

Institutional Marketing Plan Committee
Notes of 7/22/08 Meeting
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Trustees Board Room

Committee Members Present:

Michael Beseda
Bob Ciano
Jose Tomas Gomez-Arias
Brian Jersky
Jane Joyce
Guido Krickx
Lisa Moore
Chris Sindt
Elizabeth Smith

Guest: Angelica Moore

Committee Members Absent:

Mario Alioto
Jane Camarillo
Chris Carter
Mark Chiarucci
Heidi Donner
Dorothy Jones
Brother Donald Mansir
Kevin Miller

Chair, Michael Beseda called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

The meeting began with Michael advising the Institutional Marketing Committee that Brother Ron had granted an extension of the September 1st deadline for the development of the marketing plan. The extension was granted because of the importance of the PSD report and the need for broader discussion concerns its observations and recommendations.

Michael opined that the PSD report raised four sets of key questions for discussion:

1. Do we need additional research?
2. What are our responses to PSD's key questions?
3. Can we constructively address the Three traditions challenge articulated in the PSD report?
4. What are our next steps?

Discussion Items:

1. Additional Research Do We Need to Do More?

Comments included:

- It seems that there was a small representation base of alumni, should there have been more?

- Where there a set of core questions posed to each group?
- Were enough individuals surveyed to draw conclusions?
- There was a reminder that the Alumni Survey, Admitted Student Questionnaires as well as other documents were surveyed by Linda Peterson and her team.
- Chris Sindt commented that PSD's findings and observations were consistent with a host of other institutional research efforts and seemed to be "on the mark."
- It might be worthwhile to interview parents = external opinion. Inside vs. outside
- How much research is enough? Same recurrent themes, same problems and would additional research give us different or additional information? It was agreed there is a need to clarify and think about the visual identity concept, brand statement and creative concept – then go to alum again and allow time for testing.
- Tomas argued that the perceptual maps were misleading, unhelpful and should be removed from the presentation.

Conclusion: There is no need to conduct additional research at this point. We will need to test proposed identity system elements with a broad array of internal and external audiences.

2. Key Questions page 37 of presentation.

a) How Contemporary does SMC want to be?

Comments included:

- Depends on the definition of contemporary. Do we want to be in the moment interfacing with the community – Contemporary to Tradition vs. Future?
- Liked the idea of Contemporary with Traditions, but still need to define contemporary.

Conclusion: SMC aims to be perceived as contemporary with traditions.

b) How local or global a college does Saint Mary's want to be?

Comments included:

- We have a responsibility to be global. In the strategic plan – Christian Brothers and the Church make an effort to bring people in – Global in mission
- Faculty and student interchange with sister institutions.
- Have aspirations to be known globally vs. just known in the East Bay.
- Unique and special but need to be known more nationally, outside immediate sphere.
- Graduate Business is more global than most Saint Mary's programs. MBA transglobal in Austria – learning comes from students nationally through sister universities; Transglobal MBA; Barcelona; goal of an Executive MBA in India.
- Brothers network
- California (in the College name) is an important brand.
- Thrilling challenge – we need to create an identity and follow through to be local & global – we don't want to remove California

Conclusion: SMC aims to be globally connected and an integral part of its local (California?) community.

c) What unique values does Saint Mary's want its brand image to convey?

Comments included:

- See page 49 of presentation – brand elements

Conclusion:

- **Academic and spiritual inquiry combined**
- **Egalitarian learning—“We are all learners here”**
- **Globally aware and engaged**
- **Instilling a personal and intellectually grounded life-long commitment to social justice**
- **Optimistic and equipped with the skills to contribute to creating an inclusive and just society.**

d) How closely tied should college and graduate school identities be?

Comments included:

- All agreed – no resistance to brand and sub brand – should include all programs

Conclusion: There is a single SMC brand with schools and other entities functioning as sub-brands.

3. Feedback on Core Values

Comments included:

- What do we mean by those 3 traditions (page 16 & 17 of presentation)
- No change to the mission statement, but the language is understandable to internal audience.
- We need a common understanding of these terms in a simplified, clear concise language that is understandable to the general public. **A subcommittee was formed (Elizabeth, Lisa, Tomas and Chris) to prepare a brief statement of the three traditions to get agreement in these three areas.**

4. Next Steps

Comments included:

- Sharing – who needs to see it, respond to it? Need to inform audience on process – what is going on need to be widely shared. Part of the testing process – take in feedback – but not necessarily change.
 - a) Faculty
 - b) External advisory boards
 - c) Alum
- Last thing – Brand Statement: platform see page 52 of presentation. Material from page 49 in paragraph form, elements of mission should be included here – derived from the mission statement. Reframe the mission in a contemporary context – all 5 concepts not represented here – look again at Brand Platform. What is SMC of California all about? – Who is this explanation for? Elevator speech – central foundation going forward, descriptive but not aspirational enough. Is this important and how do we make it more relevant?

1.) Upcoming Meeting:

August 21, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. Trustee Board room.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.