

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

The Faculty Council on University Relations met on Thursday, **November 1, 2001**, at 12:30 p.m. Guest Chair Sandra Silberstein (Faculty Senate Vice Chair) presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Silberstein (Guest Chair), Goldblatt, Regnier, Robertson, Seifer and Thorud;
 Ex officio members Arkans, de Tornay, Doherty, Ludwig, Sjavik, Whang and Whitney.

ABSENT: *Professors* Crittenden, Dziwirek, Emerick, Fridley, and Kozuki;
 Ex officio member Russell.

Welcome to and introduction of new and returning FCUR members – Guest Chair Sandra Silberstein (Faculty Senate Vice Chair)

Silberstein, on behalf of Chair Christina Emerick, welcomed new and returning members to the Faculty Council on University Relations for the 2001-2002 academic year. Members introduced themselves and identified their departments and units.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of February 14, April 11, and May 9, 2001 were approved as written.

Honorary Degrees: Class “B” legislation in the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Council on University Relations will be submitting Class “B” legislation to the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting on November 19th. If approved by the Senate Executive Committee, it will be placed on the agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting on December 6th. The legislation, if passed by the Faculty Senate and signed by the president, would amend the Faculty Handbook. It would become Section 6 in Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11, and would read as follows:

Section 6. Honorary Degrees

Upon the recommendation of the Faculty, the Board of Regents may confer Honorary Degrees upon a person or persons of exceptional merit, other than graduates of this University. The Faculty Council on University Relations will have jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the award of Honorary Degrees and, on behalf of the Faculty, recommend candidates for Honorary Degrees to the Regents. Nominations for candidates may come from a variety of sources, including faculty councils, committees, departments, programs, schools, colleges or campuses. Honorary Degrees will be presented at either a commencement ceremony or a formal academic convocation.

RCW 28B.20.130(3) gives Faculty a significant role in the process of conferring honorary degrees. It states:

The board, upon recommendation of the faculty, may also confer honorary degrees upon persons other than graduates of this University in recognition of their learning or devotion to literature, art or science: PROVIDED, That no degree shall ever be conferred in consideration of the payment of money or the giving of property of whatsoever kind.

Except for a brief period in the 1980's, the University has typically not awarded honorary degrees, either as part of commencement or to special visiting dignitaries. And, from the 1950's until 1990, the University's featured speaker at commencement was its president. In 1998, the University's commencement was moved to Husky Stadium for a single, rather than double, ceremony for the entire University. This made it possible to consider having commencement speakers of national and international prominence. Given this, the question has arisen as to whether it would enhance the University's efforts to secure such speakers if the University were able to honor their presence on our campus by awarding an honorary degree. In

addition, the University occasionally has visitors, other than commencement speakers, of such distinguished accomplishment that would warrant such an honor.

Many people were concerned about the ability of the entire faculty to have a voice in this decision. By making this Class B legislation, that concern is addressed. Further, by addressing this as an issue of council jurisdiction, we secure a faculty role, as envisioned by both state statute and the *Code*, and allow our colleagues on the council to develop a meaningful procedure for faculty review of these appointments. On the other hand, by conferring this power as a jurisdictional grant, we need not encumber the *Code* or the council with procedural details that may warrant continual revision in the face of changed circumstances.

Building Naming

Marsha Landolt, chair of the Committee on Building Naming, was not able to attend this meeting, but will be invited to the next FCUR meeting.

Arkans said, “We have not acknowledged the concern on the part of some faculty at the University about “how we name buildings.” The significant change in building naming began over a decade ago, when the Board of Regents started to name new buildings after major donors to the University.

These donors not only had to be distinguished by careers of indisputable achievement, but had to possess unassailable ethical standards in keeping with the highest ideals of the University. In the case of corporate and institutional donors, the corporations and institutions whose names were recommended by the Building Naming Committee, and approved by the Board of Regents, could not be associated, literally or symbolically, with any disreputable practice or product. Arkans said there is “a series of screens” to which any naming recommendation is subject.

Arkans said traditional sources of revenue at the University “are no longer reliable; the University is now entrepreneurial. It actively seeks out funding resources.” He noted that there are only “a few cranes up on campus now, including those for the new Law School and the new Computer Science and Engineering building.” Except for these few buildings, there is no new funding from the State Legislature for Capital Projects specifically targeting new buildings. Thus, the University is seeking other means to continue its capital building program.

Ludwig said there used to be a practice on this campus of naming buildings after distinguished faculty or leaders of the University. Parrington Hall, Odegaard Undergraduate Library, and Gerberding Hall are three such examples. (Halls and arenas and other parts of buildings are also named after distinguished faculty.) Arkans said this practice has not been abandoned, but that the emphasis in building naming has shifted somewhat to individual and corporate donors due to the University’s increase in entrepreneurial initiatives and its entrance into “the philanthropic world” that commenced in the 1980’s.

Seifer asked what FCUR is supposed to do with respect to building naming. Silberstein said the council has a range of options: from endorsing current practices to developing guidelines to developing formal legislation. She pointed out that reading the FCFA minutes “from which this item was transferred” makes it clear that there is a range of opinions on this issue: from those who feel that building naming supports fund-raising opportunities to those who express a concern with respect to over-zealous entrepreneurship. The council can make an important contribution in its academic role by making an assessment of building naming practices and making suggestions it may have on the way those practices are conceived and carried out.

Seifer asked if there are policies on building naming. Thorud said there is a definite “process.” When a building name request is made, it is submitted by the appropriate departmental dean to the Building Naming Committee, which is appointed by the president, and has among its members several deans, one of whom, Marsha Landolt, Dean of the Graduate School, is the current chair. A justification for the recommendation accompanies the submission. The committee assesses the justification to see if it is consistent with the criteria for candidacy. If the committee deems that the submission meets the criteria, the name is sent on to the president and the Board of Regents, who make the final determination.

As for the role of commercialization in the building naming process, the University has traditionally been “typically cautious in the past,” Thorud said. But that caution unavoidably has lessened, for reasons already stated. Thorud said the question is: How does the University engage in building naming in a more entrepreneurial way with a dignity appropriate to the high ethical standards of the University? Another question is: Are the numbers right? If the University is to carry the name of a corporate donor, or a prestigious individual donor, on one of its buildings, it should receive a significant contribution from that donor, whether the name is meant to be permanent or temporary. As for name sensitivity, an individual name is considered less sensitive than a corporate name, though of course the individual name must thoroughly have passed the series of screens. Certainly no disreputable or controversial individual or corporate donor would ever be selected.

The state legislature has no policies about building naming, and has raised no questions about any decisions made by the University with respect to such naming.

One distinction that has changed with respect to eligibility for building naming is – it might be said – a matter of life and death. Formerly, to be eligible for candidacy, it was requisite that one be dead. Now, one may be dead or alive. Former UW President Charles Odegaard was very much alive when the undergraduate library that bears his name was inaugurated. And former UW President William Gerberding, after whom the Administration Building was renamed, is very much alive today.

Asked where corporate sponsors are most prevalent in building naming, Arkans said their presence, to this point, is almost exclusively to be seen in athletics (although it can also be seen in the School of Business). In renovating Hec Edmundson Pavilion, a corporate partner was the natural choice for sponsorship. The arena in the pavilion is named for the Bank of America for a ten-year period. Arkans stressed that Athletics at the UW is self-sustaining (with the major proportion of its revenues coming from the football program) and does not impinge upon the University’s academic programs.

Arkans said there is an important, if fine, distinction between “advertising” and “sponsorship,” as it pertains to promotion on the part of corporate donors involved with UW Athletics. “We do not let sponsors promote,” he said. Though some people say that sponsorship is a kind of *de facto* promotion.

Robertson said, with respect to the entire notion of entrepreneurship, “I feel it is very positive; the world is changing and the University must change with it.” Sjavik corroborated Robertson, saying that the idea of “resistance to commercialization on the part of the University is founded on a lack of understanding of where we stand in relation to the commercial world in which we live.” When an institution is “reluctant to acknowledge the conditions of its own existence,” he added, “we sell ourselves short.” It sells itself short by being “idealistically above the values of the world off-campus.” His question is: “If we go ‘all the way’ in our efforts to get money from selling ‘naming rights’, what kind of money are we talking about?” Arkans said it is a significant amount of money, though the amount obviously varies from building to building, from naming project to naming project. Ludwig said he agreed with Sjavik’s assessment, “though it’s good to have the skeptics as well.”

Arkans said he reminds students at the UW that “we do have a School of Business, and a School of Law, and Engineering and Computer Science programs, and a School of Medicine, from all of which students go directly into the world of commerce and entrepreneurship.” The difference between that world and the world of the University that should be kept in mind, he said, is that certain motives in the corporate world are “purely profit oriented,” and certain motives at the University are not at all motivated by profit.

As to what the money generated by the new entrepreneurship in building naming will be used for, both Arkans and Thorud said it will be used, in large part, for the development of academic programs at the UW.

Silberstein summarized the discussion thus far. With respect to reasons for FCUR to address this issue, if only to ratify flexible guidelines, council members had raised the following: to assure “due diligence” on the part of the University and to represent the Faculty Senate on issues of University Relations. In the context of increased privatization, council members felt that the faculty “need some kind of role in this

process, if only to protect the role of the council.” Robertson said the Faculty Senate might help enhance faculty representation on the Building Naming Committee. “The process needs input from faculty,” he said, corroborating Silberstein.

“UW In Your Community” Web site – Norm Arkans

Arkans said the Provost’s Office, some years ago, developed a Web site entitled “Presence Project.” The Web site could check on such things as community partnerships, UW Outreach K-12 programs, and health care programs in every part of the state. (What UW-related health care facilities are available in a particular town anywhere in the state?)

A new, enhanced Web site, “UW In Your Community,” will now carry on this project. Seifer said many programs in the health sciences are conducting community partnership projects involving linked Web sites. She also said that Web sites such as this can exist on a regional, as well as on a statewide, basis. Arkans concurred, but said that, for now, this program would best be kept statewide, where it should provide a wealth of opportunities for both the University and the communities it serves.

Research Firm to assist University Relations – Norm Arkans

Arkans said University Relations is in the early stages of trying to find the best-suited research firm to conduct tracking studies of public perception about the University. He will keep the council apprised of the progress of this search.

UW’s “visual manifestation” – Norm Arkans

Arkans said Jack Faris, Vice President for University Relations, wants to take a close look at how the University is presenting itself “in its visual manifestations.” A question to consider is: How should the University – all three of its campuses – present itself visually? Faris would like to see something that could blend with schools and colleges as well.

Next meeting

The next FCUR meeting is set for Thursday, November 29, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder