

**WILLIAM & MARY
RESOLUTION ON NAMING GUIDELINES AND
ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

WHEREAS, the William & Mary is dedicated to ensuring a high level of commitment to preserving the character of its campus as expressed in the architecture of its buildings and grounds; and

WHEREAS, the 2015 Campus Master Plan and the Campus Precinct Framework and Design Guidelines of 2003 provide direction to those whose responsibility it is to develop and maintain a unified and complementary campus structure; and

WHEREAS, the Design Review Board (DRB) provides oversight to this process through authority granted by the Board of Visitors; and

WHEREAS, the Board Bylaws acknowledge that the DRB is established by and advisory to the President; and

WHEREAS, the DRB's guidelines task it with reviewing any proposed changes to the exterior of any university facility and projects involving statues and monuments; and

WHEREAS, the Working Group on Principles of Naming and Renaming have developed certain design principles for historical naming and renaming as part of the Campus Master Plan, which naming guidelines have been adapted for use by the Design Review Board, and the President recommends their adoption as William & Mary Guidelines on Naming and Renaming; and

WHEREAS, the President proposes revising the DRB guidelines to reflect and implement the recommendations of the Working Group on Principles of Naming and Renaming as set forth in the following pages.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Visitors approves the William & Mary Guidelines on Naming and Renaming and the revised DRB guidelines and confirms the authority and oversight of the DRB in this area.

William & Mary Design Review Board Guidelines

Effective Date: February 6, 2003

Revision Date(s): June 28, 2016 and April 24, 2019

I. Overview

The William & Mary is dedicated to ensuring a high level of commitment to preserving the character of its campus as expressed in the architecture of its buildings and grounds. The College's 2015 Campus Master Plan and the Campus Precinct Framework & Design Guidelines of 2003 provide direction to those whose responsibility it is to develop and maintain a unified and complementary campus structure. The Design Review Board (DRB) provides oversight to this process.

II. Scope

The DRB oversees design implementation in conformance with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines. The DRB reviews proposed changes to the exterior of any university facility for conformance with the university's architectural design guidelines. This includes the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) and ancillary campuses.

Types of projects subject to review include, but are not limited to: construction, exterior renovation/modification, site work, landscaping, and statues/monuments. As part of its oversight of the implementation of the Campus Master Plan, the DRB shall consider proposals to name and rename structures on campus and to contextualize historical statues and monuments in accordance with the William & Mary Guidelines for Naming and Renaming.

All major and minor projects are subject to review. As an example, placement of a cell tower on a roof, while not classified as a major capital project, would still fall within the DRB's purview.

The DRB may recommend design elements for architects to consider as projects move through the design phases. Specifically, the DRB will review and make recommendations at three stages:

- 1) Site selection and design intent
- 2) Schematic design
- 3) Preliminary design

III. Board Composition

DRB membership shall include, but is not limited to, the following members:

- Chair – Chair of the BOV Administration, Buildings, & Grounds Committee
- Vice Chair – Chief Operating Officer
- Member from the BOV Administration, Buildings, Grounds & Committee
- Chief Facilities Officer
- Director of the Historic Campus
- Chair of the Committee on Sustainability
- Architectural Historian, Colonial Williamsburg
- Architect at large

Staff to the Board shall include, but is not limited to:

- Director, Facilities Planning, Design and Construction (FPDC)
- Associate Budget Director
- Project Manager (rotating based on project)

The DRB may call upon experts as needed. The President may appoint additional members or staff to the DRB as needed.

IV. Meetings

Quorum: Five members, one of whom must be the Chair or Vice Chair. Members may participate by phone or other electronic means.

Record: Minutes will be kept by staff to the DRB.

Action: Requires only a simple majority within a quorum.

Schedule: Meets four times a year in conjunction with the regularly scheduled meetings of the Board of Visitors and as needed in order to meet critical project schedule dates.

V. Submissions to the DRB

All presentations (site selection/design intent, schematic design, and preliminary design) will include at a minimum:

- A project sponsor
 - A project sponsor should be a member of the President's Executive Leadership Team

- Proposed projects that emerge from campus committees, studies, etc. should secure a project sponsor prior to moving forward with a concept or design
- A statement of defined scope and purpose
- An established budget to which any design must conform
 - The budget must include the proposed funding source(s)

Standard site selection presentations will include at a minimum:

- Topographical map of sites considered with proposed footprint imposed
- Selection criteria
- Advantages and disadvantages of each site

Standard architectural (schematic design and preliminary design) presentations will include at a minimum:

- Building footprint
- Elevations of all four sides
- Demonstration of compliance with order and elements of design guidelines
- Demonstration of compliance with architectural zone (Traditional to Transitional)
- Demonstration of actual building materials and mock-ups as required at the preliminary stage

VI. Authority

The DRB is advisory to the President of the university who remains subject to the oversight of the Board of Visitors.

William & Mary Guidelines for Naming and Renaming

Throughout the centuries, William & Mary has named and renamed specific elements of the campus environment – spaces, buildings, academic and other programs, and more – dozens of times. The following guidelines are intended to provide a consistent, principled, transparent approach for naming and renaming elements of the campus of William & Mary.

Decision-making, purview, and review processes

For names of buildings and objects in the campus environment, the Board of Visitors has final decision-making authority, as specified in its By Laws.

For names of programs, titles, and other matters, the President, Provost and Chief Operating Officer have decision-making authority, as generally delegated to them in the Board By Laws. Consultation with appropriate institutional bodies and constituencies is an expected assumption of normal process.

When naming is related to a philanthropic commitment, review shall be conducted by the University Advancement office and the Vice President for University Advancement shall make recommendations to the President, Provost or Chief Operating Officer, and Board of Visitors consistent with the guidelines set out in the university's gift acceptance procedures and policies.

Design principles for historical naming/renaming as part of the Campus Master Plan

1. The campus buildings and environment should help to educate

Consistent with William & Mary's current practice of contextualization of our historic campus – (i.e., telling its whole history in context) buildings and spaces should include robust historical context that reflects our expanding knowledge of the past – explaining and correcting incomplete or passed-over versions of William & Mary's history, in accessible ways.

2. The campus buildings and environment should affirm complexity

Names of buildings and spaces should represent William & Mary's broad and complex history. To recover more voices and stories that represent our past, it is necessary to commit to powerful historical work, in all of its complexity and depth.

3. The campus buildings and environment should promote honest and clear self-reflection of William & Mary's history

This work will be unwavering, to openly and clearly acknowledge the contributions of both those who are well known as well as those who have gone unrecognized, and those whose legacies impeded the nation's promise of universal human rights and equality.

Design Review Board guidelines for naming and renaming

Guiding principles developed in late 2020 as part of a two-month process of study, community input, and revision. This process was conducted by the Working Group on Principles of Naming and Renaming at the request of the president, as charged by the Board of Visitors.

1. William & Mary's naming and renaming process must represent the university's diverse constituencies

William & Mary's review process for naming and renaming shall be clear, follow established guidelines, be applied consistently and provide for input from diverse constituencies.

2. Names on buildings or spaces should represent William & Mary's evolving mission and values

When considering names for living persons and new spaces on campus, University Advancement shall follow its current practices of review, consistent with gift acceptance policies for the university and its related foundations.

When considering the naming or renaming after an historical person, William & Mary will examine the person's principal legacy in light of multiple criteria. These should include their actions during their lifetime, and, most significantly, their principal legacy in the present. The history and legacy of the university must be appropriately chronicled and explained. To demonstrate William & Mary's commitment to inclusion, equality and justice, attention should be focused on our present values of belonging, curiosity, excellence, flourishing, integrity, respect and service.

3. The campus environment should be curated holistically, as part of the Campus Master Plan

No building, structure or space should be considered in isolation. Coordination of the naming and renaming process with the Campus Master Plan is essential. The interrelationship of names across campus should reflect respect for the architectural integrity of the Campus Master Plan and consider the role of the name (honorific, memorialization, etc.).

A. Where appropriate and feasible, a name should be relevant to what it designates

In many cases, it is desirable to align a potential name with the functional use or occupancy of the space. This applies in practical ways when a parking lot is named for a building nearby; it may also apply symbolically, as with the naming of a science building, ISC 2, for William Barton Rogers, William & Mary alumnus and founder of

MIT. For this reason, where feasible, the naming and renaming process should be coordinated with the respective school, department, unit and university Advancement.

4. Naming or changing names of buildings or spaces shall contribute to the increase in diversity of commemorations across campus

The campus environment will embrace diverse individuals and perspectives across a broad array of differences. Naming and renaming provide unique opportunities to foster a more welcoming, equitable, and inclusive campus environment.

5. The decision to rename a building or space identified with an historical individual, cause or era should meet a high standard

The process of renaming must be done only after undertaking thorough and comprehensive research and deliberation. That process will take into account the current mission and values of the university.

A. The determination of whether an individual's name should be attached to or removed from a campus building or space will follow thorough research

In evaluating cases of potential naming and renaming, the DRB will define categories used to identify legacies created by an individual, such as civil rights leader, philanthropic leader, business leader, intellectual leader, etc. Recommendations for renaming of buildings and spaces must be accompanied by full documentation of personal attributes and actions that weigh in favor of or against renaming.

B. Substantive and extensive research is critical to aid in and validate new names

All historical research undertaken must adhere to the highest academic standards. This process will include consultation with others, including university schools, departments, units, affected communities, etc. The university may also consult as appropriate with historically linked indigenous tribes, local governments and cultural institutions such as the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation or Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation.

6. Building signs should clearly identify who a building is named for and why

William & Mary should provide signage, digital content and archival resources about the history and context of named places. William & Mary should strategize how building names, signage, gallery spaces and exhibitions, and deep historical recovery projects present different opportunities to honor or provide historical context about individuals from the past – with particular attention to how these people reflect William & Mary values today. As a vital component of naming and renaming decisions, contextualization serves to explain the significance of past and present campus design.