## Trusteeship Committee

### AGENDA

**Thursday, December 4, 2014**

**1 p.m.**

**President’s Dining Room, Thomas Hall**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approval of Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Trustee Recruitment and Giving Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trusteeship Committee
MINUTES
Thursday, October 9, 2014
2:15 p.m.
President’s Dining Room, Thomas Hall


Phone: Virginia Angelico-Tatum, D.D.S.,

Absent: Kevin Quinn, S.J., and Stephen Sauer, S.J.

Mr. Paul Pastorek, vice chair of the trusteeship committee, called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m.

Approval of Minutes. Mr. Pastorek asked if there were any corrections or revisions to the minutes of the May 15, 2014 meeting. There were none. He called for a motion to approve. Motion was made by Fr. Peter Rogers, S.J., and seconded by Fr. Kevin Wildes, S.J. Motion carried.

Approval of Individuals for BOT Approved List. Mr. Pastorek called upon Fr. Wildes to present the biographical information on each of the candidates. Fr. Wildes explained that when looking at each candidate, he considers diversity in the broad sense of gender, ethnicity, occupation/professional expertise, and geography. He presented the following individuals to the committee and the committee reviewed the biographical information on each prepared by the Office of Advancement Research. The following candidates were presented:

Marc D. Browning, M.D.
Gloria B. Callais
Joseph C. “Joe” Canizaro
Kurt J. Crosby
Eric J. Eckholdt
S. Derby Gisclair
Deborah “Dusti” Cherrey Jones
Joseph L. Jones, II
Peter A. Kennedy
Dennis P. Lauscha
Stuart H. Smith

After the committee discussed each candidate, Mr. Pastorek asked for a motion to approve placing these individuals on the Board Approved List. Motion was made by Mr. Bob Brown and seconded by Virginia Angelico-Tatum, D.D.S. Motion carried.
**Trustee Self Evaluation** In preparation of today’s meeting, the results of the 2013-14 Trustee Self Evaluation were sent to the committee via email. The results were prepared by Dr. Tom Longin, AGB consultant. Fr. Wildes said that this is the third year we administer the survey and that Dr. Longin tabulates the results. The continuity of using Dr. Longin allows for keener insights, observations and recommendations. Mr. Brown was encouraged by the participation rate of 78% last year which was up from last year. Although, while a 78% participation rate is good and Mr. Pastorek congratulated the Trustees for participating, he asked whether it should be the committee’s expectation of a 100% response rate and suggested calling people directly to complete the survey.

Mr. Pastorek made two observations. First, is how informed the Trustees are with the scope and quality of the University’s educational programs (page 7, #5). He would like to see more highly satisfied responses to this question and suggested the idea of showcasing a program with a 15 minute presentation at each Trustee meeting. His second observation deals with fund-raising (page 9, #19) and encouraging each Trustee to do one thing to help in this area.

Mr. McBride made an observation about the question and responses regarding selecting new members and Board orientation (page 8, #11). Although, there were nine highly satisfied responses and 14 satisfied responses, he was surprised there were not more highly satisfied responses. Fr. Wildes said it may be the way the question is worded and suggested talking to Dr. Longin about splitting this question into 2 parts, Trustee selection process and orientation of new Trustees. Fr. Wildes added that the format for board orientation includes weekly, one hour sessions over the course of 4-6 weeks that introduce new Trustees to each area of the university as well as a one hour legal training session. He thinks this format works well and is more conducive for learning than having a one day session prior to the first meeting.

**AGB Handouts** Fr. Wildes referenced two hand outs for the committee to review. First, is AGB’s Board Responsibility for Institutional Governance which is included in the committee folders. Second, is the booklet, AGB’s Top 10 Strategic Issues for Boards 2013-14, also included in the folders. Mr. Pastorek suggested that committee review the strategic issues booklet consider one or two of these issues for a more in-depth review at the next meeting.

**Executive Session** There was no Executive Session.

The meeting adjourned at 3:21 p.m.
Loyola University New Orleans
Board of Trustees Acknowledgement

Prepared for:  Insert Name Here
Board Term:  YYYY - YYYY

Fund-raising is one of the most basic and important responsibilities of a member of the Board of Trustees of Loyola University New Orleans. In order for Loyola University to achieve its goals and objectives as an institution of higher education requires the commitment of each member of the Board in maximizing our fund-raising potential.

Trustees are expected to have a working understanding of the history, mission, priorities, needs, and values established by Loyola University New Orleans. Involved and well-informed board members are better able to engage their colleagues in discussions for a fund-raising effort that ensures a commitment to Loyola for many years to come.

Beyond cultivating, engaging, and soliciting prospective donors to Loyola University New Orleans, all board members are expected to demonstrate their personal commitment to Loyola University New Orleans by making individual gifts. This is crucial for three reasons:

- Your personal contributions to Loyola University New Orleans are evidence of your faith in the institution.
- Many prospective donors will withhold or outright decline a contribution to the campaign or other purpose for which they have been solicited unless the institution can demonstrate the 100-percent participation of its board. An institution that does not have the 100-percent participation of its board is less likely to succeed in its efforts.
- As a member of the Board of Trustees, you are a vital part of our most visible and natural donor constituency. We therefore encourage you to contribute to the university commensurate with your resources and responsibilities.

Therefore, having previously discussed the university’s annual giving guidelines prior to accepting your appointment to the Board of Trustees of Loyola University New Orleans, we now respectively ask that you acknowledge your ongoing financial commitment to the university by completing the sections below.

I am aware that each member of the Board of Trustees of Loyola University is expected to make a personal contribution of $1,000 annually to The Loyola Fund during their term on the board. I hereby acknowledge and agree to this commitment.

I am aware that Loyola University is currently involved in a comprehensive fund raising campaign and that the personal commitment, involvement, and support of the members of the Board of Trustees to this campaign are critical if we are to achieve alumni and community involvement.

Having reviewed and discussed the campaign insofar as it aligns with my personal philanthropic goals, I hereby agree to a commitment of $(insert amount) per year over the course of the campaign.

(Insert Name Here)
Signature  
Date
Loyola University New Orleans
Proposed Trustee Giving Guidelines

The following are suggested or recommended minimum giving levels for any lay individual who elects to become a member of the Board of Trustees. The absolute minimum would be a personal donation of $1,000 per year to The Loyola Fund. Other recommended campaign giving levels would be flexible for each proposed Board member, based on the recommendations of the Trusteeship and Institutional Advancement Committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINIMUM CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campaign:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Loyola Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each member of the Board of Trustees would be expected to make an annual contribution to The Loyola Fund. With 20–25 lay board members, this would raise $20,000 to $25,000 annually. All unrestricted donations made by board members will be credited to The Loyola Fund. This would be in addition to any other giving related to the campaigns outlined below and should be a direct, hard dollar contribution from the board member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign:</th>
<th><strong>Recommended Amount:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Periodicity:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Credited to:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Fund Raising Campaign</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>At the direction of the donor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minor fund raising campaign would be any fund raising campaign designed to raise any total amount less than $5 million in the course of one year. It would not be launched while either a Targeted Fund Raising Campaign or a Major Fund Raising Campaign is in progress without approval of the Institutional Advancement Committee and the full Board. There could be several Minor Fund Raising Campaigns running concurrently, as in the case of three different College Funding Priority programs each raising $1 million. With 20–25 lay board members, this would raise $200,000 to $250,000 for the campaign. This should be a direct, hard dollar contribution from the board member, but may be eligible for soft credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign:</th>
<th><strong>Recommended Amount:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Periodicity:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Credited to:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Fund Raising Campa</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Over 3-5 years</td>
<td>The targeted purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A targeted fund raising campaign would be any fund raising campaign designed to raise more than $5 million, but less than $25 million, during a 3-to-5 year time frame. This type of fund raising campaign would be for a single, specific (targeted) purpose such as Roussel Hall or the new off-campus sports facility. It would not be launched while either a Minor Fund Raising Campaign or a Major Fund Raising Campaign is in progress without approval of the Institutional Advancement Committee and the full Board. With 20–25 lay board members, this would raise $500,000 to $625,000 for the campaign. This should be a direct, hard dollar contribution from the board member, but may be eligible for soft credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign:</th>
<th><strong>Recommended Amount:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Periodicity:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Credited to:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Fund Raising Campaign</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Over 5 Years</td>
<td>At the direction of the donor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A major fund raising capital campaign would be any fund raising campaign designed to raise in excess of $50 million, generally over at least five years, but regardless of the multi-year time frame. The current *Faith in the Future* is a perfect example. It would not be launched while either a Minor Fund Raising Campaign or a Targeted Fund Raising Campaign is in progress without approval of the Institutional Advancement Committee and the full Board. With 20 to 25 lay board members, this would raise $2,000,000 to $2,500,000 for the campaign. This should be a direct, hard dollar contribution from the board member, but may be eligible for soft credit.