

THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA AT MONROE
MASCOT COMMITTEE MEETING
February 8, 2006

The University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM) Expanded Mascot Committee met at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, in Administrative Conference Room #622 on the 6th floor of the ULM Library. Committee members present were: Chairman George Luffey, Wayne Brumfield, Skeet Creekmore, Kyle Gallman, Eveta Gambrah, Laura Harris, Richard Hood, Stuart Keyes, John Knesel, Stacy Lamb, Mary Ann Newton, Dave Norris, John Rettenmayer, Dorothy Schween, Don Skelton, Bobby Staub, Joey Trappey, Elee Trichel, Rod Washington, Amy Weems, Don Weems, Chris Wilson (Replaced J. D. Malone), Amanda Wing, and James Wright. Keith Brown, Sue Edmunds, Joe Farr, and Scott McDonald were absent. Others attending by invitation were: Kevin Stuart, Lindsey Wilkerson, Lillian Brown, and Mazie Williams. Media personnel on hand were: Jordan Blum – News-Star and Cody Futrell – PowWow.

The meeting was called to order promptly at 3:30 p.m. by Chairman Luffey with Skelton being asked to execute a roll call of members. Luffey then recognized the new committee members and asked them to introduce themselves. Following a review of the minutes of January 25, 2006, on a motion by Creekmore, second by Hood, and vote of the committee, the minutes were approved as corrected.

Luffey recognized Skelton to address the committee concerning the responsibility and expectation of committee members. He stated:

“In an effort to make this emotional and critical change as transparent and open as possible, we, as members, have accepted the challenge of public criticism as well as public support. We need to be conscious of the fact that any public mention (in jest or not) or declaration of support or non-support for a suggested mascot may be regarded as one of bias. While our appointments have been made to provide representation of various groups of the university community, it is critically important for each of us to serve with keeping the best long-term and broad-view interests of the university in mind in our deliberations, discussions, and decisions. A focus upon the strategic marketing objectives of the University is paramount for this body. At a number of institutions undergoing a similar change, committee members agreed to sign a “non-disclosure” statement and also agreed not to participate in the nomination process. While we have not been asked to do this, it is something to think about!”

Luffey next requested a report from the Marketing Subcommittee members. Staub reported they had met with the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC), and then deferred to Keyes to apprise the committee of updates. Keyes said CLC has agreed to review and make recommendations for marketing/consulting firms based on what is best and most suitable for ULM. He said that CLC has expertise in this area and definitely wants ULM to be successful in this process as they sell our product. However, CLC has indicated that the committee’s established timeline may need to speed up in order to meet the June 1st deadline. CLC felt that the February 28th date on the timeline, as well as the June 1st date, was fine; however, the interior process in between those dates may need some adjusting to be able to finalize the process by June 1. Mascot Committee members requested that the

Subcommittee meet again with CLC to solicit their recommendations for adjusting the timeline and to report back to the Mascot Committee at its next meeting. The Mascot Committee also requested the flexibility to make any adjustments in the timeline as recommended by CLC, pending the approval of President Cofer.

Lindsey Wilkerson, ULM Director of Web Services, was recognized and reported that the mascot-suggestion process was up and running online with a secure server operated by the ULM Computing Center. He stated that a summary would be made available immediately following the February 28th deadline for receiving mascot suggestions.

The Committee discussed the process for determining mascot qualifiers. Skelton suggested several qualifications that had been forwarded to him by members, including marketability, exhibition of strength, reflection of tradition and culture, and/or being indigenous to this region. A discussion on this followed and the general consensus of the Committee was that these should be used only as considerations rather than specific guidelines for qualifiers, so as to not restrict or limit the ability to evaluate all "viable" suggestions that may be made. The Committee also felt that the University's color scheme should be a consideration in the selection process. The Committee noted that, at present, all suggestions are in first place and last place and would remain so until the February 28th deadline. It was emphasized that, to date, there are no leading candidates, and the Committee agreed that concentrating on and addressing the selection process, rather than the mascot, was critical and of the utmost importance at this time.

After conferring with the Subcommittee members to ensure adequate time to consult with CLC and to prepare a report to present to the Committee, it was recommended, on a motion by Skelton, second by Keyes, and vote of the Committee, that the next meeting of the Mascot Committee be scheduled for Wednesday, February 22, at 3:30 p.m. in the Administrative Conference Room #622 on the 6th floor of the ULM Library.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.