

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
June 1, 2016

1. Call to Order.

CHAIR AUGIE GRANT (Journalism) called the meeting to order.

2. Corrections to and Approval of Minutes.

CHAIR GRANT asked for changes to the minutes of the April 6th meeting. There were none and the minutes were approved.

3. Invited Guests

CHAIR GRANT introduced Vice President for Development Jancy Houck.

VICE PRESIDENT OF DEVELOPMENT JANCY HOUCK thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak.

University Development is charged as a division within the university to plan and implement the fundraising programs on behalf of this campus and all the campuses and all the colleges and units of the university. It formulates the policies and principles and procedures around fundraising. Staff helps the leadership to identify and articulate the fundraising priorities to take to prospects and donors to attract support. They provide central services like annual giving, planned giving, and etc. to all the campuses. A central staff provides these services, donor recognition, IT, maintaining the database, donor relations, planned giving, corporate and foundation relations, etc. Each of the colleges and units and most of the campuses also have dedicated Development Officers in those units.

Development is a major gift-focused operation. That doesn't mean that they don't go out for \$10 gifts or \$20 gifts. They have all of those students who call alumni and donors every night looking for those small gifts but that is not the full purpose of the division's activity. Those are to identify donors who then become loyal, who move up the giving chain, who become more consistent and higher donors so that hopefully over time Development staff can identify people who have both major interest and capacity to make larger gifts. Because they are a major gift-focused organization, there are a variety of folks around the campus who are focused on the prospects who can give USC the most and do the most for the university philanthropically.

There are about 40 major gift officers on the Columbia campus. They have personal performance metrics every year for the number of visits they make to major gift

prospects, to the number of asks they make, to the number of gifts they secure and the dollars they raise. These results are tracked closely all year long. They're also charged with managing a portfolio of major gift prospects. There is a process where by individual gift officers have a portfolio of alumni and friends, corporations, foundations that they are responsible for nurturing and asking for gifts.

Staff works hard to identify prospects then educate and cultivate their interest in the university. Development asks them for a specific gift and then after they make that gift, Development staff thanks them and recognizes their support and continue to involve and engage them in how that gift is making an impact for the university, on students, with faculty etc. because that then leads to another gift.

To find donors with money from 300,000 alumni, they first look at past donors. Past behavior is the best indicator of future behavior. They look at annual giving, who gives consistently and who gives not just consistently \$25 a year but who gave \$25 10 years ago and then \$50 and \$100 and then \$500. On average it takes 19 years from the time a donor makes their first gift until they make a \$1,000 gift.

Development staff conducts wealth screening. Many companies provide services, identify individuals with significant assets. Staff shares the demographic information about USC people and the vendors look at zip codes, marketing data and publicly available data on assets that are held by people in publically traded companies, that have private foundations etc. This information comes back to Development to refine this list and identify those with major gift capacity. Staff then works to engage these individuals. Development welcomes referrals from faculty, from staff, from donors and volunteers. Houck referred to an illustration of a fictitious family which is representative of many USC families. Spouses with degrees from different colleges, and their children are enrolled in different colleges. They're donors to the athletic program. One of them might chair something at the library. Who owns those people?

The bottom line is the university owns those people. No one college owns those people and so what does the Prospect Manager do? What does the Development Officer do that's assigned to this family? They don't own that family. They manage the contacts and the interactions with that family so that Development presents a united front from the university.

They do that for major gift prospects for a couple of reasons. First is to prevent annoying the donor with too many phone calls from different areas of the university. It also helps to make sure that the prospects are asked for the right gift at the right time.

If anybody asks what can they do to help the university a perfect response is "We are so grateful. We'd love your assistance, what did you have in mind" and listen to them.

Prospects are assigned in a variety of ways. Many of the gift officers who come to work at USC are following on the heels of a gift officer who has left a portfolio of prospects that's waiting to be picked up. Many of those are inherited but gift officers are asked to make new friends every year. They can't just go back to the same people year after year after year because some people will age out, others will have made their final gift and new folks are needed to replenish that pipeline. They work to identify those who (A) have capacity and then (B) work to interest those people in the university. There are plenty of prospects. It's important to stop approaching fund raising with an attitude of scarcity and look at this with an attitude of abundance. They have just done wealth screening and there are 20,000 alumni prospects who could give \$25,000 or more who are unassigned. There are plenty of prospects out there who aren't "owned or managed" by a gift officer.

How can faculty help? Make a gift to the Family Fund, and consider a gift at the President's level which is \$1,000 for faculty and staff. Think about crowdfunding; the first crowdfunding project for the university launched yesterday for Cocky's Reading Express. Over time they hope that faculty and gift officers from the various schools will propose projects that need \$15,000-25,000 worth of funding and have mass appeal and a crowd of people who could be interested in that. It's proven to be the kind of thing that attracts new donors and younger donors.

If faculty have ideas about things that need funding or who might want to support USC, they can contact their development officers and make them aware of special opportunities. Think about alumni who have gone through programs who faculty may still keep in touch with.

Connect with corporate and foundation staff who can help with some proposals and some prospecting, and with a cultivation or a solicitation. While prospects and major donors often hear the "university message", the thing that really makes a huge difference for a prospect is to hear from the faculty member who is actually going to do the work. Faculty are terrific at conveying the passion they bring every day to their work. This is really compelling to donors - especially folks outside of the university world.

Alumni who come back are interested in talking with faculty and peeking behind the curtain. What does it really take to make this university work? Because when they were here they thought they knew but they didn't know. What does it really take to put a faculty member in a lab and to put that faculty member in front of students and make something wonderful happen?

The kind of passion and enthusiasm that faculty bring to their work really is compelling and contagious for donors. Have an elevator speech ready. If somebody says, "What's happening over there at the university?" replying "Oh gosh its summer, it's so great the

students are gone” isn’t going to get USC any gifts. Instead faculty should say something that feels genuine and is true about their work, about their experience here.

Is this all worth it? There’s a lot of work and effort and money spent that goes into development. And certain kinds of development can be pretty expensive. It can cost us between \$0.25 and \$0.50 on the dollar to go get those annual gifts. A \$10 gift from the first time donor is really expensive to get, and probably costs USC more than \$10 after all the identification, the cultivation, the emails, the letters that went out, the 1.3 million phone calls that students made last year, over the course of 17,000 hours to reach those prospects and get 10,000 pledges. But USC has to invest in that to cultivate those folks and get the loyalty and continued giving that will help identify major gift prospects.

It’s a better return on big gifts. The \$1.043 billion raised during the Carolina’s Promise campaign cost roughly 10 to 15 cents on the dollar. So talk to any business person - they’d love to invest 10 cents and get a dollar in return!

In between campaigns they try to at least maintain the new level of giving and possibly increase it slightly over the years after a campaign, to stay at the new plateau. Between the Bicentennial Campaign and the Carolina’s Promise campaign the university was able to raise about \$60 million dollars on average each year. Then along comes Carolina’s Promise, another period of intense effort that secured gifts of more than \$100 million dollars each year and raised the new average to \$130 million dollars. However, USC won’t hit \$130 million dollars this year because fund raising usually declines slightly in the year following the successful conclusion of a major campaign. Development staff asked every person they could possibly imagine would make a gift to make, support the campaign and a lot of them did. The prospect pipelines are dry and then the flood happened in October, but a down year is expected after the end of a campaign.

After a campaign is over they look back on those years and look at their results and see what they can learn from those results in order to make better decisions in the future. How long did it take from the time they identified a prospect, put them in a portfolio, started to cultivate their interest, asked for a gift and closed that gift? If that’s a 3 year process on average what can be done to shorten that process, because if they can turn them more they can get more gifts.

Houck stated that they needed to identify and articulate new fundraising priorities. In a campaign there is a nice umbrella that says this is what they are raising money for. After raising a billion dollars, prospects say, “Well you just raised a billion dollars what do you need money for now?” because the prevailing assumption is there must be a billion dollars in a bucket at the President’s office. However, many commitments were pledged to be paid over time, some gifts were already received and have been spent, some donors made planned gifts where some future event has to take place before funds

are received and some of commitments were gifts in kind. So there isn't a billion dollars in a bucket but USC does still needs private support and Development worked with each of the schools and campuses to identify new priorities for funding.

These gap years in between campaigns are an opportunity to make permanent improvements in the Development program. One of the things being worked on now is the quality and integrity of the data about the prospects, and potentially the conversion to a new data base that will be more robust and help us into the future. They are also working to increase the participation of alumni in giving. In the last decade virtually every college and university around the country has seen a decline in the percentage of participation by alumni in annual giving.

Development staff is working on their top prospects because they already know who they are, what they've been engaged in, what they've given to, and to make sure they feel connected when it's time for the next campaign. The quiet phase of the next campaign will probably start in a 3 to 4-year window.

They focus on top prospects because 134 donors gave 56% of the money to the campaign so without those donors the campaign isn't going to be successful.

CHAIR GRANT asked if a faculty member has a need are they entitled to go to their Development Officer.

JANCY HOUCK replied that they are but the Development Officer is going to check with the Dean to see where it fits in priorities.

CHAIR GRANT asked if a unit faculty as a group set their priorities.

JANCY HOUCK replied no, that they would still check with the dean.

JIM KNAPP (School of Earth Ocean and Environment) stated that one of the recurring issues for the university is the \$500 million dollars in deferred maintenance and unfortunately it's not the kind of thing that really is at the top of the radar for a lot of donors. He asked if Houck had any insight on how to creatively marry the development effort with the desperate need for the deferred maintenance.

JANCY HOUCK replied that it's not impossible to raise money for facilities that are in disrepair but they have to be selective about that. They wouldn't go out to prospects and say there's 500 million dollars' worth of deferred maintenance. But if there was a prospect for engineering and there was an area in the College of Engineering where the facilities weren't up to standards that are needed to educate today's students they could take a prospect there and show them how a gift for facilities improvements would be helping students and faculty.

CHAIR GRANT asked about contacts among their alumni. For example, if they have a former student who is successful, they want to invite them to speak to their classes.

JANCY HOUCK stated they should go ahead and schedule it but to also tell Development that it's going to happen or that it has happened. They would like for a Development Officer to be there but faculty shouldn't feel they have to check in advance because they have a relationship with those alumni and there's a professional and educational reason to ask them to come to speak to a class.

4. Reports of Committees.

a. Senate Steering Committee, Elizabeth West, Secretary:

SECRETARY ELIZABETH WEST (Libraries) brought forward the motion from Faculty Senate Steering Committee regarding the creation of a Family Fund account for the Faculty Senate. The motion was approved.

b. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor Kathleen Kirasic, Chair:

PROFESSOR KATHLEEN KIRASIC (Psychology) brought forward one correction to the report of November 4, 2015. There was an error to change the credit hours for University 290. The committee voted on the change to the number of times the course could be taken from 1 to 3 times. However, for the purpose of the report to the Faculty Senate it was presented as a change to the credit hours from 1 to 3, therefore the committee has issued a correction to the change of number of times this course can be taken from 1 to 3 and confirmed that the credit hours be 3 credit hours.

Kirasic brought forward 16 proposals: 3 from the College of Arts and Sciences, 6 from the Darla Moore School of Business, 1 from the College of Engineering and Computer, 4 from the College of Hotel, Restaurant and Sports Management and 2 from the Palmetto College.

There was no discussion and the proposals were approved as submitted.

c. Committee on Instructional Development, Professor Tena Crews, Chair:

PROFESSOR TENA CREWS (Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management) brought forward one course from the College of Public Health.

There was no discussion and the proposal was approved as submitted.

d. Intellectual Property Committee, Professor Chun-Hui Miao, Chair:

CHUN HUI MIAO reported on the committee's progress. The committee's major work for the past year was its continued work on the revision on the existing Intellectual Property policy **ACAF 1.33**. The committee has a completed draft of the Intellectual Property policy. It's currently working on the draft of the copyright policy.

CHAIR GRANT asked at what point would the proposals come to the Senate.

CHUN HUI MIAO replied that one part is the Intellectual Property policy. The other is the copyright policy. The proposal will come after the second part is also finished. It would come forward under the new chair.

5. Reports of Officers.

PROVOST JOAN GABEL began her report commenting on the importance of developing relationships with alumni for development opportunities, and the work Jancy Houk and her team are doing to channel their strategy through leadership points.

Provost Gabel reported there were 13 commencement exercises over 9 days covering all of the campuses: Upstate, Aiken, Beaufort, Bluffton, Georgetown, Allendale, Walterboro, Union, Sumter, Lancaster, and Columbia. USC graduated 7,467 students system wide. USC has graduated 78,651 since 2008. This year was the first time that both medical schools, Greenville and Columbia, had their commencement ceremony together. Five thousand health care related degrees have been awarded in the last 5 years.

The National Association of Colleges and Employers reported this year that there's an 11% increase in demand for new graduates which was part of the President's speech at all of the commencement exercises and earned a round of applause from all of the parents. The President affirmed his overarching strategy of over the course of 10 years going from 5,000 in an entering class to 6,000.

There is a lot of construction on campus. Several housing projects: The Law School building, South Tower, some Athletics Facilities, new Student Health Center.

She will have more updates on the budget as it goes through the session. It is a better year for the state of South Carolina and for higher education, although it hasn't gone back to historical funding levels. The pay raise is at 3.25%. Employer and employee retirement rates are going up 0.5 basis points. This campus received 6.5 million in additional state funds for E&G which is general operating. It's been a long time since USC has had state support simply going into the operating budget rather than into specific projects, which allows for more discretion.

It is worth noting that the state's 3.25% raise and the retirement increases will cost 10.9 million; USC is receiving 6.5 million but it will cost USC 10.9. The Honors College received 5 million dollars in one-time funding. The School of Medicine is still working

through their Rural Health Initiative. All campuses received some form of recurring operating costs, from Union receiving \$88,000 all the way up to Upstate which received half a million. Each of the Palmetto College campuses received one-time funding for building repairs etc.

Lacy Ford was announced as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and several searches are still ongoing. Helen Doerpinghaus was promoted to Deputy Provost in January and they are searching for her successor as Undergraduate Dean and Vice Provost. The Pharmacy Dean search is very close to conclusion. The CIO search committee met for the first time with the search consultant and is working on the position description. They are compiling the Social Work search committee. Tommy Chandler has agreed to chair that committee.

The Provost office is doing a lot of summer planning on budget and process. Over her first year Gabel had to try to get a sense of the operations of the office and the campus and how the two interrelate before making any process changes. The summer will be spent reflecting on observations and feedback and thinking about how that may affect processes.

The Provost Office has implemented some changes and updates for when students arrive. There is a shortened Welcome Week this year. Helen Doerpinghaus spent a lot of time with her team working on how to make that a more structured week so that students are busy with what they want them busy with that whole time. The First Year Reading Experience moved into September and resulted in a more active and deeper tie in with U101. The book is *The Measure of Our Success* by Marian Wright Edelman.

Advising changes are underway and have been well received. The new Advising Center is in the Close-Hipp building. DegreeWorks, which is a degree audit process for all students, is working really well on a variety of levels. More than 5,000 first-time full-time students will arrive early in the fall. There will be 1,500 transfer students. There has been lots of improvements across the board year-after-year in academic preparation and quality, and lots of improvement in diversity.

6. Report of the Secretary

SECRETARY WEST announced a one-year vacancy on the Faculty Grievance committee, that expires in 2017. Since the appointment will be for a year the Faculty Senate Steering committee can make an appointment without needing an election.

7. Report of the Chair.

CHAIR GRANT asked Yvonne Dudley to come forward. On behalf of the Faculty Senate and the Office of Personnel, he congratulated her and presented her with her 10-year pin and a certificate.

He reported that Faculty Senate Steering committee approved changes to the Faculty Senate Manual today, which will be posted online. The manual hasn't been updated for a couple of years and they will try to have that new version online by next week. It will be updated again in the Fall with changes that should be coming from the Board of Trustees. Faculty Senate's proposal for a permanent Faculty Senate IT committee has been moved through the administration and has been approved by the Provost and the President. It is now going to go before the Board of Trustees, Academic Affairs and Academic Liaison committee a week from Friday. If it receives approval, then it will go to the full board on the 24th of this month along with all the other changes in the Faculty Manual.

Your Faculty Senate Welfare committee has been in touch with Derrick Huggins who is Vice President of Facilities regarding changes in parking. The concern came up in the Faculty Senate Steering Committee today that Parking has not yet posted the procedures for getting permits for the new academic year which starts August 15th. The committee immediately contacted Mr. Huggins and he participated in the meeting by phone. He said that they are in the process of adding those to the website and expects those to be online next week. Faculty will still need to apply for permits. Because of the changes it's taking longer this year. Let either the Faculty Senate Steering or Faculty Welfare know of individual situations that need help. There are some unforeseen complications and parking has shown a great willingness to work with Faculty Senate with units on these issues.

Chair Grant reminded committee chairs that the committee reports for the past year's activities are due by August 15th. The next meeting of the General Faculty is on August 31st. The first meeting of the Faculty Senate for the next academic year will be September 14th.

8. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business.

There was no new business.

10. Good of the Order

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (Law) provided an update on the Richard T. Greener statue. Greener was the university's first African American professor serving from 1873 to 1877. He also served as a librarian and was a graduate of the Law School. He went on to be Dean of Law at Howard University when the university closed here and then a diplomat in Vladivostok Russia. He was one of the first people of color to serve in the Diplomatic Core and then served in private practice as a lawyer. So he's a very interesting person in lots of regards and he was Harvard's first African American graduate and we hired him shortly thereafter.

The statue has already been approved by the Board of Trustees. It will go up next to the library. If you are looking at the library there's a grassy patch off to the left, it will be hardscaping and benches put there and the statue will go there. The total is about \$350,000. That pays for the statue but also for an endowment to provide annual programming.

11. Adjournment.

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be September 14, 2016, at 3:00 p.m. in the Law School Auditorium.