

# 31<sup>st</sup> & Pearl

## BAC Equals BAd Charity

After examining [usmpride.com](http://usmpride.com)'s investigation of the USM Foundation, here's our question: If only 19.5 cents of every dollar that Gene Carlisle donates to the CoB's Business Advisory Council goes to support business students, how many Wendy's franchises would it take to put a business major through school at USM? That question comes from the fact that only \$15,000 of the \$77,029 raised last year through BAC dues (each member pays \$1,250 annually in dues) went to support the academic pursuits of various students in the CoB. What is flabbergasting to us is that a total of \$20,137 of that \$77,209 was swallowed up by direct overhead, while another \$19,392 was consumed by various parties and events. If you lump these together, a total of \$39,529 went into the overhead of the organization, for a whopping 51.3 percent of total money raised through membership dues. No wonder some of the BAC's supporters are turning their philanthropic attentions toward the business school at William Carey University. With an overhead percentage like the one above, there's also little wonder in why the "party animals" in the Dean's office, and their pals over at the USM Foundation, prefer such a "living" definition of confidentiality.

According to the American Institute of Philanthropy, in order to raise \$100, an overhead of \$35 or less is "reasonable" for most charities. Well, it's apparent that the CoB's Business Advisory Council isn't "most charities," sitting at the "more than \$50 to raise \$100" level. Based on these figures, the BAC would certainly not receive a grade better than "D" ("unsatisfactory") from the AIP, and would likely warrant an "F" for "poor" performance. Here's a tip to the students who are being shortchanged: Get on the BAC party circuit A-list. We hear that they serve heavy *hors d'oeuvres* next to an open bar. When the "private money" is the "fun money," why would one expect anything less?