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GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION, INC.
Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees
September 10, 2011

The Board of Trustees of Georgia Southern University Foundation, Inc. met at 10:00 AM at the Nessmith Lane Building in Statesboro, GA. Trustees present were: Troy Athon, Pat Blanchard, Tommy Bond, Mike Carpenter, Harry Carter, Charles Chandler, Jimmy Childre, Barbara Christmas, Ron Core, Michael Curry, Margot Dawkins, Tim Evans, Jimmy Franklin, Carl Gooding, Tracy Ham, Caroline Harless, Billy Hickman, Jimmy Hodges, Brooks Keel, Mike Kennedy, Max Manack, Joe McGlamery, Rod Meadows, Marshal Mize, Phil Moore, Martin NeSmith, Pat O’Connor, Mike Skinner and Connell Stafford. Trustees not present were: Wayne Akins, Derrick Brown, Terry Coleman, Tommy David, Jenny Gentry, John George, Bill Hatcher, Lamar Hennon, Billy Jones, Tommy Jones, Kara Martin, Ricky Nessmith. Others present were: Wendell Tompkins, Billy Griffis, Salinda Arthur, Richard Deal, Penny Scarpucci, Jodi Collins, Melanie Mosley and Samantha Nesmith.

Welcome and Opening Remarks: Mr. Manack welcomed everyone to the Fall Board Meeting of the Georgia Southern University Foundation. He recognized Mrs. Salinda Arthur, the new Vice President for University Advancement, as a guest at the meeting.

Approval of the Board Minutes: Mr. Manack referred Trustees to the minutes of the spring meeting and asked for any revisions or corrections. Mr. Pat Blanchard asked that a correction be made to the minutes, stating that a few members had abstained from voting on the motion to accept Dr. Keel’s proposal as outlined on pages 7-8 of the Spring Board Minutes. He also stated that the proposal did not meet any opposition so it passed, but not unanimously; it passed with abstentions. With that change, Rod Meadows made a motion that the minutes be accepted. The motion was seconded by Tim Evans and it passed unanimously.

Recognition of Retiring Trustees: Mr. Manack recognized the Trustees that are retiring from the Board. The retiring Trustees who were not present were: Billy Jones, Pat Douglas, Don Howard, Ric Tomlinson and Greg Colson. Retiring Trustee Michael Kennedy was present to receive his plaque and gift. Mr. Manack expressed his deepest gratitude to the Trustees for all of their support and hard work. Mr. Kennedy commented on his appreciation for serving on the Board.

Introduction of New Trustees: Mr. Manack informed the Board that the new Trustee, Dr. John George of Optim Health, was unable to attend the meeting. However, Dr. George did want to express his excitement to be joining the board and looks forward to meeting everyone at the winter Board Meeting.

Audit Committee Report: Mr. Charles Chandler reviewed the minutes from the Audit Committee Meeting that took place on September 8, 2011 with the auditor Richard
Deal from Thigpen, Lanier, Westerfield and Deal. The Committee accepted the Audit Report ending fiscal year June 30, 2011, as presented to them.

Mr. Chandler then introduced Mr. Richard Deal to give the audit report to the full board. Mr. Richard Deal presented the audit report. To review the report, a copy is available at the Office of University Advancement. Mr. Deal answered a few questions from the Board. On behalf of the Audit Committee, Charles Chandler called for a motion to approve the audit report. Mr. Martin NeSmith seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Finance Committee Report:** Mr. Tommy Bond reviewed the 2011 Income Report, followed by the budget for 2012 (previously approved), and the proposed 2013 budget. Next, Mr. Bond reviewed the Expense Report for 2011, 2012, and proposed 2013, noting some changes in the Wild Game Supper account, and Governmental Relations. Mr. Tim Evans made a motion to accept this report; it was seconded by Connell Stafford, and passed unanimously.

**Investment Committee Report:** Dr. Barbara Christmas, chair of the Investment Committee began by thanking the committee members. She then introduced Max Manack to review the minutes of the Investment Committee meeting that took place on August 16, 2011. Mr. Manack stated that there was a 22.8% return on investments as of June 30, 2011. He reviewed several other areas of the Foundation’s portfolio. The total fund as of July 31, 2011 was at $43.3 million. Mr. Manack concluded his presentation. A motion was made by Marshal Mize to accept the Investment Report; it was seconded by Harry Carter, and passed unanimously.

**Bylaws Committee Report:** Joe McGlamery discussed the minutes of the Bylaws Committee meeting that took place on June 13, 2011. This meeting was to discuss proposed changes to Article III. He continued by first reading the existing Article III of the Bylaws on the Emeritus Designation, and then the proposed changes to Article III. Mr. McGlamery made a motion to adopt the changes to the Bylaws on behalf of the Bylaws Committee. This motion was seconded by Charles Chandler and passed unanimously.

**Capital Campaign Funding Update:** Mrs. Penny Scarpucci from Marts & Lundy briefly reviewed the planning that has occurred up to this point in the Capital Campaign and the upcoming steps that will need to take place.

During May and June, Marts & Lundy conducted a feasibility study based on information found during the Capacity Analysis completed in January. The feasibility study is a combination of data received from two areas; one area being personal interviews with 48 top prospects, and the other area being information received from a related on-line prospect survey. The purpose of the study is to determine the external reaction to the case for support and the priorities identified for a major campaign, the level of interest in giving and working in the campaign, and the prospective donors’ attitudes towards Georgia Southern University. This study measures the University’s readiness to expand its fundraising capabilities, evaluate its resources and potential for a the campaign, and suggest strategies to increase the likelihood of success. The
questionnaire that was used for both the personal interviews and the online survey included questions designed to explore participants’ attitudes toward the University and to obtain responses to six key issues highly predictive of success in a major campaign.

1. The general attitude toward GSU
2. Reaction to a campaign and fundraising target
3. Case for Support
4. Catalysts/ Willingness to Work
5. Constituents’ Willingness to Give
6. Other Issues

While the results of the Capacity Analysis show that the philanthropic capacity indicated that a $138 million to $210 million fundraising effort is possible, preliminary indicators for giving were extremely low in the external testing. Strong giving relationships which would lead to significant giving have not yet been established.

Marts & Lundy has many recommendations as the University continues to move forward into the Capital Campaign. Marts & Lundy now recommends that the University adopt a lower working target for the preparation and quiet phase of the campaign, with a final goal to be announced at the kickoff of the public phase. They also suggest taking one more year of intensive preparation to allow the new Vice President for University Advancement to get into position. They suggest the launch of the quiet phase to start FY 2013 and lasting 24-30 months; with the public phase launching the second quarter of FY 2016, and completion of the campaign at the end of FY 2019.

Marts & Lundy recommends that Dr. Keel devote at least 30-40% of his time to development activity with top prospects. The Development staff needs to boost its productivity and numbers of calls/visits/requests with top prospects. The new Vice President will need to establish metrics to assure that required productivity is met over the course of the campaign. The deans and directors will need to increase the amount of time spent on their top prospects, instead of on administrative tasks and general annual fund solicitations. Marts & Lundy’s earlier assessment found that the Advancement staff was understaffed, and 12 new positions were recommended. At this time, they recommend that four positions will be critical for the preparation year and that a top priority of the new Vice President will be to fill these positions: Development Officer for the College of Information Technology, Proposal Writer, Prospect Researcher, and Director of Donor Relations. In terms of external leadership, it is recommended that a deliberate process of board development be implemented to help identify, cultivate, recruit, and engage new members. It would be beneficial to have more active committee meetings that gather on a regular basis to oversee financial management and investment of the Foundation’s assets, and provide more assistance to the fundraising process. Board meetings should be expanded to offer increased exposure/information to the Board about the University so that members become more committed. The Colleges/ Centers’ advisory boards should provide volunteer leadership potential for the campaign. Each should be evaluated for potential campaign leaders or need for additional members during the preparation year.

According to the wealth screening, Georgia Southern has 7,500 prospects that could give $100,000 or more. Of those individuals, 170 of them have the principal gift
capacity to give $1 million or more. Dr. Keel, academic leaders, development staff, and volunteers must focus their attention on increasing the cultivation of these top donors, during the quiet phase of the campaign. The other 7,400 individuals that were identified as major gift prospects will be important to extending the campaign’s success and should be included in alumni/parent activities, University communication efforts, and College/program events/activities to increase their attachment to Georgia Southern. The nearly 900 individuals (of the major gift tier) that responded to the online survey should be reviewed as soon as possible and assigned to development officers and deans to continue cultivation. The Advancement Office should undertake a process of peer screening throughout Georgia and beyond to obtain additional information about identified prospects. Also, it is recommended that new parents be screened annually to help identify more potential major prospects throughout the campaign. Parents should be included in annual giving strategies to determine their interest in giving to GSU, Eagle Club events and other GSU activities. Another suggestion by Marts and Lundy involved the Metro Atlanta area alumni and friends. The interviews identified a number of highly energized prospects, so the Advancement staff and President Keel should engage alumni prospects and volunteers to determine what strategic initiatives can revitalize the alumni base and their financial resources in this region for GSU.

Recommendations for corporations and foundations were more difficult to evaluate because only one corporate prospect was interviewed. Marts & Lundy projected $23.4 million would likely come from these institutional donors during the campaign, based on 10 years of giving history. Earlier assessments recommended strengthening these efforts with three staff additions: prospect researcher, a proposal writer and another senior development officer. Present recommendations are to immediately hire researcher and proposal writer, which will remove administrative tasks from the current corporate and foundation officer. This will postpone the addition of another senior staff member to be reviewed by the new Vice President. Also, several members of the Foundation Board as well as other volunteers have stronger, deeper relationships with potential corporate/foundation donors than those who are now assigned to work with these prospects. Members and volunteers should be recruited to help the corporation and foundations committee in cultivating and soliciting these prospects.

Next, Mrs. Scarpucci covered the recommendations pertaining to the case for support. During the interviews, as well as reactions during the internal assessments, questions were raised as to the direction of Georgia Southern. Marts & Lundy suggests that the President and other leadership need to communicate the vision for the future more forcefully and frequently to reassure that this is a logical step forward for the University. They recommend that the President’s and deans’ talking points and communication messages should highlight the current and past research accomplishments, as well as supportive comments from business and alumni leaders.

Marts and Lundy also advises that the prospectus be revised to expand on the rationale for some of the key priorities. Marketing and Communications should prepare articles and information that focus on the key priorities and their importance to the University’s continued growth and progress. GSU should also consider expanding the distribution and number of issues of the Georgia Southern Magazine to reach more rated prospects, and increase other forms of communications.
There are four major priority categories that can be trimmed from the results of the external testing and then updated in the prospectus. The first category is *Promote Academic & Athletic Excellence* which rated the top four priorities as:

1. Endowment for Colleges, Schools, Programs ($25 million)
2. Facilities, including Construction Management & Civil Engineering Building ($20 million)
3. Endowment to Recruit, Retain Faculty ($22 million)
4. Football Operations Center ($10 million)

These four priorities were considered by both interviewees and survey participants as being the most important priorities of the campaign. The second category is *Enhance Student Success* which included top priorities as:

1. Endowment for Scholarships and Internships ($10 million)
2. New Student Union

The new student union was ranked low compared to priorities in all four categories. This priority may require other funding mechanisms. The third category is *Increase Research and Creativity* which rated its top priorities:

1. Endowment to Recruit, Retain Research Faculty ($10 million)
2. Endowment for Student Research, Fellowship/Assistantship ($5 million)
3. Laboratories and Equipment ($5 million)

And the final category is *Annual Giving* ($15 million) which rated extremely high among interviewees and extremely low with survey participants. However, given that GSU has a small endowment, annual giving should remain a top priority of the campaign. Strategies should be developed to increase alumni participation as a key component of the campaign’s overall objective.

Lastly, Mrs. Scarpucci reviewed some other recommendations for the campaign. Stewardship and Donor Relations need to be expanded upon as well as Planned Giving. The new Director of Donor Stewardship should create:

1. Lifetime giving society to encourage larger gifts,
2. Higher level annual recognition groups to encourage giving by mid-range donors to help encourage their ongoing support for GSU,
3. A comprehensive stewardship plan for gifts to programs and to other endowments such as professorships—given the importance of these priorities in the campaign.

As for Planned Giving, it has been noted that an increase in structured giving has taken place over the last several years. Structured giving are gifts which combine outright giving components with an estate commitment or trust. Currently, GSU does not have a full time planned giving officer and only limited marketing of planned giving in place. It is recommended that the new VP and the Director of Advancement IT/Research should review the results of the wealth screening to determine the number of potential planned giving donors identified for GSU and then determine whether a full-time Planned Giving Officer should be hired. Also, based off the founding date and the age of GSU’s alumni population, it is recommended that planned giving be included as a deliberate strategy for the campaign, with an objective for a number of new planned gift commitments/honor society donors, and irrevocable gifts such as trusts.
Mrs. Scarpucci stressed again that Georgia Southern has the potential to receive a much higher level of philanthropy than is currently being reached. It will take a great deal of confidence, energy and commitment from everyone involved, including the Board of Trustees, to move forward with this campaign. She then asked for questions from the board. Mr. Tim Evans began by asking more specifically why was there a lack of confidence in the Advancement staff, and why was there a lack of commitment from the interviewees and survey participants. Mrs. Scarpucci replied that Mr. Billy Griffis’ departure was partly the concern for the lack of confidence, but at the same time others felt that new energy was needed within the department. The lack of commitment stemmed mostly from the bad economy. Dr. Harry Carter asked in which direction the vision of the University was headed. He stated that in the original case statement, the vision was to become a national comprehensive research university. However, more current materials are now sharing both research and teaching as visions of the University. Dr. Carter wanted to clarify if the vision had been changed, or amplified. He felt the vision needed to be very sharp and clear, so the University could make a case for the campaign and that no one would be confused as to what the goal should be for the future. Dr. Keel answered Dr. Carter’s questions by emphasizing that research and teaching go hand in hand. Universities cannot be a viable research entity without first being a viable teaching entity. The goal is to move forward with a strong research agenda, but this goal cannot be met without highlighting the importance of the teaching mission. The case statement has been modified in order to reflect the importance of both teaching and research, with intentions that the research mission will enhance the teaching mission and protect the “student-centered” approach that Georgia Southern has always had. Dr. Keel stressed to the board that the purpose of the interviews and surveys through Marts & Lundy was to get valuable input from valued donors and trustees, to better craft documents in order to convey to the public once the campaign becomes public what the vision truly is for Georgia Southern.

Mr. Michael Curry felt that knowing what the typical time frame was for universities to move from one capital campaign into the next capital campaign would be beneficial in setting a goal. Mrs. Scarpucci answered his question by explaining that universities started out having major campaigns every decade. However, over time they have begun having campaigns every 5 years. Today, universities continue to build up their staff, build up their campaign preparations, volunteer base and even donor bases throughout the course of one campaign to gear up for the next campaign. Typically one campaign will last about 8 years, and as soon as that campaign is over, the institution starts back over in the quiet phase for the next campaign. Marts & Lundy helps these institutions prepare for the next campaign: Was the goal of the campaign met? Are there priorities that were not funded? If not, then those priorities become part of the planning process for the next campaign. Today, there is only about a two year window from the end of one campaign and the start of the quiet phase of the next campaign. She specified that to the public, it does not seem like a constant campaign is taking place, because the public does not see a lot of what goes into the planning process. The purpose of the Advancement staff and internal leadership is to stay in campaign mode and to constantly improve its relationships with alumni, donors and friends.

Mr. Evans asked that if universities are in constant campaign mode, then wouldn’t donors get tired of constantly giving to the university. Mrs. Scarpucci replied that top
donors should be asked to give early on in the campaign, so that based on their giving a
goal can be set for the entire campaign. Those top donors will not be asked again to give
money for another 10 years when the next campaign has begun. If the university has done
good stewardship of these top donors, they will be more inclined to give at the same level
if not more than the previous gift. Also, the mid-level donors need to be targeted with
good stewardship as well. This is the group that if handled correctly, will give more and
more to the university as they get older. Georgia Southern is already targeting students
with groups like the Student Eagle Club, to get students and young alumni engaged early
with their philanthropic giving so they will continue as they become more successful in
their careers. Engagement must start taking place now, so that campaigns 30 years from
now have a chance for success.

Mrs. Margot Dawkins asked if large corporate facilities, such as Marriott Hotels,
are being targeted for the campaign as well. Mrs. Scarpucci answered by saying that on
the corporate level, the larger corporations that have business interest in the area or
corporations that hire Georgia Southern graduates would be the ones most likely to give
to the campaign. There is a board committee that is focused on corporate and foundation
entities as donors. However, there may be other volunteers that could be helpful to this
committee. It is being recommended that those individuals be asked to join the committee
and help open doors to large corporations. Over the last several years, corporate giving as
a section of philanthropic giving has declined because corporations have been hit hard by
the economy. Mrs. Scarpucci stated that the best chances for universities to grow its’
philanthropic return through the individual donors. As campaigns progress at a
university, typically the first campaign is heavily funded by friends and corporations/
foundations. The second campaign continues to grow the friends group and bring in more
of the alumni group. By the time of the third campaign, universities see a much higher
percentage of giving from the alumni group. For Georgia Southern, this is the second
campaign which will see giving from a majority of friends and a buildup of alumni.

Mr. Pat O’Connor reminded everyone that during the last board meeting, it was
recommended that 14 positions be added to the University Advancement staff. It was
voted on that in order to fund these positions, board members had to commit to an annual
payment of $12,500. His question was, if the goal is reduced from $150 million down to
$100 million, and if the number of needed positions to start is reduced from 14 down to
4; will the need for immediate cash be reduced in order to fund those positions, which
would take some pressure off of members of the board. The answer was that although it
was being recommended that only 4 be hired immediately, all 14 positions will need to be
filled at some point in time. This would be left up to the new Vice President to decide
when those positions should be filled. Dr. Keel stated that it does not matter what the goal
of the campaign is, the department of University Advancement is far too understaffed to
properly engage donors. Dr. Keel also reminded the board that
$3 million of Georgia Southern’s state money is being used to fund these positions as
well. Those positions are being funded by adding the state money with the money raised
and given by the board members. He added that in most institutions, these positions are
funded entirely by philanthropic giving, so the proposition that was presented to the
board was the bare minimum needed to make the campaign successful. Mr. Marshal Mize
commented that for three years he was chairman of the committee for major gifts and
planned giving, and he felt that during his time as chair, that the staff he worked with was
very qualified, but overloaded and not able to efficiently identify, engage, and involve prospects due to staffing deficiencies. He felt that this probably cost the university significant gifts in the past, and could only be rectified by adding personnel to the department. Mr. O’Connor agreed with Mr. Mize, but felt that members of the board should be told where their money would go, if not to fund those 14 positions immediately. Mrs. Scarpucci clarified that the money given by the board would be used for funding positions, the faster that money comes into the university, the faster the university can hire the needed staff. She only recommended that the 4 positions in her presentation needed to be hired immediately and before any of the other 10 positions. She felt that the new vice president deserved an opportunity to get into office, hear the rationale for these 14 recommended positions and then agree or disagree with those recommendations. The sooner the money can come in, the greater flexibility the vice president will have to put people in place to start cultivation now as opposed to later.

Mr. Tommy Bond asked at what point the board will be given the names of the top donors that are being targeted by the university. Mrs. Scarpucci stated that typically the top 1500 names are merged into a list and are shared with the board members in order to gain more feedback as to their willingness to give, if the capacity analysis is accurate, if members are willing to open the doors to cultivation, or if members are even willing to solicit the prospects on this list. This will take place during this first year of preparation.

Mr. Curry asked what other reasons for giving to the university were cited, other than ones love for Georgia Southern. Mrs. Scarpucci said that many people in the region view Georgia Southern as having a huge economic impact on the area, or other self-interests like hiring graduates from the university.

Some brief discussion took place over the funding that is required from the board and how those funds would be raised and used throughout the campaign. With no other questions from the board, Mrs. Scarpucci finished her presentation.

**University Update from the President:** Dr. Keel briefly talked about the strategic vision for Georgia Southern. This vision essentially is based on four key elements:

1) Promoting Academic Excellence  
2) Enhance Student Success  
3) Increase Research and Creativity  
4) Ensure Fiscal Sustainability

Dr. Keel reminded everyone that Georgia Southern University must maintain its student-centered atmosphere; it’s what makes the university unique. He continued to overview the recent accomplishments:

- GSU now offers Bachelors of Science degrees in Civil, Mechanical, and Electrical Engineering.  
- College of Business Administration was approved to offer an Executive MBA.  
- U.S. News and World Report ranked GSU 4th Most Popular University in the Country- behind Harvard, Stanford, and Brigham-Young.  
- Princeton Review ranked GSU as one of the top Green Colleges.
• Princeton Review also ranked GSU as one of the Best Colleges in America.
• Forbes Magazine ranked COBA as one of the country’s top business schools.
• U.S. News and World Report ranked COBA’s MBA as one of the country’s best part-time degree programs.
• COBA has also opened up City Campus- a retail store located in downtown Statesboro.
• College of Nursing continues to be one of the top ranked nursing programs in the country.
• Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health received accreditation.
• The ROTC Program received the MacArthur Award, which is given to the Top 8 ROTC Programs in the country. This is the second year in a row that GSU has received this award.
• The STEM Program (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) was ranked in the Top 10 in the country for providing African-Americans with degrees in Physics and Chemistry.
• Received final funding for the new Biology Building. Governor Deal joined the groundbreaking ceremony.
• New discoveries keep coming out of Camp Lawton. Artifacts are on display at the GSU Museum. This has become one of the most important archeological finds in the State of Georgia, and was found by a GSU masters student.
• Funding for the Rural Health Research Institute was put into place, which will impact the health of rural areas in this region in many significant ways.
• Athletics has started off tremendously: Golf, Volleyball and Baseball were Southern Champs and the Cheerleaders won the National Championship.
• Enrollment is currently at 20,500; average SAT is 1111, increased the minimum criteria for students to enroll to 1010 and will continue to increase.

Dr. Keel took an opportunity to talk more about research at the university. Research funding is how universities are ranked throughout the country. Georgia Southern should not only be teaching state-of-the-art knowledge but also generating state-of-the-art knowledge for our students. Teachers should be giving lessons out of lab notebooks that contain the latest and most up-to-date information. Research at the undergraduate level provides students with an incredibly high-quality education. The biggest challenge from a fundraising aspect is getting the story of Georgia Southern out for people to hear. Georgia Southern is still viewed as a small college by many alumni who have not seen the changes that have taken place. The university of today is nowhere near the small college it was 20 years ago, and the story that has evolved needs to be portrayed to the alumni. People need to realize the importance of this school and understand that the value of a Georgia Southern degree is not based on the reputation of the school when you graduated, but based on the reputation of the school today. It is
extremely important to build up that reputation by getting the story out there for people to hear.

Dr. Keel then took some time to review the expansion to the football program with the new operations center that will be located by Paulson Stadium. He talked briefly about old traditions, but also talked about some new traditions that are being established now. These new traditions are to help get students more engaged and to help make the school act like the big time university that it’s growing to be. These new traditions also help grow the fan base as well. Fans continue to become more passionate about the football team and are more willing to travel long distances to see this team play. In order to win games, the team has to be competitive. Dr. Keel then talked about what is needed in order to be competitive. The best coaches need to be hired and retained, the best players need to be recruited, and the best facilities need to be built. When compared to our competition, Georgia Southern’s athletic facilities are greatly lacking. The football team is losing quality recruits based on the facilities that are offered, when compared to other universities. Some key donors and friends have been working on a new 52,000 square foot facility that will be housed in the scoreboard end of Paulson Stadium. This will be the largest privately funded project in the history of Georgia Southern at approximately $10 million. Dr. Keel took some time to describe the new facility and what it hopes to bring to the Athletic program. There are big goals set before everyone with big aspirations for the future of this university, and it’s just beginning. With no questions from the board, Dr. Keel finished his presentation.

**Special Presentation:** Mr. Manack, Melanie Mosley, Jodi Collins and Samantha Nesmith took a few minutes to present Mr. William Griffis with a gift for his service as President of the Foundation. He gave a few remarks to show his appreciation and encouraged the board to continue their efforts to improve Georgia Southern.

**Outgoing Chair Comments:** Mr. Manack reminded the board that two years ago when he began his term as chair, he had invited a Georgia Southern student Jordan Walker to come and speak to the board about his experiences at Georgia Southern. Prior to the meeting, Mr. Manack had asked Jordan to write a letter to the board to share in retrospect his experiences as he now pursues a Doctorate of Pharmacy at the University of Georgia. Mr. Manack read this letter out loud to the board as his outgoing chair comments. This letter was eloquently written and showed how near and dear this university is to so many who have graduated here. Mr. Manack reminded everyone that students like Jordan Walker are the reason that this board is in place, to continue to grow outstanding students and an outstanding university (copy of letter attached). It was with great honor and confidence that he handed the gavel over to Mr. Thomas Bond as the new Foundation Chair.

**Incoming Chair:** Mr. Thomas Bond thanked Mr. Manack for all the hard work he exhibited as Chair. On behalf of the Foundation, he awarded Mr. Manack with a plaque and a gift for his service to the Foundation. Mr. Bond continued his comments by expressing how proud he is to be part of the growth and expansion of the University. He stated how excited he is to begin his role as Chair of the Foundation Board. He briefly
introduced the new leadership team, himself as Chair, Dr. Barbara Christmas as Chair-Elect, and Mr. Martin NeSmith as Vice Chair.

Committee List: Mr. Bond encouraged everyone to review the Committee assignments. With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

* All meetings of the Foundation Board are recorded. The proceeding represents a synopsis of the proceedings. Any Trustee who wishes may come to the Advancement office and listen to the complete recording of any meeting.