

## **Commitment Committee May 1, 2009, Minutes**

George Dorfman gave a brief overview of the findings of all three subcommittees from the previous two board meetings. He then presented a list of demographic subgroups and asked the committee to pare down that list to three to five groups to consider for test-targeted messages. The groups selected would determine the actual nature of those messages. The groups presented were:

- Commitment level
- Graduate alumni by department
- Affinity groups
- Young alumni
- International alumni
- Life stage (how do we define?)
- Degree
- School
- Dues/no-dues
- Geography
- Giving/non-giving
- Volunteers/non-volunteers
- Employed/unemployed
- Greek/non-greek

To which the group also then added:

- Double/multi-Dukies (are they more likely to be engaged?)
- Young alumni (perhaps to be considered a subset of “life stage”)
- Race/ethnicity (perhaps to be considered affinity groups)
- Multi-generational Dukies
- Athlete/non-athlete

The key groups identified follow:

- Life cycle/age
  - Young alumni and alumni whose involvement had lapsed due to family priorities came up again and again in the subcommittees’ work
  - How to define? Young alumni, alumni with families, retirement age
  - Is it possible to extract this information accurately from the database? Would we need to have people self-select?
  - Do older alumni, especially those with families, need the focus of a staff person similar to the way Kim Hanauer has focused on young alumni?
- Affinity groups (including race)
- Geography
- Young alumni
- Giving

- Gender
- Graduate and professional alumni
  - Are they more likely to prefer intellectual engagement with the university?

The question arose of how do we find the people who feel connected, but aren't measured by the current criteria. One suggestion was to do a simple survey to those who had not registered for reunion. (Did you come, but just didn't register? Why not? Did you gather with classmates in other ways?)

Some considerations for the test messages:

- Medium (email? postcard?)
- Length and complexity – people more likely to read short emails easily viewed on smart phones
- Frequency
- More opt-in segmentation
- Look to daily e-newspapers for successful models. If the technology can be obtained, allow people to self select areas they want to know about. (But how then will they learn about other programs when their interests change?)

The group felt strongly that, in addition to moving people from the “never engaged” and “formerly” engaged categories to the “engaged” category, there should be focus on increasing the degree of commitment within the engaged category. Further development of the matrix devised by the engaged subcommittee would be a positive step toward that end.

Dorfman reported that DAA will have the services of a Fuqua student intern over the summer and asked the group for suggestions of projects the intern could work on. Those suggestions included:

- Making the matrix workable with the database and then using it to analyze data
- Measuring/researching whether new technologies are working
- Analyzing email data (open rates, etc.) from Bronto system