CAL STATE EAST BAY EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

Educational Foundation Campaign Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, June 22, 2016
SA 4600

Trustees Present:  Patrick Devine, Jack Acosta, Marvin Remmich, Derek Kimball, Richard Sherratt
Tanya Hauck, Leroy Morishita. Via phone: Mahla Shaghafi, Jim Klescewski, and Henry Salvo

Trustees Absent:  Lee Blitch, Lou Miramontes, Carolyn Nelson, Carolyn Aver, Evelyn Dilsaver, Allen Warren

Staff Present:  Kathleen Brady, Andrea Rouah, May Hernandez, and Myra Drouillard

Meeting was called to order at 10:03 am

I. Welcome Remarks/Introductions

Patrick Devine started the Cal State East Bay Educational Foundation Steering Committee meeting with a quorum present. Patrick welcomed everyone on the phone as well as those present. Given that a quorum was met, the minutes from the last meeting, February 25, 2016, were approved.

Patrick addressed the lack of having quorums at previous meetings and whether this was something they should discuss. Marv agreed that this has been an issue and wanted to discuss what to do about making an effort to clean this up. Tanya said that has already spoken to a few committee members and reminded everyone that Carolyn Aver and Lee Blitch have had to step back from their service for now. Tanya and Rich will take a look at this issue and make some recommendations.

Marv inquired about the statement from the last meeting’s minutes that we “overestimated” donors for the CIRCLE building. Tanya and Kathleen clarified that the overestimating was in reference not to the dollar cost for the building but in the amount of potential donors for funding the building. Kathleen reminded the members that it was determined last fall that while we had a strong cadre of supporters for the programmatic side of STEM, we overestimated where these donors where in terms of moving them from programmatic support to becoming capital philanthropic investors of a building.

II. Campaign Priority Setting

Tanya pointed out that the former campaign fundraising goal of $50M was originally – raised to $60M per the President and Board approval and included an extension of 3 years instead of the 1 year that was remaining to coincide with the University’s 60th anniversary. With the help of Jim Langley, we hosted a series of roundtable discussions culminating in several white papers written by faculty and staff across campus. Following the Langley-led sessions, we held another series of discussions with David Viotti of Smallify. Soon, we will have the campaign CASE
statement written, which will include the University and campaign theme: “Rising in the East — Cal State East Bay.”

The campaign priority sessions have been very important to ensure that we focus on increasing funding for the areas of STEM research, teaching and education—being mindful of the faculty and what will benefit them—as well as aligning ourselves with other important areas such as integrative health care and preventative health care, communitive disorders, kinesiology to name a few. We are also dialoguing about what we will need to include for our students, computer science, engineering, and construction management in all of these conversations with the campus community.

Emerging themes:
- Rising above the silos across campus
- Interdisciplinary offerings
- Young faculty who can bring more into collaborating outside their institutions
- Problem solving around real problems in the community – Solar Suitcase/HPN (student assembling suitcase that can be taken to 3rd world countries; they teach in school age children-teacher the teacher new techniques of entrepreneurship.

A recent trip to Cal Poly provided us with many ideas around entrepreneurship. Cal Poly does not focus on social entrepreneurship and we could, which would set us apart.

Space is another key area that may become a campaign priority. The CIRCLE building was supposed to give space to STEM and other related programs, and since we don’t have the donor capacity at this time and redirected Bechtel funding toward renovation, we may seek additional support from donors for additional STEM-related initiatives as well as other space needs.

Derek Kimball mentioned strategic planning to make mini STEM areas and Tanya concurred that this is worth looking at and that renovating to make better use of spaces including the Library is a good idea.

Rich mentioned that his concern with the Library is that students are moving to on-line based learning; perhaps making the Library space obsolete. Derek explained the trend and movement is a lot more toward hands on curriculum. He said that the issue in science in particular is how we get students to the laboratories: quality learning via hands on is still better than what you can get on-line.

III. Rising in the East-The Campaign for Cal State East Bay

Total Raised to Date:
Patrick told the committee that we have raised 56% or $33,251,055 of the campaign’s $60M goal with $26,748,945 (44%) left to raise.

Patrick also presented the staff’s new Campaign Summary to the committee for comment. He reviewed the details of the summary and asked for their feedback. Everyone agreed that it was a good report; and they were amenable to using it as the ongoing standard report for the committee to track the progress of the campaign.

IV. Moves management: Moving Prospects and Donors Toward Major and Legacy Gifts
Kathleen gave her report on moves management. The Directors of Development work with a portfolio, which consists of a pool of donors and prospects. Once they qualify a prospect—confirm the individual has major gift capacity and an interest in the University—the DoD cultivates the person via engaging them in what interests and moves them about the University.

The majority of prospects in the staff's portfolios have been cold—lacking engagement and contact—and it takes a while to bring alumni to the stage that they are ready to make a significant major gift. The DoD's focus on individuals with major gift capacity ($25k+) while the Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations focuses on securing funding from corporations and foundations of at least $5,000. Through telephone and mail campaigns, the Annual Giving Director reaches out to alumni to engage them in making annual gifts from the University's 119,000 alumni households.

With a fully staffed team as of February 1, 2016, the division is positioned to achieve the campaign fundraising goals. The DoD's and Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations develops well thought out strategies for each donor and prospect they work with in order to make meaningful connections, create deeper relationships, and secure the necessary funding.

Generally speaking, the bell curve of this campaign is not like other campaigns where there are more lead gifts that come at the beginning and middle phases of the campaign. With a solid team now focused on implementing consistent best practices in fundraising and prospect research, we anticipate a majority of the lead gifts in this campaign to come toward the end (over the next three years). The DoD's are effectively working their portfolios and are ready to capitalize on the excitement and sense of urgency that will be generated with the launch of the public phase, culminating with the kickoff gala in September.

Rich commented that in his experience he has been amazed at how universities are run in contrast to businesses. Patrick agreed that he has seen the same thing at his church and it can be quite frustrating.

V. Heritage Society Members: Stewardship

Due to extensive conversation on other items of the agenda, the members did not discuss this item.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Patrick Devine adjourned the meeting at 11:12 am.

Co-Chair Patrick Devine

Dated: June 22, 2016

Recorded by Myra Drouillard, Administrative Assistant to the Associate Vice President for Development