Findings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Process of Naming District Facilities
(as of 10/3/2019)

Consensus Findings

- The ultimate authority regarding these matters remains with the Board of Trustees; however, the Board may wish to consider delegating certain authorities for certain spaces within the individual Colleges and satellite locations to the Chancellor and/or the College Presidents.

- The formal process should be expanded and clarified. Any enhanced process should include a more differentiated description of the types of spaces covered under the District’s policies on naming facilities and should provide some definitions of the types of spaces that are deemed to be “significant District facilities” and which may warrant a special or enhanced process of consideration.

- Naming a new facility/space is distinctly different from the renaming of a facility/space with an existing name.

- Naming opportunities provide an excellent opportunity to raise additional revenue for the Colleges; this should be a goal of the institution.

- The formal process should be inclusive and involve students, faculty, and staff and should include the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor’s designees, as well as the Office of Institutional Advancement and the Office of the General Counsel.

- Efforts should be given to develop quantitative and qualitative assessments of support for proposals on changes to established or new names for District facilities from those at the College, as well as alumni and residents of the surrounding neighborhoods.
• A written submission should be part of the process.

• Appropriate consideration should be given to the costs and benefits of naming significant District facilities including, but not limited to, impacts on accreditation (if any), the cost of signage, letterhead, etc.

• Significant care should be given to vetting individuals who are candidates to have District facilities named after them in order to avoid reputational harm to either the District or other individuals.

• Naming/renaming of significant District facilities should include consideration of the wishes of the individual and/or the individual’s family (in instances of a deceased individual).

• The process should be differentiated based on the size of the space/facility. The Board should be made aware of changes to established names of spaces within District facilities – as part of the regular board meeting process – the Board should confirm whether it wishes to actively approve all name changes or new names of spaces at or in each College.

**General Findings**

• There was broad support for the establishment of a committee convened by the Chancellor and consisting of students, faculty, and staff and others designated by the Chancellor to conduct initial vetting and review of proposals for naming of significant District Facilities. Such a committee should be balanced and representative of all key stakeholders. This need not be a standing committee.

• There was similar support for replication of this model at each of the Colleges for consideration of issues related to the proposed naming of spaces at or within the individual Colleges and related satellite locations.

• There was support for convening meetings, open to the public, in instances where the Board considers the naming/renaming of significant District facilities.

• There was support for the establishment of a general timeline for formal consideration of naming requests in the process for naming District facilities.