



UNIVERSITY OF

LIVERPOOL

University Naming Framework

Introduction

1. Names are important. They are expressions of who we are and what we value. For a university, naming contributes to a shared sense of community and collective heritage, and sends a clear message to our stakeholders, partners and others, telling them how we see ourselves and what makes us distinctive. To this end we will be proactive in ensuring all of our naming practice, whether agreeing new naming opportunities or reviewing existing names, will remain fit for purpose, positively and fairly:
 - Celebrating all that is best in the heritage and current identity of the University and the Liverpool city region
 - Representing the society we serve
 - Enacting our institutional values of tolerance, social justice and inclusion
2. Naming opportunities include:-
 - Buildings, rooms, spaces (including public realm) or other facilities
 - Chairs and other academic positions
 - Scholarships, bursaries and other financial support arrangements for students
 - Prizes and awards for members of the University
3. This document sets out how the University will manage the identification, exploration and approval of appropriate naming opportunities and their subsequent review. The framework links to the University's Heritage and Culture Strategy, its Values and Ethics statement, and its approach to philanthropy.

Naming Pathways

4. There are three naming pathways:-
 - To reflect the contribution of a **supporter** or strategic partner of the University, who has offered benefaction or other direct support for our mission (e.g. the Sydney Jones Library)
 - To reflect the University's **heritage** as a historic civic university with global reach by either:-
 - i. Commemorating posthumously an individual associated with the University and their exceptional academic, institutional or societal contribution (e.g. the Eleanor Rathbone Building), or
 - ii. Recognising another aspect of the University's history and traditions (e.g. the Victoria Gallery & Museum)
 - To be **descriptive**, the name reflecting the use of the subject in question (e.g. the Central Teaching Laboratories).
5. Wherever possible, the opportunity for externally-funded naming should be explored first and, where it exists and is appropriate, given priority. To support this:-
 - The Director of Facilities, Residential and Commercial Services (FRCS) will regularly update the Director of Development and Alumni Relations on capital developments, so that possibilities can be explored with relevant benefactors and/or other fundraising initiatives. More generally, the university's Estates Strategy will provide a

guide for the timing of capital developments, which might lead to naming opportunities.

- The Director of Development and Alumni Relations will inform the Director of FRCS or relevant member of the Formal Senior Leadership Team (FSLT) of any funder-driven opportunities that might align with their area of responsibility so that fit with the Capital Plan and our strategic priorities can be assessed.
6. In the event that no suitable funding opportunity exists for something that requires naming, the heritage pathway will be explored. If no suitable heritage-related name is deemed suitable for proposal, then the descriptive pathway will be used.

Developing a Proposal

7. Primary responsibility for developing naming proposals will be as follows:
- For new or refurbished buildings, rooms, spaces (including public realm) and other capital projects, the relevant Project Control Group, with reference to the Wayfinding and Signage Steering Group
 - For existing buildings, rooms and spaces, the occupying Department via their Faculty Management Group/Professional Service, with reference to the Wayfinding and Signage Steering Group
 - For Chairs, other academic positions and other Faculty or discipline specific arrangements, the relevant Faculty Management Group
 - For whole institution scholarships, bursaries and other financial support arrangements, the Student Intake Strategy Group
 - For any other potential naming opportunities, a member of the FSLT or Professional Services Director will be identified to lead the development of a proposal as appropriate
8. Groups may choose to delegate investigatory and developmental work to specific members or individuals (not limited to the membership of the group in question), but in all cases should take responsibility for making the final recommendation.
9. In each case the relevant group will be responsible for consulting the appropriate stakeholders and applying the criteria for naming before submitting a final recommendation for approval. Stakeholders might include: relevant students and staff, alumni, relevant members of the community as appropriate, Special Collections and Archives (to advise on heritage matters), and, given the reputational impact of naming, ER (External Relations). Given the need for proportionality, the extent of consultation will vary, but active consideration must always be given to how those who the University serves will interpret and feel about the name proposed. The responsible group must demonstrate an appropriate level of consultation as part of their final recommendation.

Criteria to be Used When Developing Naming Proposals:-

10. All naming opportunities are subjective. Proposals will be considered in light of the University's Values and Ethics Statement, and an Equality Impact Assessment carried out in each instance, and each naming process will be viewed as a positive opportunity to deliver the

University's commitment to inclusion. Diversity, Equality and Inclusion issues should and must be demonstrated to have been considered actively in *all* cases. This will include consideration of any proposal in the context of how it would contribute to how representative the spread of naming is across campus. It is noticeable, for example, that currently the majority of buildings or facilities named after individuals have been named after white men, and, indeed, that the lack of representation goes beyond these characteristics. As well as these factors, the following should be considered:-

i. For funded opportunities:-

- The value of the proposed gift. Development and Alumni Relations will maintain an indicative tariff suggesting approximate financial values for different types of naming opportunity. This will be subject to periodic review by SLT.
- The public profile/contribution/reputational risk associated with an individual's name and whether they are an appropriate fit with our values of tolerance, social justice and inclusion
- Fit with existing priorities articulated through the Capital Investment Plan
- The strength of the individual's link to the University
- In the absence of the above, the strength of the individual's link to the city

ii. For the heritage pathway (named after an individual):-

- Connection with the University
- The public profile/contribution/reputational risk associated with an individual's name and whether they are an appropriate fit with our values of tolerance, social justice and inclusion
- Whether the individual is a member of a group currently underestimated in the University's previous approach to naming, with greater weight to be applied to the nomination if they are
- Eminence/impact of the individual
- Relevance to the naming opportunity subject

For the heritage pathway (recognising other historical aspects of the University):-

- Connection with a specific element of the University's history
- The public profile/contribution/reputational risk associated with the proposed name and whether it is an appropriate fit with our values of tolerance, social justice and inclusion
- Connection with the location of the facility, either in relation to the University or to its history

iii. For the descriptive pathway:

- Fit with function
- Clarity
- Concision

The points suggested for consideration under each heading will be considered holistically, rather than in isolation.

11. For all naming opportunities, care should be taken to avoid the potential for confusion with existing locations, through multiple use of terms that imply rarity, such as 'Hub'.

Approval Process

12. For supporter or heritage-related names, after a proposal has been developed and a recommendation agreed by the originating group, approval will be through the following four-step mechanism:-
 - i. *Due Diligence Panel* will ensure that reputational or legal risks of a particular naming opportunity, including the fit with institutional values and ethics, have been considered and quantified before forwarding to FSLT. The Due Diligence Panel will not consider the value or appropriateness of the proposal beyond this. In parallel, for supporter related opportunities, the Gift Oversight Group will carry out its normal role.
 - ii. *FSLT* will consider the strength of the nomination, and how this balances with any reputational risk identified by the Due Diligence Committee. Particular attention will be paid to representation. Should FSLT wish to proceed, the proposal will be forwarded to Council via Senate for final approval.
 - iii. *Senate* will receive recommendations, not for approval but for comment. This respects Senate's role in considering any matter relating to the University, given that naming opportunities reflect and contribute to the character of the institution, and may carry reputational risk. This will be done by summary list.
 - iv. *Council* has final approval. Recommendations will again be submitted as a summary list as part of the Senate report, including any additional commentary agreed by Senate, with more information being available to members on request. In this way, both reputational and statutory compliance issues will be addressed.
13. For descriptive names, approval will be through the same process, other than requiring no reference to the Due Diligence Panel.

Re-Naming

14. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, naming will be open-ended, with the University reserving the right to re-name any subject. The minimum duration of a funded name will be specified in the terms of the agreement with the relative benefactor, along with any eventuality under which this agreement might be cancelled.
15. To ensure that names assigned remain appropriate in light of either more information being revealed about an individual or our understanding of the context in which they operated changing, all names will be reviewed against the criteria described in paragraph 10 at least every five years. This review will be overseen by a member of FSLT (normally the PVC Cultural Engagement) supported by ER and Libraries, Museums and Galleries. An overall report will be submitted to FSLT identifying any names which might need replacing. Subject to FSLT endorsement, the process for identifying new names would then begin.
16. If deemed appropriate, the mechanism for changing the name of a subject outside of this cycle will be the same as proposing a new name. However, a positive reason for changing the name, beyond simply preferring the new name, must be included in the proposal. For such a proposal to succeed, it will need to be exceptional, and will most likely relate in some way to one of the following:-

- A substantial financial donation linked to the proposed new name
- The individual after whom the subject is currently named having been discredited or no longer deemed appropriate for association with the University
- Where a subject has a functional name, the function having changed

If it is felt necessary to remove the name of an individual from a subject, and no new name can be agreed through the Supporter or Heritage routes, a name describing the Function of the subject will be the default.

17. In some cases, names are unclear, or duplicated (e.g. The Oliver Lodge Building/The Oliver Lodge Laboratories). This can be problematic in terms of signage, wayfinding and other practical applications. In these cases, the Director of FRCS should, after consultation with Special Collections and Archives to check the historic position, and stakeholders to gain the insight of users, submit a proposal to FSLT for a definitive name to be recognised and subsequently used. As this will usually apply to a descriptive term in the building's title (as in the Oliver Lodge example above) this case need only be brief and would not require detailed justification.
18. Comments on our names, whether positive or expressions of concern, are always welcome, and should be directed to our dedicated email address for this purpose (names@liverpool.ac.uk). Any such comments would be used to inform our standard review procedure. A review might be brought forward for a particular name, if it becomes clear that it is giving rise to unease.

Maintaining the Record

19. To support the historic record, and to avoid confusion, the University will formally and systematically maintain a record of its use of naming. It already does this for a range of academic positions, scholarships, bursaries and awards through the statutory framework. FRCS will maintain a register of the names of the University's buildings, rooms and other capital facilities.