faculty supposed to do this kind of work on their own?
  Answer: Development should be involved with these kinds of fundraising concerns.

- Question: How do individual faculty needing even small amounts of funds work into the larger priorities? Are faculty supposed to do this kind of work on their own?
  Answer: Communication is important so that donors are not approached more than once.

- Question: We have had longstanding lack of communication between academic units/programs and Development. What is the structure/process for faculty to communicate with the Development officers? How do we establish open communication? What happens if the allocation of one officer per school/college proves inadequate, given the great disparity in the size of these units?
  Answer: Development relies on the Deans to know the needs of their units. Academic leaders have to be responsible for understanding the priorities.

- Question: What is the format of the fundraising committee?
  Answer: Approximately 15-16 households and community partners; made up of those who can make major gifts and introduce us to others who can make such gifts. CAS has established its own committee as well.

- Comment: It may not be effective to rely solely on Deans, who may have 250 faculty under their purview. Can one person represent and know such vast and diverse needs, especially when there is no structure or process in place to relay such information between the faculty and the Deans?
  Response: Development does have the ability to respond to situational fundraising, but there simply isn’t the capacity to address all interests and all priorities.

Committee Comments/Questions:
- This committee might recommend in the future (pending further information and discussion) that CAS needs a second officer within Development.
- Many smaller academic units are now developing their own development plans, but their leaders and faculty need support on how to go about it. Could a support/informational structure be established so that individual programs/departments can assist themselves with fundraising for their own needs when not included in the university’s priorities?
- Could Deans during the town halls present ideas for priorities that target wider funding sources than the limited or highly specific allocations brought to the faculty in the past?
- Could Deans be charged with soliciting faculty in a systematic manner and on a regular basis to ensure wider understanding of need?
- Training on how priority lists are generated at the Dean and program-levels is important to make sure that communal resources are applied appropriately.
- Perhaps a process that starts with a list generated from individual faculty, unedited by chairs, and sent to Deans, might be a place to start.
• Question: Why do some schools have capital campaign committees and some don’t?
  Answer: School of Management has an advisory committee. Each school does it their own way. Perhaps one per school might be a direction in which we should move.
• Comment: The Education Unit and other non-budgetary academic programs should also be consulted on priorities. Regarding student success, we should think about some way to capture our concerns about what happens to our graduates after they graduate. This may not be all about their immediate job, but rather life-long learning.
• Comment: Relying on a top-down approach to setting advancement/development priorities might create a disconnect between the successful implementation of funds raised and the anticipated results, especially if the priorities relate to academic excellence. Priorities that impact academic matters need faculty consultation.
  o The committee recommends a balanced approach to advancement and development that includes grass-roots (faculty and students) generation of priorities and identification of need, with administrative input.
  o Without input from those impacted by the funds generated, unintended consequences, such as the prioritization of sciences over other areas like the arts, may occur. What happens if our students have great need in an area that isn’t being prioritized?
  o Please consider this committee a resource, because we may be able to recommend the allocation of more support to Development in certain areas.

Meeting concluded at 4pm.

Minutes drafted by CACBSP Faculty Secretary Sarah Lippert

Minutes approved September 22, 2016