Mascot Meeting Notes
Dec. 2, 2021
Notes: By end of meeting 17 in attendance.

Meeting Agenda:
Handout: Questions related to soliciting designs-see bolded questions
Plan to go through questions together. Vote on a choice.

Question 0: Should we start with the 5 names (or go further back)?
Round of responses:

- Responses and comments made in round before vote taken
- Keep 5 original designs-it wasn't problem before designs submitted
- NOTE: Many individuals voiced agreement with keeping the 5 names from the last time
- I could go either way

Majority support to keep the 5 names from the last time

Question -subset of Question 0: If yes to Question 0 should "Trailblazers" be removed?

Explanation about why this is a question to be considered: The design attached to trailblazers included people and distinctive genders—from a design standpoint, trailblazers, is hard to design for. Orange Crush may be similar to this. There is also a concern that there may be references to marijuana. Trailblazers could be related to settling or colonialism and white people setting land and taking over native land.

Round of responses:

- I don't think keeping it in is a big deal
- Is it worth a discussion to identify the cultural line of what is offensive and what is not?
- We cannot know what folks might say or draw that could be a distortion of an image. We can't anticipate this future so we should be careful about restrictive
- Should we remove Hawks because of marijuana reference? Support keeping trailblazers
- Doesn't need to be removed
- Keep 5 names—in context of this design do we want to make a rule to not include human figures in any design. I saw some good trailblazer designs that did not have people in them and I liked them best.
- I feel if people have problems with trailblazers I don't see a need to keep it because it is not a strong mascot. IF people have concern about it being offensive then don't keep it.
- Regardless of whether it will get votes—we should not kick it out—we should not kick it out based on some criteria we just made now. We should just present the 5 and let people choose. Let people vote
- Considering what we discussed a year ago—we want to pick a mascot that shows our values at HHS, our school. The interesting thing is that the hawk or the bear are a safe choice-but these don't necessarily show values the way the trailblazers does. Trailblazers are leaders, helping others. I don't see a reason to remove it
- I agree you can interpret a word and if you go into a dictionary you can likely find different meanings for each of the five

In favor of keeping trailblazers—
Vote taken: Majority support keeping trailblazers on the list

Question 2: Should we vote to narrow the 5 names down to 1 name before soliciting designs?
Round of responses:

- 100 percent yes—what happened when we gave 5 names for design submission, the quality of each mascot got so diluted that it left significantly lower quality choices. If we have all designers work on one design for one name the quality will be better.
- Having 5 could have been why did not have an overwhelming favorite It also gets rid of the sense that people's votes don't matter—the idea that if your first choice didn't get it than your second choice automatically gets advanced. This is a simpler method.
- I disagree—a lot of the reason a person might choose a mascot is the picture that goes along with what it looks good---there may be another image—beyond just the name that would offer more choice to the students.
- I think there will be enough images for the mascots-there were a lot of images that were very good I don't think they will be mediocre because there are many names
- It's important to get the name first—some mascots don't have an image—the image can evolve Get the name first
- The name first –get the one name - what we are representing—than we design something to represent that idea. I don't think that a picture conveys as much of an idea, an emotion like a word can bring out
- I agree that we should whittle done a name before we pick a design—streamline the process
- You don't run a science experiment with 2 independent variables. Maybe a hundred people have asked that only 5 names be put to a vote first to narrow it down
- Narrow it done
- Whittling down to one
- School wants this so this is the method
- Keeping 5 choices gives people more choice—I believe that it is not too many choices—If you didn't vote for all of them it was your choice not to vote—but there were 36 choices last time-narrowing it down will make it simpler and too many choices flusters people
- Last time I saw all of the options—I didn't have the time and so I voted for one. And I feel like a lot of people saw the list and voted for one
- Get it down to one.

Vote taken: Majority supports getting down to one name

Question 3: If yes to narrow down to 1 name should we give 1-2 designs from before so that people have an idea of how each name could be realized as a design?
Round of responses:

- It will bias people in a way that short circuits the intent to focus on just choosing a name.
- It's confusing
- People may not want to vote for this based on the image
- Many voiced no support for this idea of including examples of designs

Clear that there was NO SUPPORT for giving a design example

Question 4: Why type of voting system should we use?
Rank choice? (i.e. Everyone ranks all 5)
Everyone gets one vote and the name with the most votes (plurality)

- When we narrow down 5 names the win should be the majority
- We already voted on the bears wouldn't that win again?
- What type of voting: Rank choice voting last time because there were so many choices.
- We should do rank choice voting—I like trailblazers. If we do rank choice voting I could put bears in there. I see that not many like trailblazers so I can still vote for my second choice and it may win.
- My understanding of rank choice voting—I agree with 5 that is the optimal number
- Perfect opportunity-we are not going to throw out any names
- Favor rank choice
- I disagree you have people choosing first one and then they just select something as a second choice and it may not really matter to them. Plurality of the best—you see what people want
- I think rank choice works for 5
- It sound like people have strong feelings about 1, 2 or 3 but 4 care less-would it be an option to rank top 3 than it may be more accurate about what they really want.
- Would we be doing a point system?—the top choice is 5 points.
- What type of rank choice voting are we doing? Take all 5 and everyone votes for all 5 the one with least get eliminated. And those points go to their first choice.
- When everyone gets one vote—with 5 candidates you could win with only getting 1/5 support of those voting

- **Instant run off voti**ng –it banks on people being thoughtful on ranking all 5 of the choices. Take everyone's first choice and the one that gets the least votes gets eliminated and if that choice was someone's first choice their second choice now get their vote. There are at least 4 rounds Have to rank all 5.

- **Point system** is really plurality: Rank as many as you want to People can rank 1 to 5 first choice gets 5 and add up cumulative numbers than highest vote gets it. If people don't rank 4 and 5 they are hurting their choice. Could we tweak this and ask people to only rank their top 3? Yes, we could do that.
- Plurality—you get one vote and the one that gets the most votes wins
- Rank choice voting doesn't necessarily eliminate second choice coming out on top.
- I would like to put down the one I don't like and I want to elevate the ones I do support. I like plurality—vote for ones they have opinion on

17 people Voted: Majority support for Rank Choice voting to get down to one name

Meeting adjourned