

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FACULTY COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS**

The Faculty Council on University Relations met on Wednesday, **October 4, 2002**, at 10:00 p.m. Co-chairs Christina Emerick and Sarena Seifer presided.

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** Emerick (Chair), Robertson, Seifer and Thorud;  
                  **Ex officio members** Arkans and Doherty;  
                  **Guests** Jack Faris, Vice President for University Relations; David Wu, Assistant Dean,  
                  Development and Alumni Relations; Sandra Silberstein, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

**ABSENT:**     **Professors** Dziwirek, Fridley, Hicks, Kozuki and Regnier;  
                  **Ex officio members**, de Tornay, Russell, Sjavik, Whang and Whitney.

**Introductions of new and returning members**

All members in attendance were returning members. Guests Jack Faris and David Wu were introduced to the council.

**Approval of minutes**

Due to lack of quorum, the minutes of May 29, 2002 could not be voted on for approval.

**Announcements – Christina Emerick**

Returning council member William Robertson volunteered to represent the council on the Use of University Facilities Committee. This will be Robertson's second year on the committee.

**Building Naming Policy revisions – David Wu, Assistant Dean, Development and Alumni Relations**

David Wu distributed the draft of the "University of Washington Procedure for Commemorative Naming" and a "Construction Project Agreement (Business Plan Components)."

Wu distributed the draft of the document entitled: "Naming of Buildings, Spaces and Other Features or Objects," and the Construction Project Agreement (Business Plan Components).

Wu said, "The Development Office is working in conjunction with the UW administration and faculty on strengthening all aspects of the development operation."

To that end, he shared with the council a set of new guidelines for naming buildings, spaces and other features or objects.

Among the offices and officers participating in the naming process, said Wu, are the Provost's Office, the Executive Vice President, the Office of Finance and Administration, and the Office of Development and Alumni Relations.

The committee reviewed all aspects of the draft, and there was much discussion around these primary questions: How should positive image and integrity be defined?; Should operational costs be included in the price of naming?; and: How does the UW remove a name should some unforeseen circumstance make such a decision necessary?

The following is a general overview of the discussion.

Wu said that, if corporate entities are involved in a particular naming of a building, the dean determining the appropriateness of the recommendation will play an important role, and the Names Committee will be greatly dependent on the integrity of the deans in this part of the process.

Emerick said, “The integrity of the benefactor will be the foremost issue to many faculty at the University.” She said the “spirit of the institution is important,” and the naming of buildings is a significant part of that spirit. Wu said, “This is indeed important, but each instance will be different. The process that has been defined in the guidelines will allow for an appropriate review by the Names committee.” [Note: The names committee currently includes: Marsha L. Landolt, Chair (Dean and Vice Provost, Graduate School); Robert Crittenden, Faculty Senate Representative (Department of Family Medicine); Arthur L. Ferrill (University Historian); Connie Kravas (Vice President for Development); Jeraldine McCray (Assistant Vice President, Facilities Services); Carol S. Niccolls (Executive Assistant to the President); David B. Thorud (College of Forest Resources).]

Thorud noted that, historically, “There have not been many of these cases [in which the issue of the integrity of a particular benefactor arose after the process had been completed, or nearly completed].” He noted that “the vetting of each candidate will be the same,” regardless of whether controversy does or does not accompany a particular candidate.

Silberstein said, “We are now trying to get operational monies for University buildings. Do we want to require operational monies as part of a benefactor’s donation?”

Wu said, “It is very hard to convince a donor to give operational monies, and to require it would limit our donor list severely. We think it should not be a requirement.” Arkans said, “Some of these buildings are within our operational plan. It is rare that someone comes to us with money for facilities that are not within our plan.” Wu said, “We’re trying to capture the full cost of the building, including operational costs, so that a 50% donation would be 50% of the total cost of the building, including maintenance. We will have to come back from time to time to see how this plan is holding up, and what needs to be tweaked.”

Thorud said, “The operational cost factor is important, and this should not keep donors away.” Wu said, “We could say to donors: *If* something should come up, *this* would be the procedure.”

Wu said, “Contracts suggest that we, as an institution, reserve the right to reconsider if it should be necessary to do so.” Arkans said a general statement could be included that would apply either to an individual or to a corporation, regarding demonstrated integrity. “We’re talking here about human judgment. We could not list all negative possibilities: issues such as abortion stances, sweatshops, and a great many others that are all very complicated, and that would need to be addressed in the context of a particular candidacy. We need broad principles that could be applied to all potential benefactors.”

Silberstein asked: “Are there ‘basic values’ involved in the consideration discussions?” Arkans said, “Again, general statements could be added.”

Seifer said it would be a good idea to have a student representative on the Names Committee. Arkans said the idea had never progressed too far; that students had not expressed much interest in the naming of buildings. Also, the preferred longer terms of service on the committee would be problematic for students. Thorud said FCUR could discuss the possibility of a student serving on the committee. Several members of the council said they thought the inclusion of a student representative on the Names Committee a good idea.

Overall, the council felt that the document was very strong and recommended that language be added in section 1 which states that individuals, corporations and foundations have demonstrated values of the University of Washington.

### **Strategic Communications: Jack Faris, Vice President for University Relations**

Jack Faris said he would address three topics related to the University’s strategic communications: 1) work in progress; 2) the energized front toward the upcoming legislative session in Olympia; and 3) faculty participation in the strategic communications process.

### *Graphic Identity for the University of Washington*

Faris said the “work in progress” is the “identity project.” “We don’t have a singular graphic identity for the University,” he noted. Even the letters “UW” are “ambiguous” when isolated; they could as easily refer to the University of Wisconsin as to the University of Washington.

Faris distributed several examples of possible graphic identities. He said any notion of using UW sports icons for the University’s graphic identity was rejected outright.

Faris said that what is needed is a “draw to the eye.” Some people suggested using the UW seal. But there was more enthusiasm for the image of pillars, or columns, such as are seen in the grove below Drumheller Fountain. This image bears a significant relation to the University’s origin. And it is felt that it would be a good image for a multi-campus University.

### *2003 Legislative Session*

Faris distributed a chart illustrating “A Decade of Declining State Funding for WSU and UW.” Since 1993, Washington State University’s state appropriations per full-time student (in constant dollars) has declined 11.7%. State appropriations for WSU’s peer institutions in that same period have risen 17.1%. Since 1993, the University of Washington’s state appropriations per full-time student (in constant dollars) has declined 15.9%. State appropriations for UW’s peer institutions in that same period have risen 5.1%. Also, in that same period, companies based on WSU and UW related technologies have risen in number from fewer than 20 to more than 140.

Faris said, “Our competitiveness is not sustainable as it is now.”

Faris noted that, on October 14<sup>th</sup>, President V. Layne Rawlins of Washington State University and President Richard McCormick of the University of Washington will be taping a radio ad that potentially could reach upwards of a million people. They will be speaking to the issues of declining state funding and the contributions of both universities to the success of companies based on their related technologies, among other issues.

Faris said President McCormick has been saying that there are three possible scenarios for the University of Washington in the near future. The first would be a 1<sup>st</sup> tier research university with 35,000 students. The second would be a 1<sup>st</sup> tier research university with 30,000 students. And the third would be a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier research university with 35,000 students (the same size as now, but lower quality). The University wants to do all that it can to remain a 1<sup>st</sup> tier university with no less a student body than it has now. “We have had good editorial support from the papers throughout the state,” he said. “We have to aggressively make our case.”

Robertson said, “Send whatever you send to alumni to all faculty as well.” Arkans lauded this idea, and added, “And to deans and others, too.”

Emerick said, “This is a good approach: to emphasize what our graduates can do, and are doing, for the state, and to point out that teaching is being diminished.” Faris said, “The public and the state legislature are not sophisticated about what we do contribute to the state economy, and to the economic community overall.”

Emerick said, “There is a sensitivity, among faculty and students in the liberal arts sector of the University, that they ‘feel left out’ when we emphasize that we are a ‘research institution.’” Arkans said, “We say ‘research university,’ and not ‘research institution.’ It separates us from the four other public institutions in the state.” Faris said, “We can defend the phrasing ‘our two research institutions,’ for both Washington State University and the University of Washington. And it helps us build political support.”

Faris said, “We need to educate people who simplistically promote privatization. Our word is getting out there, but our drumbeat needs to get louder and louder.”

**Next meeting**

The next FCUR meeting is set for Friday, November 1, 2002, at 10:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder