



Development Advisory Committee (DAC)

Minutes of Meeting: 12/6/23

Circulated: 1/11/24

Approved: 2/14/24

Present: Gabriel Rauterberg (Chair), Stefan Szymanski, Nakhiah Goulbourne, John Mansfield, Kimberly McKee, Alexander Zaslavsky, Julian Hemmings, Silvia Pedraza (SACUA Liaison), Tom Baird (VP for Development), Conor Neville (Office of Development)

Absent: Gintautas Grabauskas, Xin Tong, Ivy Wei, Yaqing Zhang, Rainbow Huang,

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe, Luke McCarthy

1:04pm-1:10pm: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the November meeting were approved. The Chair went through and provided an overview of the meeting.

1:10pm-1:45pm: Reviewing draft solicitation for fundraising campaign for UM Faculty Undergraduate Scholarship

Summary: The committee read through the solicitation email draft and began working to improve it. The complexity of drafting this type of document effectively was noted as being quite high. It is suggested that the email be specific rather than vague. We want to highlight how the fund is unique. A question about highlighting DEI is raised.

A clarification is made on how many people will receive this. It will be all of the Faculty Senate members, which includes 7,300+ UM community members. It is important to keep the audience in mind when it comes to framing the request.

Logistical concerns regarding how the faculty can give are addressed. A website separate from the Faculty Senate's page may be necessary depending on the type of gift faculty would like to set up.

A point is made about how the faculty interact with the students directly. This fact should be addressed in the email. It is suggested that past recipients be highlighted in the email, to give it a more personal touch. It is suggested that there be in-person meetings between scholarship recipients and donors to really see the impact of the donation. This highlights the impact in a direct way.

The Development team is asked about their perspective on what can make the email effective. The longer the email is, the less likely people are to read the entire text, which would hurt the cause.

A suggestion is made to focus on the financial needs of recipients to show the impact the scholarship really has.



Action: Discussion

1:45pm-1:58pm: Discussing what would constitute useful public education/knowledge about the endowment

Summary: There is a lot of confusion on the endowment. Demystifying the endowment by putting out some type of content that better explains the intricacies, as well as the basics of the endowment could be a goal of the committee.

What does the committee want to create to improve the transparency of the endowment? How do we educate the broader faculty committee? It is suggested that a primer be created. Information regarding the endowment was shared. There are 12,000+ endowment at the University of Michigan.

It is suggested that the faculty be surveyed to see what information would be beneficial for them to be provided with. A suggestion is made to identify what the endowment pays for.

This suggestion to provide more information regarding the endowment has come from various faculty throughout the past few years.

Action: Discussion

1:58pm: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office