ALUMNI RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT
TO INTEGRATE OR NOT TO INTEGRATE (SOME SAY YES, SOME SAY NOT YET)
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Tweeting Encouraged Throughout: #CASEEdIConf
GOALS

- Explore the History of Alumni Relations
- Outline Different Levels of Advancement Integration
- Identify the Pros/Cons of Separate vs. Integrated
- Share Industry Trends
- Involve the Audience
GROUND RULES

- Tweeting during the session is encouraged

- Openness to understanding different models is expected

- Ask questions throughout

- There are no right answers or one-size-fits-all approach
  *(each institution has its own history, culture, and circumstances)*
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In an era of declining and stagnant alumni giving rates and finite institutional financial and human resources, more and more colleges, schools, and universities have considered formally integrating their alumni relations program with their development program. But others have resisted this trend. Some schools argue that to increase alumni giving at all levels and to increase broad-based engagement, alumni relations should be seen as partners and players in the work done by the development side of the house. Other schools, however, believe that maintaining separate teams is the only way to improve the base of donors and engaged alumni who will ultimately support the institution in the future.
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HISTORY LESSON: ALUMNI RELATIONS

- Organic growth in the 19th century
- Graduating classes started organizing Reunions
- Many early Alumni Associations were founded to “support the university” – including fundraising!
- 1913: Association of Alumni Secretaries (now CASE)
- Regional groups began to grow in large cities
HISTORY LESSON: ALUMNI RELATIONS

- “Friendraising” vs Fundraising

- Public models – 501(c)3, separate alumni association, and separate foundation

- Private models – Advancement structure

- Independent – Interdependent – Dependent
THE FUTURE?

Andy Shaindlin, Carnegie Mellon University
Alumni Futures Blog, January 13, 2014

The Future (Part I):
Fundraising's Relationship to Alumni Relations

“The first 85 years of organized alumni relations (from about 1913 to 1998) was stable, with mostly incremental change. But the last 15 years have been revolutionary. The rapid rate of change in our profession suggests that the alumni office of 100 years from now – if alumni programming exists at all – would be virtually unrecognizable to us.”
THE FUTURE?

“The most obvious place for alumni relations and development to combine efforts is in annual giving. Alumni officers and annual giving staff are talking to the same audiences: students, their parents, and alumni.”

“Friendraising is dead. Alumni relations and development are, I believe, destined to be ever more interwoven, and that's a good thing, for our donors and for our institutions.”
VIEWS OF THE PANELISTS

KRIS SCHAEFER | PHILIP LOVEJOY
### Notable Examples: Stanford University, Texas A&M, Harvard University, Princeton University
INTEGRATED
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Notable Examples: Cornell University, University of Wisconsin - Madison
CASE STUDY: CORNELL UNIVERSITY

- 1865-2006: Separate
- 2006-2008: Collaboratively Separate
- 2013: Integrated: Alumni Relations + Annual Fund
INDUSTRY TRENDS

- PCUAD: 2001 vs 2012

- 2013 GG+A Clients – sample of 22
  - Large Public: Merging 150 year old Alumni Association with the Foundation
  - Elite Private: Long history of staunchly separate being integrated into the Advancement program

- Stanford University
KEEP IN TOUCH

Shane Dunn
Managing Director, Strategic Growth and Development
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THANK YOU!
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610-737-1916
cmarshall@grenzglier.com | @CMarshallGGA
SESSION TIMELINE

• CASE District 1 – Friday, January 31, 2014 @ 10:00am-11:15am

• CASE District 2 – Monday, February 10, 2014 @ 1:15pm-2:15pm

✓ 20 minutes – Chris and Shane

✓ 15 minutes – panelists share their experiences

✓ 10-15 minutes – open Q & A and discussion

✓ 5 minutes – case study and trends

✓ 10-20 minutes – open Q & A and discussion
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