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Executive Summary

Called together in September of 2014 at the request of University of North Dakota President Robert Kelley, the Nickname and Logo Process Recommendation Task Force was charged with the development of a process for the potential adoption of a new nickname and logo for the University’s athletic teams. The Task Force began its work knowing that the matter was fraught with emotional significance for many. It also knew that change is difficult. However, the members of the Task Force also recognized that, in this case, change was both inevitable and necessary. Owing to the legal arrangements and state mandates outlined in the history section of this document, there was no going back to the old nickname and logo.

While ongoing support for a return to the old nickname and logo were notable both at some of the public meetings and among a minority of survey respondents, it is also the case that the vast majority of those who registered their opinions acknowledged that such a return was impossible and that it was important that the University of North Dakota move on and choose a new nickname for the University’s athletic teams. Indeed, the data indicates that of the approximately 7,600 people who took part in the online survey, a majority were ready to put the retired nickname and logo behind them and start a new chapter in the history of the University.

The various public meetings and the results of the online survey also indicated that in the quest for a new nickname (and for the logo which will flow from it), those charged with making the ultimate choice would need to ensure that both the name and logo would be inspirational, honorable and unforgettable. Moreover, both the nickname and logo should represent the entire state and region and reflect the pride that we all feel in UND and its athletic teams.

In keeping with these findings, the Task Force recommends that the process for choosing a new nickname should begin immediately. To be more precise, the Task Force recommends that the final decision regarding a new name should be made by a group representing the UND community and the larger community of university friends and supporters (for more detail on the proportion of stakeholders to be represented on the Committee, see the section titled “UND Nickname Committee Process” under the “Conclusions and Recommendations” section). Each stakeholder group should choose its own representatives, and this should be done as expeditiously as possible. It is further recommended that this body, in consultation with the public, develop a list of suitable nickname choices (for more information on the suggested process, see the “Committee Approach” subsection of the “Conclusions and Recommendations” portion of this report). After consultation with the public and various stakeholders – using the methods already developed by the Task Force (Conversation Café-style public meetings, town hall meetings and online surveys) – and making use of the professional advice of experts on trademarking and other such legal and licensing matters, it is recommended that this Committee generate a list of potential nicknames which meet the criteria outlined in this report. After a further winnowing of possible names, it is recommended that the Committee produce a final list of no more than five potential nicknames. At this point, the new Committee will be responsible for choosing what it deems to be the best possible option. Flowing from the many comments made at meetings and in the comments section of the online surveys, the Task Force also recommends that the new Committee include/consider the option of simply remaining UND/North Dakota.

It is further recommended that the choice of the nickname be the first priority of the Committee and that the selection of an appropriate logo should follow from this choice. Ideally, the process leading to the choice of a nickname should be completed within six months to one year, and the logo creation should follow as quickly as possible.
Preamble

Called together in September of 2014 at the request of University of North Dakota President Robert Kelley, the UND Nickname and Logo Process Recommendation Task Force was charged with the development of a process for the potential adoption of a new nickname and logo. It should be noted that discussion of a potential change in school colors was not a part of the Task Force’s charter and is not addressed here.

The Task Force began its work knowing that the matter of UND’s Athletics nickname and logo was fraught with emotional significance for many and also understood that change is difficult. However, the members of the Task Force – several of whom proudly wore UND’s uniforms as varsity athletes – also recognized that in this case, change was necessary. Owing to the legal arrangements and state mandates outlined in the history section of this document, use of the old nickname and logo are no longer an option.

The Task Force consisted of representatives from UND stakeholder groups, including past and present student-athletes, current students, alumni, staff, faculty, and administration. This group came together to work with one common resolve: to help UND find a process which will allow the University and its constituents to move beyond the current ambiguous situation regarding the Athletics nickname and logo, and to do it in a way that honors the respect and loyalty that all of the stakeholder groups have for UND.

Provided with professional support from lead facilitator Marie Miyashiro and her team and brand advisor Kelly O’Keefe, as well as technical and support staff services from the office of the Vice President for University and Public Affairs, the Task Force began its work late in September 2014. Between September 24 and the submission of this report, the 13 volunteer members of the Task Force collectively invested hundreds of hours of their time in the quest to develop a set of recommendations for an appropriate process and timeline for the potential development and adoption of a permanent nickname and logo. The work of the Task Force is explained in greater detail in the Methods and Process section of this report. We urge all interested parties to read the entire report and its supporting documentation on the website that includes the work of the Task Force: http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm.

History

To place the work of this Task Force in context, it may be useful to provide a brief background to the nickname and logo question at UND. This, of course, is part of a lengthy and complicated history which stretches back to 1930 when UND’s teams first adopted the “Sioux” nickname. In more recent years, particularly since the 1990s, the nickname – by that time “The Fighting Sioux” – as well as the use of the various Indian head logos which accompanied it, became controversial and a major source of debate on and off the UND campus. In 2005, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) became involved in the matter when it announced its intention to sanction a number of schools that continued to use tribal nicknames and/or logos. In response to the threatened sanctions, which would have prevented UND teams from using the nicknames and logos during post season play and would have prevented UND from hosting playoff games, an appeal was launched. This and subsequent appeals were denied, and in the summer of 2006 the State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) authorized the office of the North Dakota State Attorney General to sue the NCAA for its decision to penalize UND for its continued use of the nickname and logo. The case never went to trial, however, as in 2007 an out-of-court settlement was reached: UND would have three years to secure the support of the namesake tribes for the
continued use of the nickname and logo. If that support was not secured, the University would have to retire the nickname and logo.

In 2009, when it seemed that UND would not be able to meet the requirements of the out-of-court settlement in the time allotted, the SBHE instructed the University to begin the process of retiring the nickname and logo, a process that was to be completed by August of 2010. After providing an extension to allow more time to acquire support from the namesake tribes, in the spring of 2010 the SBHE formally ordered UND to retire its nickname and logo by August 15, 2011.

In compliance with this order, UND’s administration began planning the retirement and transition process. Two committees were formed in 2010, and considerable work was done between then and early 2011. However, in the spring session of 2011, the North Dakota State Legislature passed a bill which required UND to keep the nickname and logo. As a result, the SBHE ordered UND to halt all work on the retirement and transition process. A few months later, at a meeting between the NCAA’s leadership team and several State of North Dakota officials (including the Governor, the majority leaders of the Senate and the House, the Attorney General, the president of the SBHE, the UND athletic director and the president of UND) it was made clear by the NCAA that UND would face sanctions if the use of the nickname and logo was not suspended. For this reason the SBHE ordered UND to recommence work on the retirement and transition process – even though the state law calling for the nickname’s continued use was still in effect. This anomaly was done away with when the law was repealed in a special session of the legislature in November of 2011.

When petitions were filed with the North Dakota Secretary of State early in February of 2012 (which suspended the November action of the State Legislature), UND again resumed the use of the nickname and logo for all of its athletic teams. After the petitions were duly certified (this involved a referral to the North Dakota Supreme Court) the question of retaining or retiring the nickname and logo was put to a statewide vote in June of 2012. On that date, a majority of North Dakota voters – slightly over two thirds – voted to uphold the law passed in the November 2011 Special Session.

Three days later, on June 14, 2012, the SBHE voted to have UND retire the name and logo and issued a directive to that effect. At the same time, in keeping with the law passed in November of 2011, the SBHE also prohibited UND from adopting any new nicknames for its athletic teams until January 1, 2015. With that date approaching, President Kelley called for the creation of the Nickname and Logo Process Recommendation Task Force to provide recommendations on how best to move forward.

Methodology and Process

After considerable internal discussion, the Task Force adopted a mixed qualitative and quantitative methodology. In the broadest terms possible, the goal was to gather qualitative data from various stakeholders at a series of in-person, large group meetings in Grand Forks. The core data gathered at these facilitated meetings was then to be used to inform and shape the online survey instrument which Task Force members created. This survey would then be made available to as wide an audience as possible. While this form of data collection was ongoing, the Task Force simultaneously hosted a number of virtual town hall meetings at various locations throughout the state. This strengthened the qualitative research component and broadened the opportunities for people outside of Grand Forks to express their views on the best possible process. These gatherings, hosted by Task Force members and held at Williston, Minot, Bismarck, Fargo and Grand Forks, were linked together electronically in order to create a statewide town hall meeting. An Adobe Connect component was added for those who were unable to attend any of the meeting sites in person. Based upon feedback from the various in-person
meetings, it was also decided that separate town hall meetings would be held in Minneapolis/St. Paul and Denver, where UND has sizable alumni populations.

In more detailed terms, the process and methodology developed in the following fashion:

1) Upon receiving the invitation to serve on the Task Force, and ensured of the support services of the office of the Vice President for University and Public Affairs plus the expert services of lead facilitator Marie Miyashiro and her team and brand advisor Kelly O’Keefe, Task Force members scheduled a series of meetings over the next few months.

2) At the October 16, 2014 meeting, after a facilitated set of discussions and a careful consideration of the Task Force charter, two key matters were decided upon: first, that the process developed for the nickname and logo selection would be aimed at producing an Athletics mark that was also relevant to UND as a whole; and second, that the Task Force would provide a detailed written document to President Kelley by December 31, 2014 – a document that would contain an action plan for final selection of a potential new nickname based on input from appropriate constituents and Task Force recommendations.

3) At the October 17, 2014 meeting, a best practices recommendation by the facilitators was to hold three meetings in Grand Forks to gather data. One meeting would be for current student-athletes on November 5, with two additional large public meetings on November 6 and 7. Task Force members also discussed the potential value of conducting an online survey for data collection and outreach purposes. At this point, three sub-committees were formed to: (a) develop a complete outreach plan proposal; (b) determine the feasibility of conducting a survey; and (c) develop a synchronous meeting plan.

4) The meeting on November 5 would be for up to 40 current student-athletes who would represent the Student Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). The next two meetings, November 6 and 7, would be open to a broad array of UND constituents. The last two in-person events would host up to 90 persons per session, 180 in total. Representation from stakeholder groups would be invited, utilizing the following numbers: Alumni – 40; Boosters/fans – 40; athletes – 15; faculty – 25; staff – 25; students – 25; and administration – 10. Invitations for possible inclusion in the meetings were generated from data of alumni, students, faculty, and staff. Approximately 63,000 invitations to be considered for participation were emailed. The names of the 967 potential participants who indicated they would like to attend one of the four hour information gathering sessions were randomized through a computerized random number generator, and final invitations were sent out to those who were selected through that process. The Task Force completed this work in collaboration with UND’s Office of University and Public Affairs and Center for Instructional and Learning Technologies (CILT).

5) The possibility/feasibility of a virtual town hall meeting was also under active discussion as the plans outlined above were being developed. A November 10 date was originally selected so that the results of the meeting could also be factored into the survey creation process. However, arrangements and various logistical matters for this set of events could not be attended to in such close proximity to the events of November 5, 6, and 7. Arrangements were made to host the virtual town hall meetings on November 17. The decision was made to use the resulting data as an additional source of qualitative data while compiling the Task Force’s final report and recommendations.

6) All three of the November 5, 6, and 7 in-person events were conducted in a “Conversation Café” format. The Conversation Café utilized the World Café design approach to strategic dialogue, multi-stakeholder engagement, multi-generational collaboration, and cooperative action to exchange ideas,
stories and experiences, information, and/or view. Participants were provided with an overview of the process to date, general information related to organizational branding, and best practices associated with developing new organizational brands. Participants were then asked to discuss what they had liked about the “Fighting Sioux” nickname and the feelings and values it represented. At the November 5 meeting, the student-athlete participants were asked to discuss a potential process for choosing a new nickname. This was then followed by a series of roundtable discussions, and each table came up with a top two set of feelings/values and qualities/attributes that people preferred in a nickname. The final roundtable discussion focused on the question of determining which stakeholder groups should have a voice in the process of choosing a potential new nickname and logo and why.

7) After the November 5 meeting, Task Force members decided to follow the same format for the November 6 and 7 meetings with the addition of the question relating to potential timelines and to link that to the existing question on process. At the November 6 and 7 meetings, participants were once again provided with an overview of the process to date, general information related to organizational branding and best practices associated with developing new organizational brands. Again, participants were then asked to discuss what they had liked about the “Fighting Sioux” nickname and the feelings and values it represented. In a series of roundtable discussions, each table came up with a top two set of feelings/values and qualities/attributes that people preferred in a nickname. The second roundtable discussion focused on the stakeholder groups that should have a voice in the process of choosing a potential new nickname and logo and why they needed to be included. Finally, participants were asked to do the same regarding potential timelines for a nickname process and procedures for gathering/narrowing and selecting a potential new nickname and logo.

8) The results of these meetings were recorded onsite using large flip charts, index cards and a graphical recorder. All detailed data from individuals and each table was brought together by the Task Force. Space was also provided at these meetings for interested observers to watch the proceedings and also for the observers to post their views on boards provided. This material was also collected and considered by the Task Force.

9) With considerable aid from UND’s Office of Institutional Research, a sub-committee of the Task Force took the lead in drafting the online “Qualtrics” survey based upon the results of the in-person meetings. After careful editing and several revisions involving the entire Task Force, the final draft was sent out on November 14 and remained in circulation until November 30. In addition to the approximately 63,000 email recipients from data of alumni, students, faculty, and staff, the survey was made available through the UND website. Every effort was made, via the media and social media, to encourage people who had not received a survey (due to changed/incorrect email address, no personal computer, etc.) to fill one out. It should also be pointed out that because of the Task Force’s understanding of the requirements of open records laws in North Dakota, the survey responses could not be protected from public view, and survey takers were informed of this. This may have had an impact upon participation rates, but regardless, there was a very solid result of 7,603 responses.

10) While the survey was still in progress, the Task Force hosted a number of virtual town hall meetings at various locations throughout the state. This strengthened the qualitative research component and broadened the opportunities for people outside of Grand Forks to express their views on the best possible process. These gatherings, hosted by Task Force members and held on November 17 at Williston, Minot, Bismarck, Fargo and Grand Forks, were linked together electronically in order to create a statewide town hall meeting. An Adobe Connect component was added for those who were unable to attend any of the meeting sites in person. Variations of questions from the online survey were asked of the various audiences to spur conversations in each of the locations. Once again, all flip charts, index
cards and other materials were gathered and eventually entered into a spreadsheet. This created yet another discreet data set.

11) Based upon feedback from the various in-person meetings, it was also decided that separate, stand-alone town hall meetings would be held in Minneapolis/St. Paul and Denver, where UND has sizable alumni populations. The meeting in Minneapolis/St. Paul was held on December 4 and the meeting in Denver was held on December 11. For the Minneapolis/St. Paul meeting, the questions and process were exactly the same as for the multi-site town hall meetings in North Dakota. The Denver meeting had a more flexible format, allowing the Task Force members hosting the event to get feedback on an even broader range of issues.

12) All of the survey results were compiled and distributed to Task Force members on December 8. At four-hour meetings held on December 8 and 10, the results were discussed and added to the qualitative materials that had been under discussion and review. Pending the final results of the Denver meeting, individual Task Force members were assigned different portions of the report to draft. They used “Sharepoint,” a software package which allowed Task Force members to share their work with the public and thus remain compliant with North Dakota’s open records law. Task Force members compiled the data and wrote and revised the final report between December 13, 2014, and January 30, 2015.

**Results**

The work of the Task Force may best be viewed as a compilation of data gathered at three (3) in-person meetings, an online survey and town hall meetings held around North Dakota, in Minneapolis and in Denver. The work done at the in-person meetings informed the creation of the survey instrument. The town hall meetings contained both an educational component and a data gathering opportunity (please see the “Methodology and Process” section of this report for further detail). The data gathered from each of these events can be found on the website that includes the work of the Task Force: [http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm](http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm).
The quantitative results obtained from the online survey indicated that a total of 7,603 surveys were completed, with 64% of the respondents indicating they mostly identified as Alumni. Present Students were the next largest constituent group with 15%. Other respondents included Staff, Former Student-Athletes, Friends of UND, Community Members, Faculty, Present Student-Athletes, Former Faculty/Staff, UND Administrators, and those that chose the ‘Other’ category and indicated either multiple affiliations or one not included on the provided list (See figure 1 below).
The question which asked what best described the respondent’s position regarding a potential new nickname indicated that 51% had strong opinions, but were open to the best solution for UND; while 31% indicated that they had no strong opinions and considered themselves open minded about the nickname; and 13% indicated they had strong opinions and were not open to changing their minds. The responses in the ‘Other’ category can be found on the website that includes the work of the Task Force: http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm (See figure 2 below).

Which of the following best describes your position regarding a potential new nickname.

- I have strong opinions, but I am open to the best solution for UND.
- I am not open to changing my opinions. I have made my mind up about the nickname.
- I have no strong opinions. I consider myself to be open minded about the nickname.
- Other, Please specify.

Figure 2
In reference to the question regarding the best timeframe for launching the process, 30% responded that a timeline with a completion date within the next year should be established but that flexibility in the process was necessary to be sure it was done correctly. Twenty nine percent indicated the process should begin as soon as possible. Of the remainder, 16% indicated a year or more, and 17% indicated that it was too soon and UND should wait longer than 3 years to begin this process, and 8% selected the ‘Other’ category (See figure 3 below).

In the event the Task Force recommends selection of a new nickname and logo, what is the best timeframe for launching the process?

- Begin the process as soon as possible, it is time for our athletes and students to have a nickname and logo around which they can rally.
- We should take a year or more to make absolutely sure we have the best nickname and logo for UND.
- It is too soon to think about a new nickname and logo, the process should be delayed longer than 3 years. The process should be slow and deliberate.
- A timeline with a completion date within the next year should be established but be flexible enough to be sure the process is done correctly.
- Other: Please specify.

Figure 3
On the issue of who should be invited to submit suggestions for a new nickname if/when the time came, 46% of the respondents indicated everyone should be allowed to submit suggested names, with 37% indicating that only those with direct ties to UND should be allowed to submit names (See figure 4 below).

If UND decides to choose a new nickname, whom do you think should be invited to submit ideas for the new name?

- Everyone should be allowed to submit suggested names.
- Select stakeholder groups should be solicited for suggested names.
- Only those with direct ties to UND should be allowed to submit suggested names.
- Professional marketers should be selected to submit suggested names.
- Other: Please specify.

Figure 4
When polled regarding their level of agreement as to whether or not the survey allowed respondents a role in shaping the process, 53% agreed and 11% strongly agreed, while 24% were neutral on the topic and 12% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (See figure 5 below).

Your opinions are valuable to the Task Force. Please respond to the following statement. I feel this survey has allowed me to have a role in helping shape the process for potential selection of a new nickname and logo at UND.
In addition to these questions, four additional queries asked the respondents to use a sliding scale to rank items that included what actions would help them feel more confident about the recommendation process; who should be involved in narrowing the choices if nickname suggestions were provided; what values and characteristics the nickname should possess; and qualities and marketability factors for the new nickname. The respondents could rank each of the choices for these questions from 0-10, with 0 being the lowest and 10 being the highest rating choice. See Figures 1-4 for the responses to these questions.

The data gathered from the survey was also broken down by respondent group. While there were some variances in the percentages in response to each question, in general, all groups had similar results. Due to the small response size in some groups, they were not analyzed separately, but rather combined with a similar stakeholder group for the analysis. The complete report can be found on the website that includes the work of the Task Force: http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm.

The qualitative, open-ended responses were analyzed and categorized into similar groups. These represent the comments provided under the ‘other’ category for each question. The complete report of the comments can be found on the website that includes the work of the Task Force: http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm. For the question regarding position on a potential nickname, there were 377 comments. For the question that addressed process recommendations, there were a total of 877 comments. The timeframe questions generated 426 comments. The question regarding who should submit potential name suggestions generated 594 responses. The question regarding narrowing the selections had 129 comments. Seven hundred ninety-six comments were generated by the values and characteristics question. The qualities and marketability factors question added 230 responses and the final question dealing with helping to shape the process yielded 689 responses. Please see the complete list of responses on the website that includes the work of the Task Force: http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm.

The North Dakota town hall/virtual meeting generated data in a similar manner to the survey, with participants asked to answer and share their responses to questions regarding their position on a UND nickname, stakeholders to be involved with developing a process for a potential new nickname, and a timeline for the process. The questions generated discussion and comments both in the meetings and online. The responses were collected, collated and are presented on the website that includes the work of the Task Force: http://und.edu/university-public-affairs/nickname/index.cfm.

The town hall meetings held in Minneapolis and Denver gathered additional comments and shared information about the process with those in attendance at the sites. Please see the supporting documentation for the comments.

**Discussion/Interpretation**

The Task Force examined all of the data collected throughout the past four months to formulate the conclusions and recommendations contained within this document. The greatest proportion of the UND stakeholders indicated that, above all, they wanted what was best for the University. The passion and pride in UND was apparent from all stakeholder groups, regardless of their individual views on the need for a new nickname, as was evidenced by online survey responses of over 7,600 and the presence of several hundred individuals at in-person and virtual meetings.

The in-person meetings, both the Conversation Cafés and the town hall, proved to be very important to the process, for it was through these activities that the passion for UND was most strongly expressed.
Participants expressed appreciation for being able to engage in the process and have their voices heard by the Task Force. These opportunities were invaluable to the Task Force, and we suggest that a similar format be utilized in the next phase of the process. The openness, inclusiveness, and transparency that the Task Force has emphasized is also expected to continue as the Committee moves forward with the process.

It is clear from the survey responses that a majority are ready to put the retired nickname and logo to rest and move on. The Task Force appreciated that there were many stakeholders with strong feelings that the Sioux name can never be replaced, and there are also those who indicated they will never be anything but “Sioux.” Understanding the deep passion for the old nickname and logo is paramount for the Committee as it proceeds forward, but the results from this initial phase of the process are clear — the majority of voices are ready to move forward and begin a new chapter for the University. Since understanding that ‘what is best’ for the University is a matter of personal opinion, the Committee can refer to the outcomes presented in this report as the baseline of affirmative support to continue the process.

From the listening sessions and surveys, several common themes emerged regarding the values and characteristics that are important for the next nickname and logo. Participants felt that, like the now-retired nickname and logo, the new one should be inspiring, unforgettable, honorable and should represent the state and the region. There was a diversity of opinion on what form the new name should take, whether it should be something real or imaginary, concrete or abstract. But the overarching goal indicated by the majority of the stakeholders is that the new nickname should be something that would be a source of pride and be representative of the entire institution. Many expressed the need for the nickname to be a symbol that the students, current, future, and past, could share and embrace. It will be no small task to take all of the characteristics and values desired and mold them into a single entity, but the Task Force is confident that with the data gathered, the task can be accomplished. It should be remembered that respect for and acceptance of the new nickname cannot be mandated, but rather needs to be earned. As the Committee moves forward, the process should help to build the route toward acceptance and respect.

In terms of the process of gathering suggestions for a new nickname, the results indicate that a majority of students and alumni would like an open process that lets everyone have an opportunity to suggest names. The relatively short timeline for the next phase of the process is a result of the need expressed by most constituent groups as well as by student-athletes and coaches to have a name to identify with as they compete.

The Task Force appreciated that 64% of the respondents to the online survey indicated they supported the work of the Task Force. While not everyone agrees and it is not possible to please everyone in a process with such high stakes, it is important that people feel their voice is heard and that their concerns are addressed. The Task Force has taken this responsibility very seriously and did the best job possible to recognize and represent all the different stakeholder opinions.

Education of all constituent groups needs to be an ongoing process. The suggestion of a layperson blog to give a voice to the Committee is one that should be taken seriously. While the negative comments will likely persist throughout this process, having an avenue to continue to provide information and educational updates would be of great value to the Committee. Administrative support and the advice and counsel of many different “experts” will also be crucial for the Committee as they progress forward with the process. (See next section for suggested advisors to the Committee.)
Finally, the Task Force suggests that the final decision in this process rests with a representative group, not a single person. The results indicated that no single person should be the final decision maker in this process. Clearly, the passion that surrounds the University should be harnessed and utilized to the advantage of the Committee so that the best possible outcome results in a nickname and logo that will represent this Institution long into the future.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**UND Nickname Committee Process**

It is the recommendation of the UND Nickname and Logo Process Recommendation Task Force that a committee be named to explore, solicit ideas and make the decision on a new Athletics nickname and logo for the University of North Dakota. The committee should be selected from a group of stakeholders identified through the Task Force’s data gathering process initiated through the in-person meetings, online survey and Community Town Hall meetings held in various locations and reported in December 2014.

**Committee Membership**

The new Committee will be formed with the responsibility for making the final decision of a nickname for UND Athletics. Administrative support will be provided by the UND University and Public Affairs Division. The new Committee should also have access to, but not limited to, the following advisors:

- Branding/marketing expert
- Trademark attorney
- Sports apparel and merchandising expert
- UND University and Public Affairs Division
- Two members of the UND Nickname and Logo Process Recommendation Task Force

A Committee will be formed which meets the following five criteria:

1. **Availability** – As laid out in the recommended timeline, this may be a commitment of two years or more. Individuals on this Committee must be willing to make themselves available for in-person meetings, conference calls, and outside assignments throughout the process as needed.

2. **Hard Working** – This commitment will require effort. The individuals on this Committee must be willing to work together for the best outcome for UND.

3. **Open-Minded** – Committee members must be open-minded to hearing others’ opinions and treating those opinions with respect. Each member should approach the process in an unbiased fashion.

4. **Diversity** – The Committee will include members of various backgrounds, ages, and opinions. Members should be mindful of the experiences and backgrounds of others.

5. **Collaborative** – Committee members must be able to work together for the greater good of the University and the stakeholders they are representing.

This Committee, consisting of no more than 15 voting total members, will reflect the stakeholder groups that were deemed key voices in making the final decision on a nickname for UND per the efforts of data gathered by the Task Force. The new committee should include the following stakeholders chosen as defined:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Selection Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>5 (2 Former Student-Athletes, 3 Non-Student-Athletes)</td>
<td>Alumni Association chooses candidates using the criteria outlined above, Alumni Association Board of Directors make final decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current UND Students</td>
<td>2 (1 Male, 1 Female)</td>
<td>Student Senate will choose representatives from their peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current UND Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>University Senate will choose a Faculty member to represent them on the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current UND Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff Senate will choose a Staff member to represent them on the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current UND Student-Athletes</td>
<td>2 (1 Male, 1 Female)</td>
<td>SAAC will choose the student-athletes to represent them on the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor/Booster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Champions Club will select the Donor/Booster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Friend of UND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Chamber will select a community member with assistance from UND’s VP for University and Public Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UND Athletics</td>
<td>2 (1 Administrator, 1 Coach)</td>
<td>Current Athletic Director makes final decision of representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ex. Officio, available at every meeting to assist in the work of the Committee. Chosen from the available members by a vote of the Task Force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of North Dakota’s Charter, created in 1883, provides that one of the University’s missions is to serve the Native American people of our state. As each group considers candidates, we ask that focus be placed on making this new committee culturally diverse, with special consideration for the Native American populations who have historically been part of these discussions. Because of the University’s mission and historical significance of the previous Fighting Sioux nickname, as it is possible, at least one of the committee members should serve as a voice for Native Americans.

It is the recommendation of the Task Force that the Committee members must be chosen by their own representative stakeholder groups. Alumni representatives and the Champions Club representative would be chosen and endorsed by the UND Alumni Association and Foundation Board of Directors. Student-Athlete representatives would be elected or endorsed by the SAAC and representatives from the student body would be selected by the Student Senate. The faculty representative would be selected by the University Senate. The staff representative would be chosen by the Staff Senate. Representatives from UND Athletics would be appointed by the Athletic Director. The Community member representative would be selected by one of the Grand Forks based community organizations such as the Chamber or related organizations.

**Committee Approach**

The Task Force recommends that the Committee use a similar model of gathering information and feedback as utilized by the Nickname Process Task Force. The “café model” of community town hall meetings around the state and key locations was very effective in gaining insight and thoughts on the nickname process. Task Force representatives feel this would be highly effective and an important tool for the nickname selection committee. The use of surveys among the various stakeholders should also be considered in gaining insight and suggestions for potential nicknames.
It is also a recommendation of the Task Force that the Committee review past information and ideas generated by the previous nickname initiative for potential nickname ideas and insight. Flowing from the many comments made at meetings and in the comments section of the online surveys, the Task Force also recommends that the new Committee include the option of remaining UND/North Dakota.

**Suggested Process for the Committee**

1) It is the Task Force’s recommendation that the process should allow everyone the opportunity to suggest nicknames for the University of North Dakota’s athletic teams. No one should be excluded from the process. Appropriate avenues such as telephone, regular mail or online networks should be established to allow anyone and everyone to provide name suggestions. The town hall café model could be used as part of this process.

2) The Committee should then evaluate these suggestions based upon a rubric derived from the results of the current Task Force’s work. The application of this rubric, which will constitute a type of checklist of the values, characteristics and attributes which were deemed most desirable in a UND nickname by those who participated in the Conversation Cafés, town hall meetings and the online survey, will allow the committee to weed out all inappropriate suggestions quickly and easily.

3) The Committee could then submit this list, narrowed down to perhaps 20 to 30 choices, for further public input and comment. This process will allow the Committee to further narrow the field and allow the legal and technical advisors to have a shorter list which they can investigate for trademark and other legal restrictions which might apply to any possible choice. (It is also possible that the Committee might wish to repeat this process more than once, starting out with a higher number of possible choices and gradually winnowing it down after public input.)

4) After one or more rounds of such consultation, it is recommended that the Committee should produce a final list of no more than five (5) possible nickname selections. This final list should then be sent out to UND’s stakeholders through an online survey for one final round of public input. It is suggested that participants be asked to rank the possible selections in order of preference. The results of these rankings are not meant to be binding upon the Committee; rather they will be used to help inform the final deliberations of the Committee.

5) After considering all of the data gathered via the completion of steps one through four, the Committee shall render its final choice to the President of UND sometime between July and November of 2015.

**Professional Support**

There are potentially many legal issues and brand considerations that need to be addressed as the nickname process moves forward. The Task Force utilized professional consulting services to gain insight on branding, marketing and the dynamics of obtaining consensus, and the selection process of a new nickname. It is the recommendation of the Task Force that legal services be retained to explore the process of securing trademarks of a new nickname and logo. In addition, branding experts and related consultants should be retained and utilized by the Committee for direction and guidance on all branding and marketing concepts and initiatives. It is imperative that legal consultants be retained to secure a template for legal protection of related trademarks.

The Committee would also benefit by working closely with the Ralph Engelstad Arena management team on their insight on branding and marketing concepts going forward.
**Logo Selection**
The nickname and logo processes should be separate from one another. Once the nickname is chosen, the Committee should identify campus and professional resources that can assist in the design, implementation and marketing of a new logo.

**Timeline**
Based on the information gathered by the Task Force, upon approval of the recommendations by President Kelley, it is recommended that the process of naming this Committee take place as expeditiously as possible. It is hoped that the process could be concluded with decisions made for the new nickname within an 18-24 month timeframe, but the Task Force recommends the deadline be somewhat flexible to allow the process to be completed appropriately.

**Committee Charter**
The Task Force suggests the following as the start of the Charter for the Committee:

The Committee is charged with facilitating the selection and adoption of a permanent nickname and logo to be used predominately by UND Athletics, but which is both distinctly linked to UND and versatile enough for the entire University to embrace.