MINUTES OF THE ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
March 30, 2010 (submitted by David Downie)

Present: David Downie, Stephanie Frost, Sally O’Driscoll, David Sapp (chair)

Agenda items:

(1) Approval of minutes from 2/22/10 meeting.
   Prof. Sapp introduced one correction. Minutes approved: 4 in favor

(2) Update on Activities of the University Advancement Division

Stephanie Frost reviewed the Cash and Activity Report. She confirmed, as reported at the last meeting, that giving is up for the current year over the similar period last year. A new phone program using current students is responsible for some of the increased giving among the general alumni population. The phone call campaign began last fall. Student calls resumed in February and will ease off in May. The Advancement office hopes to have some students continuing to work over the summer. The revamped structure of the Advancement Division, as outlined at the last meeting, and in particular shifting some existing full-time staff to major gifts officers, also appeared to be succeeding. The goal for this year remains $9 million in cash and $11 million in activity and prospects are good for meeting or exceeding this goal.

The Alumni relations team had also engaged in significant activity since the committee met in February, including organizing Alumni events in Hartford, Boston, Washington, D.C., New Jersey and on campus. Alumni relations was also collaborating with admissions to plan alumni hosted events in areas with large amounts of admitted students, to which the students are invited. The team is also working with the Athletic Department to develop special tailgate events at Men’s and Women’s lacrosse games. Some alumni leaders traveled to Nicaragua with relevant staff to scope out a possible alumni service trip. A travel trip to Greece was cancelled but the office hopes to develop new ones, on its own or in collaboration with other schools. It was also exploring possibility of developing trips in collaboration with Fairfield courses or other University initiatives.

Planning for the Fairfield University Awards dinner were proceeding with ticket sales and associated activity going very strong.

(3) Board of Trustees.

In his capacity as Chair of this committee, Professor Sapp attended a meeting of the Board’s subcommittee on Advancement. This was the third meeting he attended and he will attend one more. The most recent meeting included an update
on advancement and alumni relations activities as well as a discussion of past and possible future capital campaigns and the processes required for planning, initiating and conducting a successful campaign and the process of identifying funding priorities.

The Committee discussed the operations of the Board of Trustee sub-committee on Advancement and purpose, process and rules of faculty participation.

In a subsequent discussion, Frost noted that views of the Board, President and senior academic administrators, as well as details of the strategic plan go into setting fundraising priorities. Faculty were involved in development of the strategic plan and can and should be involved in other relevant discussions. Faculty representation on the Board of Trustee sub-committee on advancement, as well as on this committee, could also be vehicles for faculty input. Sapp expressed the hope that faculty representation would be meaningful. O’Driscoll noted that faculty should also provide input via the Deans of their schools into discussions of priorities.

(4) Purpose and composition of Advancement Committee

The committee continued its general discussion, began at the previous meeting, regarding the purpose and composition of the advancement committee and how one or both might be adjusted to benefit university advancement or provide more input by, and information to, the general faculty. A variety of issues were introduced or discussed including, inter alia: Should there be more members? Should membership be defined so it always included faculty from multiple schools, disciplines or both graduate and undergraduate programs? Could the committee require that members have been at Fairfield for a certain minimum number of years? Should the Committee be a conduit for increasing faculty participation in advancement? Was the committee, in its current purpose and composition, as effective as it could be to accomplish its functions? Was representation by its chair on the relevant Board of Trustees subcommittee effective vehicles for productive shared governance on the relevant issues? It was noted that the present structure might be appropriate but that these issues deserved consideration.

As it had a previous meetings, the committee noted that any proposed changes would need to go to the Academic Council, then General Faculty, and then be voted on as Handbook change. It was decided to continue this discussion at the next meeting, if necessary.

Sapp made a motion to adjourn
O’Driscoll seconded