The Board of Trustees meeting was called to order at 7:08 a.m. by Trustee Carroll, Chair. He was joined by Trustee Bookhardt, Trustee Hanzlik, Board Chair Cohen, Vice Chair Lucero, Trustee Robinson, Faculty Trustee Hal Nees, Student Trustee Kat Cammack, and Alumni Representative Eric Peterson. President Jordan, Board Secretary Loretta P. Martinez, and Mr. Jon Robinson from the Foundation were also in attendance, along with various faculty, administrators and staff.

Committee Chair Carroll asked for relevant updates, and Dr. Jordan introduced Ms. Jean Galloway of the Galloway Group. He advised the Committee that Ms. Galloway’s company is a community relations, marketing and public relations firm specializing in strategic community investment. Ms. Galloway will be instrumental in the broader communication of the issue of a strategic name initiative.

Board Secretary Martinez stated that the Committee would be looking and talking about multiple prongs related to a strategic name initiative: communications, PR strategy, legal, political consulting and branding and marketing piece.

With that she provided the Committee with an update regarding the RFP process that had occurred in relation to a search for both federal and state legislative liaisons to assist Metro in general and with specifics. She advised that while the federal choice is still pending, the Evaluation Committee, of which she was a member, voted to re-engage Capstone Group as state legislative liaison and would be working towards finalizing a contract with them so they’re on board for summer. Ms. Christine Staberg of the Capstone Group would be providing the Committee with download of what she’s learned before the legislature for use as the Board determines the actions it wants to take regarding a name change.

Committee Chair Carroll thanked everyone for the updates and segued into a discussion regarding the different types of consultants that could be useful to Metro: communications, political, marketing, and lobbyists. This led to a discussion on legal strategy, how to include faculty and students in this process, and the use of outside legal consultants in relation to the RFP process.

The committee discussed the public’s perspective of what has transpired up till now, and what actions can be taken to provide a clear picture and alleviate the confusion that exists regarding whether or not the name change took place. This led into a discussion regarding trademark issues.

Board Chair Cohen reiterated that the list of action items from the last meeting was important in relation to the progression of how the Committee and Board proceed. Committee Chair Carroll suggested the Committee gather a stakeholders list prior to the next Committee meeting, and tier the level of stakeholders who will be included in conversation.
The Committee discussion then changed to having an elevator speech in relation to a name change, and the question was raised as to whether or not the name of Denver State University was still valid, and if so, what strategy would be needed to successfully support that name. Capstone Group would be relied upon to provide a post mortem discussion to be used going forward, to identify roadblocks, challenges, how to maneuver around those issues in the future if we the choice is made to stick with the DSU name.

A vibrant dialogue around the testing that was previously conducted regarding name choices ensued, and again identified the four issues/goals that were dominate: the value of the degree, issues surrounding Metro being a two-year or four-year school, the location of Metro, and the length of the name. The Committee was now charged with determining if the four issues identified were still valid issues, and to determine if the Board proceed with the current name choice or a different name.

Board Chair Cohen reminded everyone that the Board had a motion unanimously voted by the Board to continue to move forward with Denver State University but to defer the process for a year. He reminded the Committee that the only group who could make that decision is the Board and that the Committee’s responsibility is to bring the Board information and/or a recommendation for them to move forward.

Trustee Lucero recapped the conversation up to this point by stating that the Board would stick with the name of Denver State University unless the post mortem discussion indicates a need to change strategy. There is a need to have to have the post mortem discussion, trademark analysis, identifying key pieces to validate this the name, budget analysis, and allowing enough time to readjust if there’s a red flag indicating an adjustment is needed.

Dialogue continued surrounding the circumstances that complicated the issue of a name change, and current situations that may encumber the issue. The new Faculty Trustee, Dr. Kottenstette, along with Student Trustee Cammack talked about due diligence within the Board and Committee, but the need to update and advise the campus is of utmost importance.

Committee Chair Carroll then addressed the matter of proposed meeting dates for the Committee, indicating the goal is to have the Committee meet every three weeks during the summer months. There was subsequent conversation in relation to funding of the efforts that had been raised by the Committee, and there was assurance that if the Board approved the 2011-2012 budget at the Board meeting later, there were funds set aside to pay for the cost of this process that were not state funds or grant related.

Mr. Jon Robinson advised the Committee that the Foundation supported the name Denver State University and that it was time to move forward and get it done. Committee Chair Carroll stated that it was his opinion that this is what the Committee is going to do unless they are met some insurmountable obstacle.

The Committee agreed to meet again on June 22nd, and Committee Chair Carroll adjourned the meeting at 8:28a.m.