



Development Advisory Committee (DAC)

Minutes of Meeting: 10/8/25

Circulated: 1/9/26

Approved: 1/19/26

Present: Sergey Gutor, John Mansfield, Lori Tschirhart (Chair), Jefferson Williams, Nakhiah Goulbourne, Stefan Szymanski, Erika Hathaway, Tom Baird (VP for Development), Conor Neville (Office of Development)

Absent: Vinay Aakalu, Kimberly McKee, Ivy Wei

Faculty Senate Office: Eric Vandenberghe

12:00pm-12:06pm: Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Minutes, Announcements

The agenda was approved. The minutes for the April DAC meeting were approved. Introductions are made.

12:06pm-12:14pm: Review of charge for the year, outline of plans

Summary: The Chair reads through the Charge and offers an opportunity for committee members to offer feedback. The committee does not raise any objections to the charge. As items come up throughout the year, the committee can raise issues under the final charge item that allows for emergent issues. These issues may come up between meetings and can be discussed asynchronously through email.

Action: Discussion

12:14pm-12:34pm: Are faculty properly cultivated?

Summary: The Chair brings up the topic of how OUD and unit level development teams update faculty donors. This issue was brought to the Chair by a faculty colleague who had donated to another unit and had not received desired updates. A member asks if there is a universal policy for this, particularly concerning donors who make significant contributions.

Every unit is decentralized and has their own policies regarding this type of correspondence. OUD corresponds with donors who make donations that are not unit specific. Each unit has different resources, and this is a factor in the donor correspondence calculation. A member suggests that OUD should encourage units to be responsive and proactive in providing donors information regarding how their gift is used. They suggest this could lead to further funding opportunities with satisfied donors. Another member suggests that model units should be highlighted to provide examples of positive correspondence standards.

Action: Discussion



12:34pm-1:01pm: Updates from the Office of University Development (OUD), and primer on their role

Summary: VP Baird provides an update on the work being conducted by OUD. The current funding campaign continues and is progressing well. The campaign has raised 58% of the goal, 53% of the way through the campaign. VP Baird discusses how university leadership plays a role in fundraising efforts.

A member asks how the current political landscape has impacted fundraising efforts. VP Baird indicates that fundraising has been relatively steady. He provides an example of a tumultuous national moment of the recent past where fundraising experienced slower funding. The gifts were slower coming in but still came. The point is made that donors typically donate to specific projects/causes and are not interested in making general donations to the university. An example is given of a successful fundraising campaign for a unit that was negatively impacted by federal priorities. Discussion ensues on how this positive example can be replicated in other parts of the enterprise. In the current moment, due diligence on gifts is more important than ever. OUD is providing the same thorough vetting that is their standard practice.

A member brings up the need to promote the research of the university. Discussion ensues on the "[Look to Michigan](#)" campaign. This is an internal and external campaign meant to highlight the value to society that UM produces. Advertisements have been taken out in publications including the Atlantic, Wall Street Journal, New York Times, etc. It is suggested that faculty be made aware of this effort. Further discussion on this subject ensues and the meeting comes to a close.

Action: Discussion

1:01pm: Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,

Eric Vandenberghe
Faculty Governance Coordinator
Faculty Senate Office