

**The University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met Thursday, May 24, 2001 at 8:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding. Chair Robert Holzworth presided.

PRESENT: Professors: Adman, Carr, Holzworth, Hunn, Luchtel, O'Brien, Poznański. **Ex-Officio:** Krieger-Brockett, Fabien, Ludwig, Olswang, Rickerson, Rose. **Special guest:** Norm Arkans, Associate Vice President and Executive Director of University Relations; Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.

ABSENT: Professors Haley, Riley, Roberts **Ex-Officio:** Bentsen Sjøvik.

Building Names

Norm Arkans, Associate Vice President for University Relations, gave a presentation on the history of fundraising and naming buildings on campus. He began by noting that this began in the budget crisis of 1981 in which the entire University community was encouraged to be more entrepreneurial. This also led to an increase in the focus on fund raising and major capital campaigns.

He reviewed a number of buildings that are the result of these campaigns and efforts and the resultant named buildings: Allen Library, Lloyd Nordstrom Tennis Center, Sea-First Executive Education Center, Mary Gates Hall and the planned William Gates Hall.

He then turned to athletics. First, for many years, this program has been self-sustaining and operates without a student fee, state resources or internal fees. Everything in the program is self-sustaining. Some is paid for by gifts and some is paid for by the department's own bonding ability. An indirect cost rate is paid back to the University for staffing costs, police, etc. Arkans said that building and donor's efforts are done "tastefully." His view is that we can't ask that department to be self-sustaining and simultaneously make it difficult to seek alternate funding. For example, when the \$40 million gift table was developed for the Hec Edmundson building, a private donor didn't come forward and they had to seek a partnership with a private business. Thus, Bank of America was granted a ten-year naming right for the arena although the building name remained unchanged.

Holzworth inquired about the relationship between giving to this program and the academic program. Arkans said there's been a lot of study of this but there is no clear evidence about whether there is a connection between athletic giving and giving to the academic program generally. Arkans did say that, anecdotally, there is a connection on this campus, citing Neil Dempsey, Wayne Gittinger and others. His view is that it is not a zero sum game; there has tended to be a connection between athletic gifts and university gifts. Of course, he said, there are individuals who will give only to one or the other. In response to a question, he noted that individuals and businesses that give large amounts tend to want some public acknowledgement of their gift. He noted that within the Washington Administrative Code, there are prohibitions regarding commercial activity on campus. For example, these limit direct access to students as a market and we are very firm in enforcing these rules. The caveat to this, in the Code, is that if it has an educational purpose, there are some exceptions. He cited activities that take place on the business school. Therefore, he doesn't see "business" as a negative word or partner in University arrangements. He feels that tasteful acknowledgement of gifts in the athletic program is acceptable; he would reject it however, in the library. For him, it has to do with the nature of the activities, characterizing one as the life of the mind and the other as a form of entertainment where people plan to have fun. He also distinguished "naming opportunities" from the placement of logos on various academic facilities. Noting that the Regents have the final authority regarding names, they consider factors such as longevity of the enterprise. Holzworth asked for other criteria and Arkans said that he is

not privy to those but suggests they are often contextual, and are made with reference to long-term University goals and standards. Arkans pointed out that there are three tiers of decision-makers regarding naming opportunities and urged that people give some deference to that process. Also, he noted that there are some high-priority needs here that can be met only with generous philanthropy.

Fabien suggested that these are not really gifts because gifts do not come with the expectation of conditions such as naming opportunities. Arkans, respectfully, disagreed with this characterization, while acknowledging that most gifts are designated gifts rather than restricted ones. That is just the way that fundraising works. Further, he noted that even when there are named buildings, the giver does not micro-manage the program or design of the building.

Rose asked people to be very cognizant of the slippery slope that is inherent in these decisions and distinctions. Describing his family's circumstances after his "country doctor" father died, his family decided to give a scholarship to the medical school. It was important to his family to do this as a way of honoring his family, and his doctor's provision of care during the Depression. Then he asked, given the name, "Is that commercial?" Olswang said that more than 90% of the gifts are restricted, noting that there are almost 200 named chairs and professorships. Rose made one other comment: that givers have intentions that accompany their gifts. They wanted their gift in the medical school, not in the English Department (by way of example). Adman said that this arrangement seems appropriate to her, but that Microsoft seems different to her because of the potential to impinge on academic freedom. That is, commercial names have a chilling effect that private names do not. Holzworth said that some people may not ever want to go into a building with a commercial name and that we need to be aware of that impact. Hunn said that even if these "gifts" come from corporate philanthropic funds, it is still a form of advertisement.

Holzworth pointed out that advertising budgets are far larger than philanthropic budgets, and that we would be besieged and have lots of money if we opened ourselves up for purely commercial/advertising ventures. Luchtel reiterated his view that there is a difference between commercial and private individual names. Additionally, he doesn't see that there is a clear policy in regards to naming opportunities and that such a policy, with clear criteria, is needed. Arkans pointed out that currently there are only two facilities that are named after businesses. Also, there is a policy that all naming must go through the Naming Committee and the Regents. He described a change of policy in regards to the Odegaard Library, and noted that when Gerberding became president, we became much more actively engaged in fund raising. Also, he noted that the University's reality has changed: the legislature no longer adequately funds the University and that private sources must be approached to meet University needs. Luchtel responded, referring to Art Ferrill's remarks at an earlier meeting, about the unease that these naming opportunities engender. Arkans responded that he believes that all of the naming opportunities have been good and appropriate. The only decision about which people may differ regards the Hec Edmundson Pavilion.

Holzworth asked about the downsides of corporate naming and giving. Is there a way in which this could adversely affect us? Is it ever counter-productive? Arkans said that no one really knows the answer to that, and pointed out that the University has been chronically under-funded for the last 30-40 years. While he believes it is reasonable to think about downsides, at the same times, the needs in the state are so great that he cannot envision a point in the foreseeable future in which the Legislature would fund the University at a level which would sustain it. Hunn conceded this but stated that he didn't feel this should keep the University from developing principles that would prevent commercialization of the campus as we seek more private funds. Arkans said that this is hypothetical and has not been borne out by past experience, although several members of the Council felt that this is where we are heading. Luchtel said that Arkans' position is "an end justifies the means" approach. While Arkans said that might not be inaccurate, he said that he takes a far more charitable view of business. He said, for example, why do we have a business school if we're not willing to train people to go out into business.

He said that at the core we are not a business. Olswang disagreed somewhat, characterizing us as an education business. There was some discussion as to what we are. Fabien painted the parade of horrors in which every building would have a commercial name. Vaughn pointed out that this doesn't necessarily have to do with the characterization of the University enterprise, but whether they "trust" the current process. She described different regulatory processes as expressing different levels of trust about the carrying out of various university activities. She then questioned whether this is an area in which the Faculty wants to channel discretion. Olswang pointed out that the Faculty does convey its view through the University Names committee although Holzworth pointed out that the Faculty does not, through the Senate, appoint Faculty to that Committee; rather, it is done by the President's office. Holzworth expanded on this point by talking about our level of comfort with a particular process as opposed to a policy that could be implemented by anyone. Arkans said that all of the Regents with whom he has dealt have been sensitive to this issue. In response to a question from Hunn, Arkans said that a Faculty expression of concern and interest in this issue would be welcome by the Regents. Olswang said a Class C resolution would be appropriate, and Hunn said that this would present an opportunity to air various opinions about this. Arkans urged the Council to invite the new Development Vice President back in the fall, so that the Council could hear from someone who is involved in development. Holzworth thanked Arkans for attending the meeting. Holzworth recommended that the Council keep this issue on the agenda this fall. Luchtel concluded that he is still disturbed by the lack of what he would call "some kind of broad policy" that would give the Regents some kind of fall back position when corporations engage in overreaching. Adman did point out, in mild dissent, to keep in mind who is doing the asking. Luchtel said that a policy might shape negotiations, however, once the giving process begins. Holzworth pointed out that Luchtel and the Council members have made progress on this issue since it first came before the Council.

Instructional Responsibility Policy

Hunn introduced the latest version of the draft resolution that the Council will be sending to the President. He noted that it has been dated to avoid legislative retribution. Holzworth asked for comments, noting that the idea of sending it has already been approved. He solicited comments, either here or by e-mail, to this letter. Olswang assured the Council that the President would review this and respond in an appropriate manner.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 10th were approved as written.

Adjournment

Hunn moved that the Council vote an acknowledgment of appreciation for all of the work that Holzworth has done, with acclamation by applause.

Fabien asked questions about faculty mentoring on campus. Olswang noted that there is no Code language on this. Also, because of inconsistent administration of this program, there were several adjudications that led to abandoning this program in the College of Arts and Sciences. Fabien noted that there are lots of practical and legal issues, but that junior faculty want mentoring and that they wish there was some kind of policy for the provision of mentors. Holzworth asked about the kind of information

that would be useful to junior faculty. Fabien said they want information above and beyond the yearly meetings with the Chair. Some junior faculty said that they felt that some of these evaluations were not entirely honest. Holzworth said that a consistency check would be good. Fabien described an example in the medical school where her chair has no knowledge of the faculty member's work and thus is incompetent to review it. Krieger-Brockett said that this is a very complicated area, noting that there are an abundant number of books on this topic. She doubted that a policy would provide the kind of help needed, and that information is more useful. Olswang said that we hear from women and minority faculty that mentoring doesn't work; they aren't invited to the informal social gatherings where a lot of mentoring takes place and that in some settings, it may need to be mandated. Then, said Carr, there is the problem of mandating relationships and his department has a mentoring committee that works with an individual and that the responsibility is shared. Members talked about the need to do some research in this area and to look at different models. There are advocacy models, informal ones, etc. Ludwig noted that he was recently involved in a tenure review in which the junior faculty were uniform in their chastisement of the mentoring that had been done in the department. He thought that it was particularly acute in small departments and that perhaps we need a larger institutional commitment. Vaughn pointed out that some of the information junior faculty seek transcends substantive areas. Holzworth asked about what can be done over the summer to have this ready for presentation in the fall. If items are on the agenda in the fall, they are most likely to be successful. Olswang said that the Council would want to invite the Mentoring Committee of the Teaching Academy that has been working on this issue.

Holzworth closed the meeting with some parting reflections on how much he has enjoyed working with everyone on the Council on what could have been some very divisive issues. The work the Council has done has been exciting: research faculty vote openness in tenure, salary policy, etc. People have been able to come together in a collegial way and it has been a good experience. He acknowledged Steve Olswang's contributions as a constructive member of the administration and Lea Vaughn's contributions as Secretary of the Faculty. This Council will continue to play a major role as long as the Council works diligently to avoid surprises and does its work carefully. He expressed his appreciation for the hard work of the Council members, and noted he will be on sabbatical next year.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

Minutes by Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.