I. Background of the Committee

On March 26, 2018, University of Vermont Board of Trustees approved the creation and appointment of the Board of Trustees Renaming Advisory Committee. This Committee is charged with considering and making recommendations to the Board regarding proposals from the University community to remove names from University buildings, applying principles and criteria developed at Yale University in 2016. Input from the University community is to be sought with respect to any proposed name removal that is considered by the Committee.

II. Criteria and Process

Once the Committee receives a proposal, it conducts an initial review to determine whether the following requirements have been met:

- Rationale for name removal, including relevant Principles on Renaming that apply
- Any relevant documents including pertinent historical or other evidence, with appropriate documentation and citations

If the requirements have been met, the Committee evaluates the proposal using the following criteria, which were developed by Yale University:

There is a strong presumption against renaming a building on the basis of the values associated with its namesake. Such a renaming should be considered only in exceptional circumstances.

The presumption against renaming is at its strongest when a building has been named for someone who made major contributions to the University.
Principles to be considered:

- Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
- Was the relevant principal legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived?
- Did the University, at the time of a naming, honor a namesake for reasons that are fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
- Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?

The Yale report further states: “We expect that renaming will typically prove warranted only when more than one principle listed here points toward renaming; even when more than one principle supports renaming, renaming may not be required if other principles weigh heavily in the balance.” (Yale University, 2016)

Next steps in the process include:

1) Gaining a thorough understanding of the legacy of the individual whose name is proposed for removal.
2) Providing an opportunity for UVM Community members to contribute input and commentary with respect to the proposed name change.
3) Once the Committee is satisfied that it has received adequate information to consider a recommendation, final deliberations take place. The Committee then delivers a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

III. Guy W. Bailey Name Removal Proposal

The Committee received the attached proposal, dated April 29, 2018, to remove the name of Guy W. Bailey from the Bailey-Howe Library complex. The proposal (“Weinstock Proposal”) was submitted by Professor Jacqueline S. Weinstock, and included 108 faculty supporters.

The proposal also may be found here: http://www.uvm.edu/trustees/?Page=other_com/renaming/content.html&SM=submenu1.html

The primary rationale for the proposed name removal was Bailey’s direct and active involvement, while UVM President, in supporting the Eugenics Survey of Vermont (“ESV”).
The proposal did not request removal of the Howe name on the Library Complex. Howe was unaffiliated with Bailey’s tenure and his name was added separately to an addition to the library constructed later. Consequently, the Committee did not consider the removal of the Howe name.

IV. Summary of Committee Review

The Committee reviewed multiple sources both to verify the information presented in the Weinstock proposal, and to gather historical perspectives to inform its own inquiry. The Committee also fully reviewed all comments from members of the University community.

Through its research, readings, and deliberations, the Committee draws the following conclusions with respect to President Guy W. Bailey’s legacy:

1) Guy W. Bailey (1876-1940) was the 13th President of UVM, appointed in 1920, serving until his death in 1940. (Bassett, 1991)

2) Bailey’s tenure saw enrollment grow rapidly, with many new buildings added to the campus, including Slade Hall, the Fleming Museum, Ira Allen Chapel, Southwick, and Waterman. (Gale, 1991) Bailey was respected by many who knew him and benefitted from his guidance when they were students. He offered moral and financial support, active mentorship, and concern for their academic success and personal welfare and was actively engaged across the University community. He also is credited with expanding educational access to students, including women, as well as keeping the University financially afloat during the difficult years of the Great Depression. These aspects of his legacy formed the basis for a proposal by a group of alumni to burnish his tarnished legacy with respect to financial issues, and name the new library for Bailey, approved by the Board of Trustees in 1959. (Beckley, 1976).

Supporters of Bailey described him as “...A king-sized individual in every way. He was the most respected man in the State of Vermont. He could have been elected Governor if he had had the slightest interest in the job. He preferred to be President of the University of Vermont.” (Beckley, 1976).

3) With respect to eugenics, the issue upon which the Weinstock proposal is based, Bailey was significantly involved. Specifically, he supported the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and its principal leader, Henry Perkins, UVM Professor of Zoology, in multiple ways, including:
   • “Heartily endorsing” Henry Perkins’s work with respect to the Eugenics Survey of Vermont. (Gallagher, 1999)
   • Serving as the key University leader in raising substantial private funding for the Survey, which was the first privately-funded research project at UVM. (Bassett, 1991)
   • Serving on the Eugenics Survey Advisory Committee. (Gallagher, 1999)
4) Broader Impacts of the ESV:
   - Perkins and the ESV successfully lobbied for the passage of a voluntary sterilization law in Vermont in 1931. While there is no direct evidence that Bailey was actively involved in this lobbying effort, he remained a member of the ESV Advisory Committee during this period. In practice, many of the sterilizations subsequently carried out were involuntary. (Gallagher, 1999)
   - In Vermont, eugenics research was largely motivated by concerns about the supposed degeneration of native-born Yankee “stock.” Although sterilization records are not available, it appears likely that it was mostly poor women, along with darker-skinned French-Canadian and Native-American populations, who were targeted by the Vermont eugenic sterilization program. (Gallagher, 1999)
   - By 1935, eugenics was largely falling into disfavor, especially after the Nazis embraced the concept in their “race hygiene” programs. (Gallagher, 1999)

5) Eugenics is now widely recognized and condemned as misguided and racist. However, in Bailey’s time it was widely accepted as an intellectually progressive idea built on a foundation of science. “The eugenics movement, led in America by biologists who embraced Mendelian genetics, attracted a broad and powerful constituency and generated a vast literature that influenced public policy concerning immigration, mental health initiatives, and state intervention in family life.” (Gallagher, 1999).
   
   Another perspective is offered by Alison Bashford: “...Eugenics was often, but not necessarily driven by race questions. Reduction in birth defects, on the other hand, was one consistent and central objective of eugenics in almost all national contexts. Eugenics and race, then, are often used interchangeably, in a way that flattens out this complicated history and that stems, in large part, from a still-common conflation of eugenics with Nazi racial hygiene.” (Bashford and Levine, 2010).

6) Although not mentioned in the Weinstock Proposal, a significant controversy over inappropriate financial practices employed by Bailey is well documented as part of his legacy. After his death, Trustees found that Bailey had concealed the fact that the University was deeply in debt and nearly bankrupt. (Bassett, 1991) “He spent money that he had no legal right to spend,” including using restricted annuity and scholarship funds for current expenses, and making unsecured loans to friends. Bailey also inflated the value of University property in order to make the institution appear solvent. (Beckley, 1976) Despite these clear violations of fiduciary responsibility, Bailey’s supporters asserted that his intentions were good. Bailey’s bookkeeper, Edwin B. Abbott, believed that “If he had lived, there was a good chance he would have succeeded in making up the deficit.” (Bassett, 1991) Of course, the outcome of this speculation will never be known.

V. Application of Criteria

The Weinstock Proposal identified three relevant Yale Principles to be applied in considering removing the Bailey name from the library. Most relevant are Principles 1 and 4:
“Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?”

“Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?”

The Committee agrees that these two principles are most appropriate to apply in considering the Weinstock Proposal, thus reaching the threshold of meeting more than one of the Yale principles. The Committee also carefully examined Principles 2 and 3, but did not find sufficient evidence regarding the extent of debate over Bailey’s legacy at the time of naming to further consider these Principles. Therefore Principles 2 and 3 did not “weigh heavily in the balance,” one way or the other, per the guidance provided in the Yale Report. (Yale University, 2016).

Guy W. Bailey had numerous positive accomplishments that are part of his extensive legacy as President of UVM. However, the Committee is in agreement that two principal legacies of Guy W. Bailey’s Presidency are fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University (Principle 1):

1) His active involvement as President of the University in supporting and promoting the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and;
2) His misappropriation of University financial resources, leaving the University in a dire fiscal condition at the time of his death. Although this was not identified in the Weinstock Proposal, the Committee deemed it worthy of consideration.

Further, the Committee is in agreement that the building named for Guy W. Bailey --the Bailey-Howe Library --is at the epicenter of forming and supporting both educational and social community at the University (Principle 4).

It should be noted that although there exists extensive written material on the broad subject of eugenics, Guy Bailey’s connection to it was limited to his support of the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and of its primary champion, Henry Perkins. Written materials related to this specific issue are limited. As well, although extensively acknowledged and unrefuted by both supporters and detractors, written accounts regarding the questionable financial practices employed by Bailey are few in number.

VI. University Community Commentary

The Renaming Advisory Committee received 44 commentary submissions from a variety of sources: students (grad and undergrad), faculty, staff, alumni, Emeriti Trustees, a parent, and a member of the local community unaffiliated with UVM. A significant majority were in favor of removing the Bailey name from the Library.
VII. Committee Recommendation

It is the unanimous recommendation of the Trustee Renaming Advisory Committee that the name of Guy W. Bailey be removed from the University of Vermont Library complex, currently known as the Bailey-Howe Library.

VIII. Other Suggestions

Although not under the direct charge of the Renaming Advisory Committee, we further suggest, that the University work to establish a lasting educational effort with respect to the history of eugenics, UVM’s role in it, and its impacts on populations in Vermont and beyond. Such an effort might include classes, seminars, speakers, displays (such as currently exists in the library), or public works of art.

Resources:


Additional Related Readings:


**Attachments (2):**
- Weinstock Proposal
- Yale Principles
Proposal for Removing a Name from a UVM Building or Program
April 29, 2018

I. Name(s) and contact information of proposers:

Jacqueline (Jackie) S. Weinstock
Associate Professor, Department of Leadership & Developmental Sciences
Email: Jacqueline.weinstock@uvm.edu (preferred)
Office Phone: (802) 656-2058

II. Facility or program for name removal consideration: Bailey/Howe Library

III. Rationale for name removal, including relevant Principles on Renaming that apply:

Bailey/Howe Library currently honors former UVM President Guy W. Bailey. Yet we have found sufficient evidence that President Bailey played a significant role in supporting and promoting the Vermont Eugenics Survey, enough to warrant removing his name from the library’s name. We understand that there are other contributions that Bailey made to the university and that Bailey will still be recognized as one of UVM’s presidents. Yet we believe given the record of his direct eugenics support, and the prominence of the undergraduate library to UVM students, faculty and staff, as well as to the larger surrounding communities, the honor of having the library named after him should now be denied.

According to Nancy Gallagher—whose University of New England Press book *Building Better Vermonters: The Eugenics Project in the Green Mountain State* (published in 1999) originated in research for her UVM masters’ thesis—Henry Perkins “began teaching eugenics in his new Heredity course in 1921” (Gallagher, n.d., “Vermont Eugenics: A Documentary History”). The Eugenics Survey grew out of this undergraduate course (Dann, 1991), and as Kevin Dann argued, Guy Bailey played a major role in helping to obtain initial funding for this survey. Specifically, “Guy Bailey acted as intermediary in soliciting” initial funding for this survey that came from Emily Proctor Eggleston, whom he knew “from her support of the Vermont Children’s Aid Society (VCAS) of which Bailey was treasurer.” An initial $5,000 of funds from Mrs. Eggleston was presented to UVM “after which they were dispersed to Perkins” (Dann, 1991, p. 8). This was in 1925.

In 1927, Professor Perkins obtained more substantial funding to create a comprehensive rural survey, ultimately referred to as the Vermont Commission on Country Life (VCCL). Here too, Guy Bailey played an important role. Indeed, as Dann reported, Guy Bailey wrote the official grant application that supported the expanded survey, which when implemented after securing funding, was “christened the Vermont Commission on Country Life.” Furthermore, as Dann reported, “Bailey was Perkin’s continual supporter in his eugenic endeavors, granting a year’s sabbatical (1927-1928) to organize the survey” (1991, p. 18)

Nancy Gallagher (1999, n.d.) also revealed Guy W. Bailey to be one of the central supporters of Perkins’ survey. Although the Eugenics Survey was “privately funded and staffed by a succession of professional social workers who conducted investigations, compiled reports, and
promoted the findings among Vermont’s social service agencies,” it operated as an “official” adjunct to the University of Vermont’s Zoology department. From this department Professor Perkins enlisted “the cooperation and support of an impressive roster of civic leaders, private charities, government officials, and professors in relevant fields” who “endorsed the enterprise” by serving as “advisors to the survey.” Although Gallagher notes that “Perkins’ advisors frequently tempered his zeal for hereditary causes of social problems,” they also “supported state programs for identification, registration, and ‘social control’” of those families found to be “deficient.”

Among these advisors was Guy W. Bailey, listed by Gallagher (n.d.) as one of the Academic Members of the Advisory Committee for the survey (as evidenced on the subpage, http://www.uvm.edu/~eugenics/partnersf.html). Specifically, Gallagher notes Bailey’s role in “giving his support primarily through negotiation and administration of the sponsors’ funding of the Survey and granting Perkins sabbatical leave to expand the scope of his enterprise.” This evidence suggests that Guy Bailey was not simply involved in name only, as a result of his being President of the University, but rather was directly supportive of and involved in the Vermont Eugenics Survey.

IV. Relevant Principles on Renaming: Two of the four principles to be considered are relevant to the current renaming request.

- “Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?”
- “Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?”

It was during Bailey’s 20-year tenure as UVM’s President (1920-1940) that we see evidence of his being a supporter of Henry F. Perkins who spearheaded the Eugenics Survey of Vermont. We also believe there is substantial evidence that Bailey’s support was more than in name and that through his support for the survey—both in terms of supporting fundraising efforts and supporting Perkins in his work on the survey—he shares responsibility for the consequences of that survey and its “results.” These consequences include the passage and enactment of Vermont’s 1931 sterilization law, the expansion of programs for segregation of the “feebleminded,” and other forms of discrimination against individuals and groups based upon racial and ethnic identity in the name of promoting “blood and breeding” among Vermonters.

It is clear that the Eugenics Survey of Vermont, and support for it evidenced by President Guy W. Bailey, runs counter to the stated vision and mission of this institution (Office of the President, 2018): “To be among the nation’s premier small research universities, preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to liberal education, environment, health, and public service” (vision) and “To create, evaluate, share, and apply knowledge and to prepare students to be accountable leaders who will bring to their work dedication to the global community, a grasp of complexity, effective problem-solving and communication skills, and an enduring commitment to learning and ethical conduct” (mission). The Vermont Eugenics Survey was embedded and
resulted in unethical conduct and oppressive policies that egregiously harmed the health and wellness of indigenous citizens of Vermont.

Even more clearly, Bailey’s support for the Eugenics Survey violates the Justice value of “Our Common Ground”:

   As a just community, we unite against all forms of injustice, including, but not limited to, racism. We reject bigotry, oppression, degradation, and harassment, and we challenge injustice toward any member of our community.

Similarly, the Responsibility value, stating that “We are personally and collectively responsible for our words and deeds” is relevant here.

In affirmation of these two common ground principles, we respectfully request that Guy W. Bailey’s name be removed from Bailey/Howe Library. Even if it could be argued that Bailey was not fully aware of the grave consequences that followed from the Vermont Eugenics Survey or that he acted from bigotry widespread in his time, there is no doubt today that this survey and the policies that followed from it reflect such a degree of prejudice and inflicted such injustice that those who gave their names and their time to support it—that is, whose beliefs and actions not only reflected the prejudice of their era but helped foster and reinforce it—should not be honored on our campus.
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We, the undersigned University of Vermont faculty, join with UVM students in calling for the name of Bailey/Howe Library to be changed so as to no longer honor Guy W. Bailey, whose promotion of the Vermont Eugenics Survey\(^1\) devastated indigenous and other communities across the state.

1. Jamie Abaied, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
2. Tatiana Abatemarco, Lecturer, Environmental Studies
3. Eve Alexandra, Lecturer, English and Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies
4. Sarah C. Alexander, Associate Professor, English
5. Kenneth Allen, Senior Lecturer, Medical Laboratory and Radiation Sciences
6. Ellen Ann Andersen, Associate Professor, Political Science and Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies
7. Jacques Bailly, Associate Professor, Classics
8. JB Barna, Sr. Lecturer, Social Work
9. Annika Ljung-Baruth, Senior Lecturer, Gender, Sexuality and Women’s Studies
10. Emily Beam, Assistant Professor, Economics
11. Emily Bernard, Professor, English and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies
12. Jean Bessette, Assistant Professor, English
13. Deborah E. Blom, Associate Professor, Anthropology
14. Lynne Bond, Emeritus Professor, Psychological Science
15. Holly-Lynn Busier, Senior Lecturer, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
16. Vicki L. Brennan, Associate Professor, Department of Religion and Director, African Studies Program
17. Mary Burke, Senior Lecturer, Sociology and Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies
18. Keith Burt, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
19. Nichole Caisse, Lecturer, Department of Mathematics and Statistics
20. Yolanda Chen, Associate Professor, Plant and Soil Science
21. Sheila Boland Chira, Senior Lecturer, English
22. Thomas I. Chittenden, Senior Lecturer, Grossman School of Business
23. Selene Colburn, Associate Professor, UVM Libraries
24. Nicole Conroy, Lecturer, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
25. Stephen Cramer, Senior Lecturer, English
26. Celia Cuddy, Lecturer III, Social Work
27. Daniel DeSanto, Assistant Professor, UVM Libraries

28. Jennifer Dickinson, Associate Professor, Anthropology; Director, Center for Teaching and Learning
29. Sue Dinitz, Senior Lecturer, English
30. Maeve Eberhardt, Assistant Professor, Romance Languages and Linguistics
31. Deb Ellis, Associate Professor and Director, Film and Television Studies Program
32. Katherine Elmer, Adjunct Faculty, Environmental Studies
33. Tina Escaja, Professor, Department of Romance Languages and Linguistics; Director, Gender, Sexuality and Women’s Studies
34. Elizabeth Fenton, Associate Professor, English
35. Yolanda Flores, Associate Professor, Romance Languages and Linguistics
36. Alice Fothergill, Professor, Sociology
37. Gillian Galford, Research Assistant Professor, Gund Institute for Environment and Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources
38. Jason C. Garvey, Assistant Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
39. John Gennari, Professor, English and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies
40. Kathleen Gough, Associate Professor, Theatre
41. Anthony E. Grudin, Associate Professor, Art & Art History
42. Sayamwong E. Hammack, Professor & Director, Undergraduate Neuroscience Program, Department of Psychological Science
43. Susanmarie Harrington, Professor, English
44. Paula Higa, Lecturer, Music & Dance Department
45. Maria Hummel, Assistant Professor, English
46. Deborah Hunter, Associate Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
47. Jen Hurley, Associate Professor, Education
48. Major Jackson, Professor, English
49. Vijay Kanagala, Assistant Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
50. Brian Kent, Senior Lecturer, English
51. Colby Kervick, Assistant Professor, Education
52. Nikki Khanna, Associate Professor, Sociology
53. Felicia Kornbluh, Professor, History and Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies
54. Eric Lindstrom, Associate Professor, English
55. O. Veronica Lopez, Lecturer, Rubenstein School
56. Teresa Mares, Associate Professor, Anthropology
57. Fred Magdoff, Emeritus Professor, Plant & Soil Science
58. Todd McGowan, Professor, English
59. Rebecca A. McLaughlin, Lecturer, English
60. Anis Memon, Lecturer, Romance Languages and Linguistics
61. Libby Miles, Associate Professor, English and Director of Foundational Writing & Information Literacy
62. Eleanor M. Miller, Professor, Sociology
63. Beth Mintz, Professor, Sociology
64. Rachael Montesano, Senior Lecturer, Romance Languages and Linguistics
65. Mindy Morales-Williams, Assistant Professor, Rubenstein School of the Environment and Natural Resources
66. Charles-Louis Morand-Metivier, Assistant Professor, Romance Languages and Linguistics
67. Helen Morgan-Parmett, Assistant Professor, Department of Theatre
68. Dianna Murray-Close, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
69. Sarah Osten, Assistant Professor, History
70. Ingrid Nelson, Assistant Professor, Geography and Environmental Program
71. Hilary Neroni, Professor, Film and Television Studies
72. Deborah Noel, Senior Lecturer in English
73. Jane E. Atieno Okech, Professor and Chair, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
74. Holly Painter, Lecturer, English
75. Bindu Panikkar, Assistant Professor, Rubenstein School of the Environment and Natural Resources
76. Janice Perry, Lecturer III Dept of English
77. Elizabeth Pinel, Associate Professor, Psychological Science
78. John Pirone, Lecturer, American Sign Language Program
79. Walter Poleman, Senior Lecturer, RSENR
80. Cynthia Reyes, Associate Professor, Education
81. Corey Richardson, Lecturer, Social Work
82. Julie Roberts, Professor, Romance Languages & Linguistics
83. Kelly J. Rohan, Professor and Director of Clinical Training, Psychological Science
84. Valerie Rohy, Professor, English
85. Kate Ross, Lecturer, Communication Sciences and Disorders
86. Lawrence Rudiger, Senior Lecturer, Psychological Science
87. Frederic Sansoz, Professor, Mechanical Engineering
88. James Lam Scheuren, Lecturer, Art and Art History
89. Helen Scott, Associate Professor, English
90. Jeannne Shea, Associate Professor, Anthropology
91. David A. Shiman, Professor Emeritus, Education
92. Jean Sienkewicz, Lecturer, Social Work
93. Brenda Solomon, Associate Professor, Social Work
94. Laura Solomon, Research Professor Emeritus, Psychological Science
95. Peter Spitzform, Associate Library Professor, UVM Libraries
96. Clyde Stats, Senior Lecturer, Music
97. Brian Tokar, Lecturer II, Environmental Studies
98. Regina Toolin, Associate Professor, Education
99. Sarah E. Turner, Senior Lecturer, English
100. John Waldron, Associate Professor, Romance Languages and Linguistics
101. Rasheda L. Weaver, Assistant Professor, Community Development and Applied Economics
102. Jacqueline S Weinstock, Associate Professor, Leadership and Developmental Sciences
103. Nancy Welch, Professor, English, and Coordinator, Graduate Writing Center
104. Dan Wells, Lecturer, Environmental Studies
105. Beverley Wemple, Associate Professor, Geography
106. Jamie Williamson, Senior Lecturer, English
107. Sean Witters, Lecturer, English
108. Hyon Joo Yoo, Associate Professor, Film and Television Studies
Procedure for Consideration of Renaming Requests

The Report of the Committee to Establish Principles on Renaming (http://president.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/CEPR_FINAL_12-2-16.pdf), adopted by the Yale Corporation on November 28, 2016, sets forth the principles for consideration of requests to withdraw the name of a building or other campus structure or space ("renaming request"). The report provides:

- There is a strong presumption against renaming a building on the basis of the values associated with its namesake. Such a renaming should be considered only in exceptional circumstances.
  - The presumption against renaming is at its strongest when a building has been named for someone who made major contributions to the University.

- Principles to be considered:
  - Is a principal legacy of the namesake fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
  - Was the relevant principal legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived?
  - Did the University, at the time of a naming, honor a namesake for reasons that are fundamentally at odds with the mission of the University?
  - Does a building whose namesake has a principal legacy fundamentally at odds with the University's mission, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University's mission, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?

- The report states: "We expect that renaming will typically prove warranted only when more than one principle listed here points toward renaming; even when more than one principle
supports renaming, renaming may not be required if other principles weigh heavily in the balance.”

A renaming request must be submitted in an application that meets the following administrative requirements:

- states the grounds on which the name should be changed;
- specifies how the Principles on Renaming (http://president.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/CEPR_FINAL_12-2-16.pdf) require that the name be changed, presenting a thoroughly researched and well-documented case with supporting historical and other evidence; and
- meets other administrative requirements as the Office of the Secretary may from time to time establish.

Such applications shall be submitted in writing to the Office of the Secretary at 105 Wall Street, 2nd floor, or via email to secretary.office@yale.edu. The Secretary or designee(s) will review the application and determine whether it meets the administrative requirements. This review will not address the merits of the application. If the application does not meet the administrative requirements, the applicant will be so advised and the application will undergo no further review. If the application meets the administrative requirements, it will be forwarded to the President who will consult with members of the University Cabinet (i.e., the Provost, Vice Presidents, and Deans).

The President, following consultation with the Cabinet members, will decide whether the application warrants further review under this procedure. Further review may be warranted only if (1) the application clearly demonstrates that the request may overcome the presumption against renaming when the Principles on Renaming are applied to it and (2) the review is needed in order to address significant concerns of the University community. The President may also determine without an application having been submitted that the historical name of a building or other campus structure or space warrants review under this process.

If a renaming question warrants further review, the President will appoint an advisor or advisors who have relevant knowledge and expertise to advise the President and Corporation on the question. The advisor(s) will consider the name removal question by applying the Renaming Principles and may obtain expert advice and consultation, solicit appropriate input from the University community, require the applicant to present additional evidence (historical or otherwise), and conduct research and fact-finding. Upon completion of this review, the advisor or group of advisors will submit to the President a report and recommendation.

The President will transmit the report and recommendation to the Corporation, which will review the matter and make a final decision.
After a name has been considered under this process, it will not be considered again absent a material change in known facts and circumstances.

Student Life at Yale (#block-block-30)
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