



Dear Friends of St. AndrewsNC,

As the president of Webber International University, and a St. Andrews University alumnus, I greatly appreciate your concern for the future of our beloved alma mater. Like your diplomas, mine says St. Andrews Presbyterian College – giving us a strong and shared personal interest in its success. I strive every day to make sure it's the sort of place I'd be confident and proud to send my own child.

As I am sure you have anticipated, we are rapidly approaching the point where St. Andrews and Webber have a duty to vigorously defend ourselves. As we were preparing for that, the question was asked – what is it this anonymous group (i.e., you) actually hopes to accomplish? So, while my initial objective in reviewing your assertions was to prepare exhibits for a five-day notice precedent to prosecution for libel or slander as required by Florida Statute §770.01 and North Carolina General Statute §99-1, and for a demand for removal of infringing material as required by Title 17 United States Code §102(a)(5), I decided instead to attempt to elicit from you a simple answer to that simple question.

Certainly, in the most recent instance, I am concerned about the latest social media graphic you have posted to your organization's social media accounts which depicts Dr. Arthur Keiser as a major donor to St. Andrews. As you are undoubtedly aware – indeed, as the link below the photo demonstrates you know – Dr. Keiser did not give \$11 million to St. Andrews (or Webber). Facts, of course, matter. Despite your continued posting of false information, it was the not-for-profit Everglades College, Inc. which made a sizeable and unrestricted donation to St. Andrews (i.e., one not-for-profit school donating to another not-for-profit school, something unique neither in higher education nor even in North Carolina). Because this donation sustained us during our most difficult time and helped position us for the future, St. Andrews is forever grateful. Having been given a new lease on life, St. Andrews has made great strides in the past three years to meet the changing demands of our students and to expand our goal of providing vital educational resources to the communities and populations we serve.

As an alumnus of St. Andrews who endeavors to see my alma mater outlive me, I express a slightly different sentiment regarding this transformational and lifesaving gift which you publicly disparage. You

DR. H. KEITH WADE, PRESIDENT AND CEO

863.638.2940 (direct) • 863.638.2823 (fax) • WadeHK@webber.edu

1700 Dogwood Mile, Laurinburg, North Carolina 28352 • www.sapc.edu | 1201 North Scenic Highway, Babson Park, Florida 33827 • www.Webber.edu

have laid siege to our alma mater knowing full well, and even acknowledging, that the only current options available to Webber with respect to St. Andrews are to increase its financial stability or close the campus. So, my question is sincere: what is it you hope to accomplish?

St. Andrews continues to rely, albeit less than in earlier times, on philanthropy. Can you possibly expect this charity, which changes lives, to continue when donors are met not with thankfulness but scorn? Why would anyone give to St. Andrews when even those not idly repeating but actually practicing the very words of Jesus – “whenever you give to the poor, don’t blow your trumpet as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the street so that they may get praise from people” (Matthew 6:2 [CEB]) – are subjected to public scorn (and this is not the first large or even multi-million dollar gift St. Andrews has received for which the donors neither desired nor received public acknowledgment). For what purpose do you seek to establish St. Andrews as a place where rather than “thank you”, a donor might just as well expect to be publicly branded as someone incapable of charity but rather one who must have a diabolical and/or pecuniary motive? For what purpose do you knowingly spread falsehoods intended to chip away at the public confidence of our alma mater and that of the only institution in the nation which answered her distress call?

The last president of St. Andrews made a compelling case – to a skeptical Webber board, to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), to the US Department of Education, to the North Carolina Department of Education – that Webber and St. Andrew were stronger together. You now insist – not even suggesting a basis upon which to do so – that we immediately reverse this argument. In picking through various documents for scraps of information which lend salaciousness to your page, you must know that St. Andrews is relying on Webber financially to survive. While Webber is indeed currently stronger without St. Andrews, you repeat this demand for independence knowing that St. Andrews cannot currently stand on its own and therefore cannot be separately accredited. And, ironically, as you endeavor to cripple the institution’s ability to raise money and enroll students, financial independence becomes even harder to achieve. Except for hoping to close the doors, what could be the purpose of loudly demanding that which you know is currently impossible?

For what purpose do you falsely associate some of St. Andrews most controversial decisions with Webber? Webber did not change the name St. Andrews Presbyterian College (which appears on my diploma) to St. Andrews University. Webber did not close Burriss Hall. Webber did not

sell the shopping center adjacent to the campus. Webber did not enter into the sale / leaseback agreement with the campus (though that one was brilliant and instrumental in strengthening St. Andrews' balance sheet). And while I agree with it, the decision to branch out into adult education at satellite campuses was made over thirty years ago with the opening of the Pinehurst campus. What do you hope to accomplish by painting Webber as the perpetrator of decisions – some of them as necessary as they were painful and unpopular – with which you do not agree?

How do you expect us to recruit board members – a position which take time and incurs fiduciary liability – when you publicly and libelously malign them? As just a few examples, our Joe Miranda is in no way connected to the two personal injury firms with which you disparagingly associate him. Regarding Fred McCoy, had there actually been “alumni pressure,” our Board is aware that SACSCOC Comprehensive Standard 4.2.f would have precluded them from electing Mr. McCoy, a fact of which he is also aware. And while my personal feeling is that anyone willing to voluntarily serve on any federal panel for any administration deserves our thanks, having one's children subjected to public ridicule, as you did with Capt. Donald Jones' (who, ironically enough, was introduced to me by former President Paul Baldasare in 2010), dramatically narrows the field of those who are willing to serve on a voluntary basis. What purpose have you in making Board service undesirable?

How do you expect us to hire high quality staff when irrespective of their experience and qualifications they run the risk of being publicly attacked? Confident that I hired the very best people available, I will leave to the judgement of the less charitable the fact that of the ten very experienced and eminently qualified leaders you publicly attack, seven are women and five are women of color. Having been thoroughly vetted, having made it through multiple interviews, and having been selected as the best for the job, these seasoned professionals – who weren't easy to recruit – now face defamatory and libelous accusations that they were hired because they are “Keiser's associates, who in most cases would not qualify for an academic leadership position.” As an experienced university president, a former academic dean, a former member of multiple SACSCOC C&R committees, and a current member of the Executive Council of SACSCOC, I can assure you that I know Comprehensive Standard 5.4 (qualified administrative and academic officers) backwards and forwards. But for what purpose do you make it challenging to hire the best talent, being especially vicious in your vile and baseless attacks on those from underserved populations with a long history of having their qualifications challenged because of their immutable characteristics?

Much of your false narrative also ignores the facts that St. Andrews has been a branch campus of Webber International University for over ten years, the Campus President reports directly and only to me, and the control you demand over the timing and nature of the hiring process is unprecedented with respect to the management of a branch campus. Still, having been promised that unlike in 2006 – when one College President departed and another was appointed during a two week period over the Christmas break (and at the time as someone whose only connection was being an alumnus, it looked to me like such expediency was probably necessary) – there will be input from various constituencies in the selection of the next Campus President, for what purpose do you endeavor to make this a job nobody we would actually hire would have? While you exude a great urgency in prematurely commencing a search, you simultaneously craft a false narrative that the institution is sick, impossible to govern, and plagued by a gang of alumni who would sooner burn the place down than extend its transformational benefits to those who have taken a different path through life or have a different socioeconomic background than do you. Nothing could be further from the truth: St. Andrews is, as it always was, a place with a faculty and staff second to none which welcomes to our educational community and the benefits to be obtained there any student who meets our enrollment standards. At a school whose loving alumni, during the last hurricane drove to campus and actually took students who they had never met – all of them, not just the ones they deemed worthy of attending their alma mater – home with them to weather the storm, why would you falsely portray it as a place which is so detested by its alumni that they would publicly disparage it and sabotage its success?

What do you anticipate the impact to be on recruiting students and the employability of our graduates when you select elements of our publicly reported metrics which are no better than other schools (which, frankly, in those few areas, are high on our priority list to address), and loudly proclaiming them as harbingers of poor quality? You know the context in which these few outliers indicative of our being squarely in the middle of the pack in a few very specific and inappropriate to extrapolate areas should be viewed and you personally know the superlative quality of our education. What hope do you have to accomplish by deceptively, and knowingly, portraying any school – especially our alma mater – as providing a low-quality education?

You even accuse me of having fabricated a St. Andrews education. However, the fact is that I am indeed a son of St. Andrews. My St. Andrews began one fair Saturday afternoon with Dick Prust's SAGE 101 (the theme of our particular section was Argument Towards Truth) and by

that very Thursday we had learned that ad hominem and appeal to false authority were simply beneath a St. Andrews student. My St. Andrews was a place where the dialectic was much more important than any personal agenda we might wish to advance. My St. Andrews was a place where students didn't "lie, cheat, steal or tolerate those who do." My St. Andrews was a place where we checked our sources. My St. Andrews was a place where we lent our personal credibility to things others said very carefully and only after strict trial. My St. Andrews was a place where one's politics were great to debate over a beer, but completely and utterly unrelated to one's worth as a fellow human being. My St. Andrews was a place where even the toughest of topics could be passionately debated, with a sincere desire to get to "the answer" even if it wasn't "our answer", and the absolute knowledge that at the end of the day we were St. Andrews and nothing could ever change that. My St. Andrews was a place where, grateful as we were for the impact it had made on our lives, we left the ladder down for those who would come after us and seek the same transformational education we had experienced. And sure, my St. Andrews has been battered a bit over the years – sadly and astonishingly more by you to whom she gave so much than by any outside group – but the cross of white on a field of blue proudly yet waves. Notwithstanding the deceptively translucent and rapidly fleeting veil of anonymity your website affords, I know who some of you are and therefore know full well that your St. Andrews wasn't all that different from mine. So the excuses those without the benefit of a St. Andrews education might have – read it on the internet so it must be true, it's okay to make stuff up if you post it anonymously while hiding in the shadows, and hate justifies all – simply don't work. Unable to claim not to know better, what is it you hope to accomplish?

As we discussed prior to your libeling and publicly disparaging our alma mater, numerous are the reasons why a group of alumni – even if it were an elected and representative group – cannot function as a de facto governing body for any regionally accredited not-for-profit college. As we discussed prior to your libeling and disparaging our alma mater, as laid bare in *St. Andrews Presbyterian College v. Sacs.*, 679 F. Supp. 2d 1320 (N.D. Ga. 2009), the St. Andrews model which so many of us loved, notwithstanding all that was truly marvelous about it nevertheless proved unsustainable, and led to our alma mater's financial ruination, its loss of accreditation, and very nearly its extinction. As we discussed prior to your libeling and disparaging our alma mater, even if there were a compelling case for independence, St. Andrews cannot currently stand alone financially and therefore cannot currently be separately accredited. It seemed, before undertaking your public smear campaign, that you indeed understood what can, and notwithstanding what any of us might like, what

cannot, be done at this moment in time. Yet, in all candor, with Webber's current choices relative to St. Andrews limited to "stay the course" or "close the doors," it seems that while some of us are striving to return St. Andrews to its former success (an undertaking which, while respecting and preserving the core, nevertheless involves some change), you only seek to destroy it by knowingly sharing inaccurate information which some would argue rises to the level of tortious interference. And this truly baffles me. In the spirit of St. Andrews, I reach out to you and earnestly ask you: what is it you're trying to accomplish?

With a 125-year history of academic excellence, St. Andrews remains committed to providing a transformational education to our students and will continue this mission to ensure qualified students of all backgrounds can, if they're willing to put in the hard work to get there, achieve their academic and career goals. I sincerely invite you to join us in this undertaking as we simply can no longer allow you to undermine it. As previously noted, I'd be happy to meet with you to discuss your concerns.

Respectfully yours,



H. Keith Wade, DBA, CMA, CFM, LBBP
President, CEO, and St. Andrews Class of 1987 Graduate